UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

prefaced by an outline of

Ukrainian History

-by-

John Yatchew, B.A.

Being a thesis presented to the Department of English of the University of Alberta, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

March, 1924.

PART ONE

AN OUTLINE

OF

UKRAINIAN HISTORY

++++++

C O N T E N T S

PART ONE

PART TWO.

++++++++++-

INTRODUCTION.

Among the best signs of a nation's greatness is its greatness in Art and Literature. For, it is through these that the life of the people who have reached nationhood is best revealed to us. And, we have no more perfect a medium whereby this can be better accomplished than by means of Art and Literature. The expression of national sentiment is for the most part left to the poets and the writers. They are the sole of the nation, and it is through them that the heart of the nation finds its expression. They are the select ones, the most sensitive and therefore the best interpreters of the innermost feelings of man. Since literature is the written records of man's spirit, of his thoughts, emotions, aspirations, it is the only true history of the human soul. It must be accepted as being the only outward expression of a people's inner life, in words of truth and beauty; it is a river of pure water reflecting and revealing the tastes, customs, hopes and achievements of the people.

As a nation the Ukrainian people have been heretofore little known to the world and to the English speaking world in particular. It is therefore the purpose of this essay to make them and their culture better known by means of an inquiry into their literature. The writer is aware

of the fact that the history of the Ukrainian people has been only recently introduced to foreign libraries , and has not yet been read to any appreciable extent. So that the reader not being familiar with the history of the people would probably find some difficulty in properly understanding their literature,and a dissertation on literature alone would, to a certain extent, fail in its object. Hence this brief outline of Ukrainian History.

AN OUTLINE OF UKRAINIAN HISTORY.

The Extent of the Territory of Ukraine,

Ukraine embrasses a substantial part of Eastern Europe. Its Western boundary borders on the Sub-Carpathian plains of Hungary, so as to include Galicia and Bukovina, and runs through Bessarabia to the Black Sea. The Southern line runs along the Northern shore of the Black and the Azov Sea, including the Kuban District and reaching the high Caucasian Mountains , which district is inhabited by Kuban Cossacks , who are purely of Ukrainian nationality . This territory stretches along the Black Sea extending to the delta of the Danube River. The Eastern boundary borders on the Don River, including part of the region of the Don Cossacks. The Northern line runs through Central Russia and abuts the frontiers of Poland and Lithuania.

Of the cities of Ukraine the chief and the most beautiful one is Kiev on the River Dnieper; then there is Lviv (Lemberg), Czernivtzi, Kamianetz, Zytomir, Chernihiv, Kharkiv, Poltava, Katerinoslav , Kherson, Odessa, Katerinodar and others.

The area of Ukraine is 330,000 square miles, which is about twice the size of Texas, U.S.A., and 2½ times the area of France.

This territory includes the following provinces of the former Russian Empire and of Austria-Hungary:

1. In former Russia:

Volhynia, Podolia, Kiev, Chernihiv, Poltava, Kherson, Kharkiv, Katerinoslav, Tauria, (without Crimea), Kholm, Bessarabia (about 1/5 of the province) , Grodno (about 1/3 of the province), Minsk (about 1/3 of the province), Kurk (about 1/3 of the province), Voronizh, (the South half), and about $\frac{1}{4}$ of the South Western part of the Don Cossacks' Province.

2. In Austria:

Eastern Galicia, as far as the River Sian (awarded to Poland in 1923), and the Northern half of Bukovina,(now under the sovereignty of Roumania).

3. In Hungary:

Carpathian districts including the territory South of the Carpathian Mountains of Eastern Galicia and embrassing approximately 10,000 square miles.

The above Ukrainian territory is inhabited by over 50,000,000 people,of which number the Ukrainians constitute nearly 4/5 . According to Dr. Stephen Rudnitsky, author of a geographical history of Ukraine, the number of Ukrainians in Russian Ukraine in 1910 was 32,000,000, and of Austrian Ukraine (Galicia and Bukovina) , at least 5,000,000. Then too, a large number of Ukrainians have settled in Great Russia, Central Asia, Southern Siberia, and the Maritime Province of

Eastern Siberia. Adding to this over one and one half million in the United States of America and South America, and some 300,000 in Canada, the total number reaches 40,000,000 people.

The Capitals of the Ukrainian Provinces together with the estimate of the inhabitants in 1916, are as follows:- Volhynia- the City of Zhitomir, 90,000; Podolia-Kamenetz-Podilsky, 47,000; Kiev- Kiev, 626,000; Chernihiv-Chernihiv, 32,000; Poltava- Poltava, 77,000; Kharkiv- Kharkiv, 249,000; Kherson- Kherson, 67,000; Tauria- Simferopol, 68,000; Kholm-Kholm, 23,000; Kuban- Katerinodar, 90,000; Eastern Galicia-Lviv (Lemberg), 220,000; Bukovina-Chernivtsi (Czernovitz), 90,000; Hungarian-Ukraine- Mookachiv, 20,000.

The largest Ukrainian city is the Sea-Port of Odessa with 650,000 inhabitants.

Neighbors of Ukraine.

Ukraine with its rather lengthy and uneven boundaries has many nations for its neighbors, viz: The Bulgarians, Turks, and the Greeks; then further the Roumanians , Magyars, and the Slovaks, then come the Poles, White Russians, and the Great Russians, and, finally the Kirkhiz, Hruzins, Circassians, and the Tartars.

Land and Climate.

A considerable portion of the country is represented by the Steppes. "The Steppe", says an English author of the 17th

Century "does so far resemble the sea that the mariner's compass might be useful for the direction in one as in the other". The plains stretch along the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov in a strip nearly 600 miles wide.

There are seldom any trees on the Steppes excepting in the North, but they are thickly covered with tall grasses. These plains are well watered by numerous streams and rivers. The chief of these is "Father Dnieper" as the river is called by Ukrainian Poets, which divides the Steppes into two practically equal parts. Differing from Northern and Western Ukraine, the Steppes are dry. The summers are long and hot, and the winters short but cold. The climate is such distinct in character that it is called by a French Geographer "the Ukrainian climate".

The Soil and its Products.

As to the quality of the soil of Ukraine , it seems that even a few hundred years ago Western Europe has known it to be of the best quality. Yaroslav Fedortchouk in his treatise on the Ukrainian question quotes a French writer -Pierre Chevalier- who in the 17th Century wrote "This Countrey lieth between the 51 and 48 degrees of Latitude below which there is nothing but desert plains as far as the Danube, and on the other to Palus Maeotis, the grass of which Countrey groweth to an increditable length. Ukrain is very fruitful, and so is Russia and Podolia, and if the Earth be never so little

cultivated , it produceth all sort of grain so plentifully, that the inhabitants know not for the most part what he doe with it"

The famous black soil of Ukraine is noted for its fertility, and so, to no other country as much as to Ukraine can the term " a land flowing with milk and honey" be more properly applied. This soil produces everything in abundance. Wheat is the principal agricultural product; the ripening fields of which justifies the expression "the gold of Ukraine". Besides wheat other grains grow,e.g. rye, barley and oats. The country also abounds in flax, hemp, potatoes and sugar beats. Cherries, apples and pears are extensively grown in orchards and fruit gardens for export as well as home consumption .

The vast extent of arable landmakes it possible for Ukraine not only to provide for its own wants, but also to supply the whole of Russia, and to export a large surplus to other European countries.

Ukraine produces yearly 50,000,000 cwt of corn, wheat, barley and rye. Of the total products of Ukraine, which are one-fifth of that of the whole of Russia, wheat forms 46 per cent, and barley about 60 per cent. In quality Ukraine wheat is only equalled by that grown in Canada.

The provinces of Kharkov and Tchernihov are the chief sugar centres. The ground devoted to sugar producing roots

in Ukraine covers 8,800,000 acres which produces over 2,000,000 tons of sugar yearly.

Other industries are tobacco, wine, maze, etc.

The North-East and the Northern part of Ukraine is covered with thick forest, which provides the whole country with lumber and fuel.

On the Steppes 30,000,000 head of cattle graze every year.

Ukraine is rich in coal and minerals. The Donetz coal field is said to be the largest in the world. In 1912,20,345,000 tons of coal was mined in Ukraine; all this in the district of Katerinoslav. In the same year 2,795,000 tons of iron ore having been mined in Southern Ukraine. Added to the above, manganese and salt are to be found in Katerinoslav; and the oil fields of Galicia,which outside of those of Roumania,are the richest in Europe, would when properly exploited make Ukraine the wealthiest country in Europe.

It may be noted that the geographical position of the country is quite favorable to commerce and industry. Ukraine possesses a coast line measuring more than a thousand kilometres. The land is connected with the Black Sea by three great rivers, namely, The Dnieper, Dniester and the Don.

In view of all this wealth of the country and possibilities for the development of the industries above mentioned and others, Ukraine is undoubtedly a self-sufficing State.

Origin of the term "Ukraine".

The terms "Ukraine" and "Ukrainian" (pronounced Ookrayeen or Ookrayeena, and Ookrayeenian respectively) though now universally used and preferred to other names , were by no means the original names by which the land and its people were designated. The oldest name was, according to Michael Vozniak, Rus to designate the land, and Rusini, the inhabitants therein. The Latins called them Rutheni, from which our present word Ruthenian is derived. This was the name of the cradle of Ukrainian Motherland - the territory of Kiev during the times of the first Ukrainian State of Kiev until the 12th century. But, whereas the State of Kiev embraced not only the Ukrainian Tribes, but also the White Russians and the forefathers of the present Great Russians, the term Rus came to be used to include beside Ukrainian Territory the territory of the other mentioned people . When later the State of Kiev weakened, there arose on the Western Ukrainian soil a mighty Galician-Volhynian Dukedom, which commenced using the term "Little Rus ".

Meanwhile the same reasons which caused the downfall of the Kievan State enabled the birth of the Muscovite Dukedom, which began organizing the Northern Muscovite lands and considered them as Rus. In order to show the difference between the Muscovite lands from the Ukrainian, the Greeks called the Muscovite territory Rus, i.e. Great Russia and the whole of

the Ukrainian territory- Little Russia. These terms were used only in books, for, the Ukrainian people continued to call themselves Rusini.

When in the 17th Century Ukraine came under the domination of Muscovy the Ukrainians, in order to indicate that they are a separate nation from the Great Russians, abandoned the original name and began calling themselves Ukrainians.

At first the term Ukraine was applied only to the lands bordering with the Polovians and later with the Tartans,(in the native tongue "Ukraine" means borderland). At the time of the Cossacks the name extended its territory to include the right and the left banks of the Dnieper River. And, since the new Ukrainian literature had its birth in Ukraine of the Cossacks, the name Ukraine and Ukrainian spread not only over all the Ukrainian lands, which were incorporated in Russia, but also over all those lands which became part of the former Austria-Hungary. And, so now the people of all Ukrainian lands adopt the term Ukraina and Ukrainian, since in their veins runs the same blood as that of the Ukrainians of the territory of Kiev. However more correct as answering the native enunciation, the spelling "Ukraina"may be, the Germans, French and the English for a considerable length of time have used the spelling "Ukraine". It is therefore probably better to continue using this spelling of the word. As to employing the article "the" in connection with the name, it can hardly be considered in-

correct on account of its long use, although grammatically speaking it is so.

Tribal Origin of the Ukrainian Race.

The Aryan Race.

The Ukrainian people is a member of the Slavonic race, and together with other Slavonic people belongs to the Indo-European or Aryan race. It is to the early spiritual and mental qualities and development in this race that we attribute our modern civilization. Indo-European languages include most of the languages of Europe, and also some of the languages of Asia.

Civilization of the Slavonians.

Historians tell us that from the time of their branching off from the Indo-European race the Slavs were tillers of the soil. They were engaged in mixed farming, and especially raised many cattle. Bee-keeping was also a favorite and an important occupation among them. It is therefore not without justification that these people used to say that their land " flowed with milk and honey". Of the cereals they raised rye, wheat, barley, oats and millet. It is therefore mainly in the names of these products that the present Slavic peoples find their common roots and similarities in languages. In spite of these similarities of languages and their reciprocal dealings, however, the

Slavs neither shared the same culture nor spoke the same language, nor did they belong to the same anthropologic race. And, so naturally civilization of the Slavs differed according to the place and time. For our purposes this is an interesting fact, since now a large number of researchers claim the territories of Visla and Dnieper to have been the home of the primitive Slavic races, that is so to a great extent, on the present Ukrainian ethnographic territory.

Branching off of the Slavic Races.

It is presumed that the division of the Slavs into separate nationalities was caused by the wandering of some of the groups Westward to the Oder River. A general breaking up of the Slavs into separate and distinct groups occurred when after the downfall of the mighty Huns, a great number of the Slavs in the 15th Century followed the Goths towards the Dniesterand the lower Danube. Thus we have a beginning of the Western branch of the Slavic language, among which are the Polish and the Czecho-Slovak. This group according to historians of the 16th century, migrated Southward into Thrace, and also considerably Westward. These new comers because of their aggresiveness , occupied practically the whole of the Balkon Peninsular, and in the course of time created two States, the Bulgarian in the East and the Servian in the West. To the North of the Serbs there settled the Croatians, and still further North, the Slovens.

Settlements of the Eastern Slavs.

The Eastern Slavs settled along the Middle and Upper Dniester, the Buh and the Dnieper. To the West of them were Slavonic and Germanic settlements, while they were separated from the Balkan by the Southern Slavs. In view of their geographical position, therefore it was not unnatural for them to move, as they did Eastward to the Don, to the shores of the Black Sea, into the regions of Western Dvina and to the Volga River. Tothe North and North-east of them were the Finns and Turian tribes with which they often contested. The Slavs were more numerous and stronger. In course of time, therefore, the Finns became assimilated and the outcome is the present Russians.

Needless to say, the Finns on their part during the process of assimilation influenced the Russians to a great extent, not only as regards the physical type, but also as regards cultural qualities and national character.

Ukrainian Tribes.

Historians place the settling down permanently of the Eastern Slavs to the years 700-800.A.D. They occupied the whole of the basin of the Dnieper River, excepting the remote Northern parts of it. They concentrated their settlements on the Buh, the Dniester in the Steppes and on the banks of the Black Sea.

The tribes which later amalgamated farming the Ukranian nation were as follows:- Tivertsy inhabited the banks of the Black Sea; Ulichy were to be found between the Dnieper and the Buh. Further North were the Poliani (signifying that they were inhabitants of the prairies); to the North and East of these were settlements of Derevliani (dwellers of the forest). Then on the left side of the Dnieper were the Siveriani. They were the most Northern of the Ukrainian tribes.

We see that these tribes occupied the territory in the neighbourhood of Kiev. The first Ukrainian Chronicler,Nestor, the Monk, tells us that the Princes of Kiev eventually united them under one Government. He also tells us that living among them were a great number of Scandinavian settlers; in fact the very dynasty of the Ukrainian rulers was of Viking origin.

The majority of the Ukrainian tribes at that time could boast of a comparatively advanced civilization. Their chief occupation was farming. They were great gardiners and fruit growers. Various tribes, according to where they happened to be living, were also good hunters, lumbermen and apiarists. Mead was drunk to a great extent. Mead, wax, hide and fish were their principal industries, both for home consumption and for exchange with the neighboring people.

As regards handicraft, they tanned hide, did woodwork, made articles of clay and metal. It is said that excavations reveal that people in those days made articles of iron, copper,

bronze, silver and gold.

Social Life,

The oldest Chronicler praises very highly the Poliani tribe. He says that men were naturally humble, kind and highly respected their mothers, wifes and daughters. Women in turn held them in very high esteem. Marriage was a recognized institution amongst them. On the other hand the Derevliani tribe was far behind them .They were cruel, pugnacious, and unrefined. Marriages were effected in the most primitive way , by the kidnapping of a bride by her future husband with the help of his friends. Unlike the former they were polygamists.

From information on hand one could not help agreeing with the philosopher Locke, that the State originated in the family. These tribes were really at first nothing else but large families. The tribes apparently had a democratic form of government. They met periodically and elected an Elder called Kniaz (Prince). The Prince kept order in accordance with the wishes of the meeting and led the army in time of war. Of course, real wars were not often resorted to amongst them, as land was not scarce and all had sufficient food. The art of war, however, grew out of necssity, to defend the country from the neighboring and more warlike people. In course of time, therefore, an army which could be ready to fight on short notice was deemed indispensable.

Religion,

Like many other primitive people the Ukrainian Tribes

were heathens. They worshipped the sun, heaven, water, earth and such like. Like the early Romans, the Greeks and the Saxons they believed in various Gods as having control and supremacy over the different elements in nature. The chief God was Perun; the thunder God ; Svarog, the God of Light and of the Sky; Dazhboh, the Sun God; Leada, the God of War; Volos, protector of cattle and sheep, the Pan-Apollo of the Slavs; Stryboh,God of the Winds; Morena, Goddess of Death and Winter; Siva, Goddess of Universal Life. Then there were Rivers like the Don, the Dnieper and the Danube which were divinized. Ukrainian Poets even to this day call the Dnieper River "Father Dnieper". They also believed in Vodiany, the Spirit of the Waters; Lieshii, Spirit of the Woods, the Domovoi, Genius of the Home; and the Russalkas, or Naiads. Outside of these,local divinities of birds etc., were created, and practically every family had its own protector.

In view of these beliefs it would be superfluous to broadly comment on the people being as deeply superstitious as they were religious. Suffice it to say that they used extensively their natural wealth of imagination. And, the traditions, the early tales and legends, folk-songs which have come to us,clearly reveal their polytheistic sentiments and beliefs. Much of their early literature shows their inborn inclination to revere and fear the natural phenomena which they could not understand.

The period when the Ukrainian tribes, after a lengthy

nomadic life ceased their wanderings and settled down permanently occupying a stretch of territory which they considered to be their own, thereby creating a nation, may be called the first period in the Ukrainian history. This period commenced about the 7th and ended in the 9th century A.D. Ukrainian Kings or Grand-Dukes first mentioned in history of this period are three semi-legendary brothers, Kyl, Schek and Horiv, the first of whom is said to have rebuilt and restored Kiev, the ancient Capital of Ukraine. They were succeeded by two Norseman, Oskold, who reigned from 860-867, and by Dyr, who reigned about the year 880. It may be noted that the same factor that gradually drew the Ukrainian tribes together also segregated them more and more from their former kindred Slavic races. This factor was the trading of Ukrainians with the neighboring nations, to the South with the Greek Cities and Constantinople, in which latter city Ukrainian Wheat was in great demand. Ukraine's trade relations also extended East and West. From the South traders came back with silken goods, glassware and fruit, for which they exchanged hide, wax and slaves. The Western trail crossed Galicia and Czechia to Southern Germany. Here the Ukrainian Traders traded for goods of Central Europe and those brought from Byzantium. It may here be mentioned that the influence of Byzantium on Ukraine resulting from trade relations was a very beneficial one. Grecian art and culture spread rapidly along the Northern shores of the Black Sea

and then over the whole of Ukraine . Travelling East they went as far as the Caspian Sea,or transported goods by means of Camels up to Bagdad. Since travelling was at that time unsafe owing to numerous highwaymen lurking in the woods and waiting for booty, the traders, in order to be successful had to be skilled in the use of arms. In fact the guards accompanying them were real soldiers. It is here, therefore, that we find the beginning of armies of these people which were later used effectively to defend the coveted territory around Kiev. These defences were not without advantage, for they instilled in the inhabitants the love of their land, and in that way awakened in them the consciousness of individual national entity. For this Kievan country of federated tribes the inhabitants adapted the name "Rus'" and for themselves the name "Rusini". The country inhabited by Rusini did not include the territory which was later called Muscovy.

The Russians.

A word of explanation about these people may not be amiss, owing to the fact that some of the writers are under a misapprehension as to the priority of origin of the two Slavic and kindred races, viz., the Ukrainians and the Russians. For some reason or other one finds in more than one encyclopaedia a sketch of Russian history showing the Russians to be the first great race which later gave birth to less numerous nations, one of which is the Ukrainian nation. I wish here to correct this

misapprehension , and to state that the process of branching off was vice versa to the general belief hitherto.

An old Chronicler has left records showing that to the North of Ukraine there lived two notables called the Meri and the Ves. They were descendants of the Finns. They spoke the Finnish language and lived a life different in every respect from that of the Ukrainians. For many years the White Russians (a neighboring people closely akin to the Ukrainians) and some Ukrainians travelled to those lands and settled there. The Finns were a humble race, with only an elementary education. They were peaceful with no desire for war, and their State was poorly organized. The more progressive newcomers, therefore, soon had control of the affairs of the country. The Ukrainian and White Russian Princes built their cities in various parts of the country. While living with the Meri and the Ves they intermarried and in course of time became assimilated. The new language which was the product of the assimilated races became known as Muscovite (Russian). Of course at that time the Ukrainians and this new nationality still shared one common name- Rusini (Ruthenians). The Princes who ruled this country were of Ukrainian Origin. One of them Yurey (George) founded the city of Moscow. This territory, however, was considered Ukrainian , being under the sovereignity of the Grand-Duke of Kiev. Later one of the might Muscovite Princes Andrey Boholubsky refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Kiev

and attacking with his army, he completely devastated it. From that time on the Muscovites gradually began developing into a separate nation, now called Russia.

VOLODIMIR THE GREAT.

The Second period of Ukrainian history may be termed the Golden Age period. During this period the country rose to a proud and independent Kingdom, the largest among its contemporaries in Europe, highly civilized, rich and strong. This is well evidenced by the fact that when in 907 A.D, King Oleh drew his hosts before the gates of Byzantium, the Greeks promised to pay tribute to Ukrainian Rulers. This period is placed between the 9th and the 14th centuries. Bedwin Sands of London, England, who is a close student of the Ukrainian question in his lecture on Ukrainian history stated that the kingdom reached the zenith of its prosperity under Volodimir the Great who succeeded to the throne in or about 980.A.D, and ruled until 1015. Volodimir brought the lands belonging to his realm into closer connection with Kiev by appointing as governors his own sons instead of other Princes.The territory governed included all the provinces. Ukraine of those days included Volhynia, the Carpathion country and the boundaries of Poland-the Don region, Crimea, and parts of Caucasus, Rostor and the middle region of the Dnieper. It is surmised that a fighting contingent of Varangian troops which had been in the service of the Ukrainian kingdom during the 9th and 10th centuries,

helped a great deal towards the expansion of the State. The Varangians who later served the Byzantine Emperors were at first in the service either of the Rusini or the Scandinavian Princes, and so called themselves Rusi, which supposition throws some explanation upon the theory of Professor Thure Anne, a Swedish Archaelogist, that the Rusi were Normans.

The feature of Volodimir's reign which is of great historical significance, was his conversion to Christianity in the year 988. The Byzantine Emperor , Basil II, needed help and invited Volodimir. The latter would help him only on condition that Basil give him his sister Anne for his wife. Basil agreed but requested that Volodimir first accept the Christian faith. Volodimir married the Princess, and himself became baptized as a Christian. Then, according to the custom of the timeshe compelled all the inhabitants of Kiev to be baptized . Some of the subjects outside of Kiev had been Christians since 860; after an expedition from Byzantium,Olha, wife of Ihor,became converted and she tried in vain to persuade her son Sviatoslav, the father of Volodimir to follow her example.

Volodimir the Great,or St.Volodimir as he is sometimes called, was greatly mourned by his subjects. He is well remembered for three things, namely, for the union of the Ukrainian territories which he effected, extending his rule

to distant foreign lands- the Khazars of the Volga, the Finns of the North, who later became known as Muscovites, and others who paid tribute to Ukraine; for the introduction of Christianity in Ukraine, and for the rapid progress in education and culture made during his reign as never before.

Volodimir left several sons as rulers. Unfortunately it cannot be said of them that they always worked in co-operation; as a matter of fact they often fought amongst themselves for supremacy, particularly over the office of Grand-Dukedom over Kiev. At times they even invited foreign help against one another. The result of this was for a time a weakening of the Ukrainian State, but, with the rise to power of one of them Yaroslav the Wise (1019-1054) the kingdom was again re-organized and became strong. Yaroslav became ruler of all the Ukrainian lands and annexed some of the neighboring territory. He became acquainted with various Royal families of Europe. One of his daughters married the French King Henry I;one of his sons married a Greek Princess, two others, German Duchesses; another Volodimir Monomachus, who reigned from 1113-1125, married Gytha, daughter of Harold 11, Saxon King of England, who was killed in the Battle of Hastings or Senlac in 1066. This contact with foreign powers was without doubt very beneficial to the Ukrainian people from the point of view of civilization, culture, industry, trade and commerce.

Yaroslav like his father established schools all over the

country. He was himself fond of learning. He had some of the Greek works translated into Ukrainian, and also built a library at Kiev. As a ruler he endeavoured to maintain order in the State. He made numberous good innovations in legislation and was the first to keep records of these. He is therefore remembered as the"compiler of laws."

Volodimir Monomachus was successful in 83 important campaigns, concluded some 19 treaties with the Barbarians,who pressed upon the frontiers of the kingdom,and took 300 Princes of the nomad Mongolian nation of Polovtzians. In his reign the Golden Era found its conclusion.

The Tartar Invasions of Ukraine.

It was not fated that Ukraine continue enjoying the prosperity which it reached at this time. The neighboring Muscovites grew zealous of its power and under the leadership of their Duke Andrew Boholubsky entered Kiev in 1169. Besides the sword they used fire and raised the city to the ground. Then other invaders, namely, the Hungarians, Khozars, Pechenyhi, and later Polovtzi and others stormed the walls of the realm with the intention of plundering, but these were successfully repelled. Real danger came with the coming of the Tartar tribes. They were migrating in large numbers into Europe from the plains of Asia, Ukraine, being less protected by nature on her Eastern frontier, became an object of incessant invasions.

The Tartars were found to be warlike people, did little

work and lived on plunder. The Ukrainian peasants were no match for them in war. They crept in from beyond the Don and the Volga under the leadership of their Khan, and at first attacked the Polovtzi, and when they were successful here, they proceeded towards Ukraine where they badly defeated the Ukrainians in the year 1224. They then went back, but thirteen years later returned. In 1237 the Tartar Khan Batey with a 300,000 army invaded Muscovy and conquered it. He then moved on to Ukraine, and after destroying Kiev, over-ran with his army the whole of the country. The wild hordes spared neither property, men, women nor children. Their plan was to leave noone alive behind them. In five years' time the Tartars had control of the whole country. Many men, women, and particularly pretty girls were carried away by the invaders and made slaves, or in case of maidens forced to become wives of the Khan and of his men. Those who remained in the country keeping the inhabitants under subjection, exacted exorbitant taxes from the people. And , so for the first time in history the humble Ukrainian peasant felt the cruel yoke of the Infidel , restricting his freedom in his own land. This experience left a bloody mark in his memory, and often in his own heart attributed this state of affairs to the petty discords among the Princes.

And now, since the Dnieperian Ukraine was turned into a number of disunited communities paying tribute to the Tartars, Roman (1199-1206) took it upon himself to strengthen the kingdom

where this was possible to be done. He succeeded in uniting under his rule the provinces of Galicia, Volhynia, Kholm and Podolia. His dominions still formed territorially the largest among the States of contemporary Europe.

Roman's son Prince Danilo (1228-1264) continued to work with his father and endeavoured to free Ukraine of the Eastern foe. He was a man of strong personality and succeeded in driving the Tartars out of the land after the first invasion, and was hailed as savior of the country. He regained practically all of the Ukrainian lands. Under his rule prosperity once more was beginning to be felt, education spread and the people began to renew dealings with the civilized nations of Western Europe.

But, luck would have it that Danilo be away in Greece in connection with an international affair at the time of the second Tartar invasion. When he returned he found the country in ruins and the enemy in power. He was forced to enter into a treaty with the Khan, this time promising to supply him with military forces when asked for instead of paying taxes as he previously did. Danilo, however, had his mind set on ridding his country completely of the Tartars, and so resorted to diplomacy. He arranged for marriages between his sons and the Hungarian and Lithuanian Royalty. He was also on friendly terms with the Polish King, and with the Pope. He could not obtain outside assistance , nevertheless, and his own army being

small, failed in his attempt at driving the foe altogether out of the land. The reign of Danilo was the culminating point in the Galician kingdom and the last page in the history of ancient Rus' (Ruthenia). Soon the process of dismemberment decisively obtained the upper hand, and in another Century Ukraine's political independence was at an end. At the death of Danilo in 1264, no stronger leader was to be found who could resist the Tartars.

UKRAINE'S RELATIONS WITH LITHUANIA

While Ukraine was warding off the incursions of the fierce barbarians and when finally its resistance weakened and its people became harnassed in a foreign yoke, its neighbors prospered and grew in power. Amongst these were Poland and Lithuania. The latter eventually came to the assistance of the Ukrainians, but its object in doing this was selfish gain. It not only claimed for its own any territory of which it gained control by driving away the Tartans, but also by several later successful invasions brought the whole of Ukraine, with the exception of Galicia, which was annexed by Poland in 1340, under its domination. Together with Ukrainian lands Lithuania also annexed the country of Bila Rus' (White Ruthenia), now called White Russia. The two kingdoms thus united were called Lithuanian Rus.

However, it cannot be said that the Lithuanian rule

was a harsh one. The Ukrainians had no reason to complain against it. Outside of putting the Ukrainian Princes out of office, the Lithuanian Princes did not try to effect many sudden changes in the country, on the contrary they themselves soon underwent a change. They became converted to Christianity; being illiterate they acquired some education and learned to speak and write Ukrainian. Their legal enactments and documents were written in Ukrainian. In short because of the higher civilization, culture and mental development of their subject people, the Lithuanians became assimilated, with the result that their State in course of time became in reality a Ukraino- White Ruthenian State.

During the Lithuanian rule the Ukrainians had only the Tartars to fight against, and this was now a much easier task than formerly. The country gradually grew richer, and the former refugees were lured to return to their native land and to resume their favorite agricultural and pastoral life. Besides the Ukrainians, foreigners were also attracted to come and make their homes here. Bedwin Sands states that there may be found in Ukraine old names such as O'Brien and O'Rourke, which goes to prove that people of distant foreign countries came to settle in the happyland. And, when we consider that in those days in Ukraine all were free, and republican institutions thrived while their neighbors the Muscovites had an absolute Monarchy,and the Poles a haughty Aristocracy, we feel

like admitting that it was a happyland indeed.

During this period the Cossacks, whose origin could be traced as far back as Scythian and Cymmerian times, were first made use of by the Lithuanian Princes.

UKRAINE AND POLAND

We now come to a very important era in the political history of Ukraine. The international relations between Ukraine and Poland resulted in the most unhappy consequences to the former country . And, it is only by a careful study of these relations that we will be able to understand the discord which to this day exists between the two nations. The following Latin verse of the Cossack period which reflects on the Polish Rule may give us a slight idea of the transformation that took place in this land of progress and promise:-

"Clarum regnum Polonorum
Est Coelum Nobiliorum ,
Paradisum Judeorum,
Et Infernum Rusticorum. "

Poland had been waiting and hoping for a long time to stretch its arm in order to absorb Ukraine into its own kingdom. It viewed with jealous eyes the rising democracy, but could find no pretense for interference with its internal affairs. But its opportunity came; at the death of the Polish King Ludwig, his daughter Jadwiga survived him. In 1386 the Polish nobles arranged a marriage between her and a Lithuanian Prince Jahailo,

at the same time electing him King of Poland. In return he promised to annex to Poland the whole of Lithuania, Ukraine and White Ruthenia. Jahailo kept his promise, and soon Ukraine was incorporated in the new Polish-Lithuanian kingdom. The Poles soon began to play the leading role in the federation and succeeded in removing the Lithuanian claims upon Ukraine and turning the latter into their exclusive property. Even at this time,nevertheless, Ukraine preserved its autonomy, but presently we shall see how difficult it was to keep it in view of Poland and later Russia determining to exterminate the Ukrainian nation. Poland could not bear this autonomous State, for, the Szlachta (nobles) found it a difficult task to keep their semi-servile peasants from migrating to Ukraine to escape the lords' lash and to enjoy democracy. Severe measures were , therefore, employed by the Polish government to prevent the Polish peasants from leaving their land.

It appears from the above that the lords in Poland had a strong hold on the poorer classes whose liberty they limited to the extreme. It was the lords alone who had a saying in the government of the country. At conventions called "sejm" which they arranged periodically, or as necessity required, they elected Kings for rulers. The King was directly responsible to the lords, and without their consent could not pass a single enactment, nor could he ever ignore their wishes and still retain the throne. Each lord had a castle and an army

of his own, and so did not care to wholly renounce his personal liberty in favor of a common body politic. We are all aware how this individuality of the Polish lords and their "Veto" ultimately caused the downfall of Poland. It is needless to add that practically the whole of the land belonged to the lords or the clergy, in a way similar to the feudal system of Western Europe. The subject class was compelled to perform socage services, while the lords gave command and led a life of pleasure and ease.

In the natural course of events when Poland gradually got a stronger and stronger hold on the property of Ukrainian peasants, the King, in order to retain the support of the lords, began to allot large tracts of the peasants' lands to them. And, since only a Pole could hold land, the Ukrainian and Lithuanian aristocratic families saw that in order to be allowed to retain their property they would have to become Polonized. Consequently many of them renounced their nationality, gave up their language, and allowed themselves to degenerate into oppressors of their own people. Thus it was not long until Ukraine was becoming a scene of sporadic castles of lords. Ordinarily the lord himself would be residing in the City while his lessee, usually a Jew, would be managing his estate and extorting all he could out of the poor working people in order to make enough for his lord and for himself. . Quite frequently his treatment of the pesant would be barbarously

inhuman. He had the power of life and death over him similarly to the masters in the early history of the Roman Pater Familias,

Once the majority of Ukrainian Aristocracy became Polonized, the Poles saw the possibility of inducing the rest of the people to follow their example. This, of course, could not be effected over night, nor was it wise to employ methods of compulsion, hence, they decided upon what they considered to be an unequivocal method of Polonizing them by means of substituting their faith. As already noted the Ukrainians adopted Christianity from the Greeks. Their religion was called Greek Orthodox. The Poles on the other hand were Roman Catholics. Without doubt, with the aid of religion, assimilation of the Ukrainian element would be considerably enhanced. They commenced their work by sending Jesuits among the Ukrainians with instructions to endeavor to effect conversion, but since this appeared to be too sudden and direct a method, they resolved to suggest a union of the two churches. Their proposal was to allow Ukrainian Priests to adhere to Greek ritual, but along with the Roman Catholics to recognize the Pope as their head. After negotiating for some time the Ukrainian Metropolitan Rahoza together with two other bishops Terletzki and Potey in the year 1595 at the Council of Brest secretly consented upon the union, proclaiming their adhesion to the dogma and hierarchy of Rome, and delivered the executed document to the Pope. This document purported to speak for the entire Ukrainian nation. The Poles

now had a good pretense to carry out their church reform. Ukrainian churches were being turned into Polish, Orthodox Priests were being dismissed, and in their places Roman Catholic Priests were placed. The Ukrainian Noblemen were from childhood forced to abandon their Orthodox faith, language and nationality, or, if they refused to do so, they were not admitted to public offices, and the civil and political rights enjoyed by the Poles were denied them. The people through oppresive measures were forced to worship in a way which they disliked. This led to much controversy and serious developments.

But, it is said, when adversity comes it usually follows one on top of another, and, so it was with the Ukrainian nation. While Poland was keeping the Ukrainian peasant down and reaping the benefits of the Ukrainian State, there was another danger threatening the State's existance from the South.

THE TURKS AND THE TARTARS

To the South of Ukraine in Crimea was a kingdom of the Tartars, while the territory along the Danube was also inhabited by four hordes of the same people. The Ukrainian kingdom at that time stretched up to the banks of the Black Sea, and so occasionally frictions occurred between the wandering Tartars and Ukrainians for pasture claims and game in the forest.

In the year 1453 when the Turks defeated the Greeks, and the Sultan made Constantinople his Capital, he proceeded to overcome the Khan and to annex the Tartar lands to Turkey, in

which he succeeded without much difficulty. In a short time the Turk had under his subjection several different nationalities, among whom were the Greeks, the Serbs and the Bulgarians,; from this time on the Turks and the Tartars from natural inclination and because the Mohammedan religion contained no restrictions to the contrary, were making ceaseless inroads upon the Christians, and Ukraine was a victim of pillage and plunder. In addition, whenever Poland and Russia happened to get into a quarrel , either one would ask the infidels for aid , and this was injurious to the inhabitants of Ukraine. The year 1484 witnessed the climax of these invasions. The Crimean Khan Mengli-Girey, a friend of the Russian Czar Ivan III, invaded Ukraine, ruined the City of Kiev and took back with him a great number of the citizens.

The Tartars returned again an d again. The hordes were merciless in their treatment of men, women and children . They burnt the villages, plundered property, and gathering the people as it were, in a flock, chased them on horseback using the whip as they went along. These slaves were even branded with hot irons so that they could easily be kept track of. When they reached Crimea they were classified into different grades and put up for sale. Not infrequently the older and the weaker ones not being fit for work were put aside to be used as targets in shooting practices, or else they were stoned to death or cast into the sea. The slaves had to endure great hardships and inhuman tortures. They were forced to work every

day including holidays, while at night they were kept in prison. The more unfortunate ones were made Galley-slaves and were manacled to the Turkish Galleys, which they propelled by means of oars. These manacles were seldom loosened until the relief by death necessitated it.

Perhaps the most severe lot was that of Ukrainian women and maidens, especially the pretty ones, who, not without justification cursed their beauty. They could never escape the hold of the Infidel, and when captured were forced to become his concubines or sold to those who wished to buy them.

This Turkish-Tartar peril hung over the Ukrainian people for a long period - for decades. This is seen from the fact that as late as 1575 the Tartars again visited the unhappy land and carried away over 55,000 inhabitants, 40,000 horses ans about half a million of cattle.

Brotherhoods.

The time had now arrived when the Ukrainian nation was to be wholly disintegrated and its existence wiped off the face of the Earth, or it was to do something for its salvation. Groping in the dark for a means of self-preservation the Ukrainian people conceived the idea of organizing guilds called Brotherhoods.

Brotherhoods were organized in the Country as well as in the Cities. Some of them had an immense membership. Hetman Sahaydachny for example joined the Kievan B rotherhood together with his Cossack army.

The function of these brotherhoods was to help morally and materially the Ukrainian cause. They established Churches, hospitals, homes for the aged and infirm, helped the poor and where possible ransomed slaves from the Turkish or Tartar captivity. They also brought aid to the Ukrainian clergy who were abused by Polish or their own Polonized nobles and bishops. They often carried their grievances to the Patriarch at Constantinople, and in some instances, obtained relief. Besides this, after the formal union of the Orthodox and Catholic churches, they were from time to time called upon to defend the Orthodox Faith. Sometime previously some of the leading Ukrainians who had not become Poles, as for instance, Constantine Ostrovsky or the Khodkevitchi began establishing Ukrainian schools and printing presses for printing books. The Brotherhoods favoured and followed the same policy.

Before long, thanks to these Brotherhoods many national educational institutions flourished in the land. People read and studied. They defended their nationality and Faith. Many books were being printed and knowledge was spreading among the common people who then commenced to recover their consciousness of nationhood.

Yaroslav Fedortchouk notes an interesting fact, and that is, that the earliest grammar of the Ukrainian language in Latin and Ukrainian is said to have been published in Oxford in the sixteenth century.

While the Brotherhoods were benevolent, educational and cultural organizations it is quite obvious that in those days

of predominance of physical force over everything else, and an even more cogent belief than at present of might being right, these Guilds could not be an effective antidote against the attempts of Uknaine's foes to reduce it to insignificance. A physical force was a sine qua non, otherwise the extinction of the Ukrainian element was inevitable. Hence we see this force coming forth in the form of the Cossacks.

The Cossacks (Kozaki).

The term "Cossacks" is misapplied nowadays. And without doubt the Cossacks of old would have been ashamed to call themselves so, had they known that it later be given to the half savage regiments of the Russian police force. I have in mind a native expression which is still in use, which will serve to illustrate the meaning of this old organization, the remark is, "He's a Kozak" which is understood by all to mean the same thing as the anglo-saxon expression "He's a brick".

The Cossacks were organized somewhat on the plan of the chivalry of Western Europe. Their precepts were obedience, piety, chastity and equality, and their greatest virtue was to take a revenge on the Tartars the Turks and other enemies of Ukraine. Their beginning dates back to the Tartar invasion, and the whole Polish-Lithuanian is remarkable for their gradual growth in number, strength and organization. The formation of these associations of warriors to defend the liberties of their oppressed countrymen against aggressors, roused great hopes in the inhabitants with regard to their future political life.

The Cossack leader was the Hetman (headman) who was

elected on a wholly democratic principle and was highly respected and obeyed. But at the same time, he was not exempt from being liable to be dismissed for incompetency or improper management. The Cossacksadhered to strict rules of justice and order. They welcomed into their ranks any Christian however dark his past record may have been, so long as he made up his mind to repent and commence to live in conformity with their standards of manhood and morality. No credentials were required from those who threw in their lot with the Cossacks. Criminals fleeing from justice or injustice, religious martyrs, those irritated by the trammels of the state or of society, all were welcome in to this common melting pot. For any digression from the rules of conduct in the organization the members were severely punished. For instance, if a Cossack dared to bring his wife with him he was tried and executed. Similarly the penalty was severe for even though very slight departures from the set principles. In their various mannerisms the Cossacks were bizarre, which was it is presumed designed with the specific purpose of terrifying their enemies. They shaved their heads leaving only one long wisp of hair in the middle of the head at the top. Their moustaches were long and were twisted to lay down.

Ordinarily the Cossacks travelled in divisions under the leadership of their Hetman. Sometimes the Hetmans were of the common folk, but quite often they were chosen from the patriotic nobility. Since the Cossacks' mission was to defend their native land from the Tartars, and to emancipate slaves and property

from the hordes, the nobles co-operated with them. One of such nobles was Dmitro Vishnevetsky, who is known in Ukrainian poetry as Baida. He built a castle on Khortitsia Island on the Dnieper, gathered a large army of Cossacks and from thence directed his operations against the Turks. In course of time the Cossacks made the island on the Dnieper "Zaporohami" (signifying beyond the rapids) their principal place of abode, and that is where the names Zaporogian Cossacks and Zaporogian Seech are derived from. There all who were abused by the lords at home and expected to be punished for an offence, or simply wished to try a life of adventure, found a ready resort.

The Dnieper river was a good passage to the Black Sea and to the Turks; with this advantage the Cossacks often went as far as Constantinople and after a successful encounter with the enemy returned with liberated slaves and other trophies. Not infrequently, however, they were not so fortunate in their expeditions but were captured by the Turks and Tartars and retained as slaves.

In the early development of the Cossack associations, the Polish nobles were grateful to them for affording them protection against Mohammedans, but when they saw that they were losing hold on their semi-servile peasantry who were rapidly deserting them to swell the ranks of the free Cossacks, they began to place restrictions on their successful growth, and, not being able themselves to counteract the widespread influence, they even solicited the aid of the Sultan in their acts of repression. Various

limitations on the liberty of the Cossacks coupled with their endeavours to Polonize them by means of imposing on them Roman Catholicism was too much for a freedom-loving Cossack to bear. The result was, ceaseless revolts against the Poles which lasted for over a score of years. Thus now Ukraine became once more engaged in constant warfare on several fronts. At first they were quite successful, so that the Polish king Stefan Batory who reigned from1576 to 1586 practically recognized the complete autonomy of Ukraine. But their force was not equal to that of the enemy, so they met with defeat.

But the Zaporogian Cossacks were so far invincible. The nobles could not reach the "Seech". Their Hetman Petro Konashevich Sahaydachny was a great personality and has been in fact described as one of the greatest Slavs in history. Under him in 1612 the Cossacks became again very powerful and in 1618 Sahaydachny proclaimed himself Hetman of Kievan Ukraine and of the whole Cossack army . By numerous successful campaigns and by many clever acts of diplomacy he had transformed the Cossacks from a half military, half piratical caste into a disciplined organization, a nucleus of the revived national State. He kept the Infidels at bay and succeeded in weakening the Poles with the result that they were forced to recognize the independence of Ukraine. Presently the whole Ukraine called itself "Kozachchina", the land of the Cossacks. Due to his education, wisdom and good leadership Sahaydachny is famous; for the spread of education, establishing of printing presses, building of churches

and the production of works of learning and art. During his rule Petro Mohila the Metropolitan of Kiev, founded the first Ukrainian University called "Academia of Kiev".

Unfortunately these victories in battles and in spiritual progress were of short duration. In a battle against the Poles and the Turks near Khotin the great leader was mortally wounded and upon his return home, died in 1622.

After his death the Poles again set to work to tyrannize over Ukraine with redoubled fury. The people were massacred in cold blood and the country mercilessly wasted. Sands quotes the following excerpt from Harmsworth's History of the World stating: "Among the Polish magnates who took the greatest share in the enslavement of Ukraine, Yarema Wishniovicki distinguished himself by his barbarity; he burnt, beheaded, impaled or blinded all the Cossacks who fell into his hands" Let them feel they are dying " were his orders."

Several different leaders arose to lead the Cossacks against the foe and the greatest of them was an officer of Chihirin.

Bohdan Khmelnitsky.

Khmelnitsky was a skilful warrior, he was well educated wise and cunning. He suffered imprisonment first by the Turks and later by the Poles, when he escaped he fled to the Seech where the Zoporogian Cossacks welcomed him as their leader. Then in 1648 he set out to clear his Country of the Poles. As he went along his ranks were augmented daily. The peasants being

tired of the oppressive foreign yoke, all joined him. Those who could not get a sword or a gun took with them scythes, forks or other implements for weapons, and joined the army fighting heroically for their freedom. With such help and encouragement Khmelnitsky conducted a series of brilliant campaigns. He annihilated the enemy's forces, put the Polish State into a process of rpaid disintegration, and freed Ukraine. He entered Kiev in state, and there was proclaimed Hetman of the whole of Ukraine. Foreign Courts including Poland, Muscovy, Turkey, Venice Hungary and Sweden sent their ambassadors to the ruler of liberated Ukraine and some offered alliance.

At this time Khmelnitsky signed a treaty with the Poles and returned home. But the trouble was not over, the agreement contained no restrictions on the Polish nobles desiring to settle in Ukraine. With the return of the nobles popular uprisings again took place and there was bloodshed once more. This time Khmelnitsky failed to obtain the confidence of his subjects; consequently he was defeated. A new treaty was signed, but it was worse than the first one and was short-lived.

A new war resulted in which the Ukrainians were for a time victorous but through the treachery of the Tartar Khan who had proposed to assist him, but who in fact favoured the Poles Khmelnitsky saw that he was forsaken. The Khan concluddd a treaty with the Poles and returned home together with a great number of Ukrainians doomed to slavery. The struggle continued, however. Poland was too jealous of the existence of the new nation, so it

lost no time nor spared efforts in stirring up enmity of its neighbours against it. This was easily accomplished, for the country was rich and they saw their chance to get their share of the wealth therefrom.

When thus beset by enemies on all sides, being harassed by Poles, Turks and Tartars, Khmelnitsky was forced to come to the conclusion that Ukraine could not exist as an entirely independent nation. Accordingly the Ukrainian National Council decided to enter into an alliance with one of the powers. There were several evils to choose from. Under the advice of Hetman Khmelnitsky they decided upon Muscovy. On January the 8th 1654 a treaty was signed at Pereyaslav in the Province of Poltava, a step which the Ukrainian nation has regretted ever since.

It may not be out of place here, to point out the interest shewn by the Anglo-saxon world in the Ukrainian Republic of the seventeenth century. Fedortchouk states that English writers of the time displayed great concern in the affairs of this country. The reason for it being that in the seventeenth century Ukraine was still an autonomous state and the country and its people were of no small importance in the affairs of Europe. The writer says that it is possible to trace the history of the heroic Khmelnitsky and of his revolts from 1649 to 1654 against the Polish oppressors of his country, in the English newspapers of that time. For example a copy of the Mercurius Politicus of July 3rd-10th, 1651 contains in

part the following; "From Statin in Pomerania, 8th June. They write that the Cossacks have met some part of the Polish forces coming from Lublin and Quarnikow, that were marching to the King's army, whom they engaged and routed, But on the other side , that Prince Ratziwil from Litaw, is falne into the Cossacks Country, called Ukrain, and both taken the chief city thereof, called Kiew; But hereof is no certainty"

Another extract reads as:-

"From Dantzick, March 7th, 1654 S.N. The news out of Poland is, that the Cossacks have agreed with the Muscovite, and to secure him their fidelity, are to deliver him three Earldoms, if it be not a report rained by the Court to further the agreement with the Cossacks, as to procure more large contributions, which a little time will shew"

The writer selected a few passages out of Edward Brown's translation of a French book entitled "Histoire de la Guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne, avec un discours de leur origine, Pays Moeurs, Gouvernement er Religion, et un autre des Tartares Precopites," The book was written by Pierre Chevalier who obtained some of the information contained in it from the celebrated work by Guillaume la Vasseur, Seigneur de Beauplan which appeared in 1651. The translation of the book was published in 1672. Chevalier describes the character of the Cossacks of the time thus:-

"The inhabitants of Ukraine, who are all at present called

Cossacks, and glory in carrying that name, are of a good stature, active, strong, and dextrous in what they doe, liberal and little caring to gather Riches, great lovers of Liberty, and that cannot suffer any Yoak; unwearied, bold and brave." The translator begins his Preface by remarking:

"Although Ukraine be one of the most remote Regions of Europe, and the Cossackian name very Modern, yet hath that Country been of late the Stage of Glorious Actions, and the Inhabitants have acquitted themselves with as great Valour in Martial affairs as any Nation whatsoever; so that this and other Motives have made me earnest to put this account of it into English; where it cannot be otherwise than acceptable, since the Description of a Countrey little written of, and the atchievements of a daring People, must needs be grateful to those who, of all the World, are the most curious and inquisitive and the greatest lovers of bolt Attempts and Bravery....
Nor can this short Treatise be unseasonable, since most have their eyes upon this Countrey at present; and it is already feared that the Turks or Tartars should make their Inroads this Summer into Poland through Ukraine,scarce a Gazette without mentioning something of it; and our preparations in the Western Parts will probably, at the same time, be accompanied with great attempts upon the most Eastern of Europe"

UKRAINE AND RUSSIA

The Treaty of Pereyaslav was the most momentous event in the life of the Ukrainian Republic. By the articles of the treaty, officially called the Articles of Bohdan Khmelnitsky, which treaty is still in the Statute Book of the Russian Empire, or was before the revolution, Ukraine recognized the supreme authority of the Czar over itself. Nevertheless, it was to retain all its former rights; neither the Czar nor the nobles had any right to interfere with Ukrainian affairs. The Hetman had rights and powers to the extent of receiving and sending ambassadors to foreign countries. He had to pay the Czar a yearly tribute, which he was allowed to raise without interference of the Czar's officials. In return the Czar bound himself to render Ukraine the necessary military assistance. Two of the principal articles of the treaty are as follows:-

"1. If the Hetman dies bythe Will of God (for every man is mortal- such is the law of nature) let Ukraine herself choose a new Hetman from her own people, and only inform the Czar of the election. Let His Majesty be not discontented by that, for it is an ancient custom of the country.

The Czar ordained and the Boyars voted: Let it be according to their wish.

2. Let the Hetman and the Ukrainian Government receive Ambassadors who "ab antiquo" come from foreign lands to Ukraine. The Hetman and the

Ukrainian Government will consider themselves bound to inform His Czarish Majesty about proposals about proposals which might be directed against it.

Concerning this article the Czarish Majesty ordained: To receive and to dismiss the Ambassadors who come with good intentions informing His Czarish Majesty precisely and in good time about their proposals and the replies given to them. Those ambassadors, however, who will be sent from anywhere with propositions hostile to His Majesty, must be retained in Ukraine, and His Czarish Majesty must be asked immediately for instructions. Without such instructions they must not be allowed to depart. With the Turkish Sultan and the King of Poland they are not to treat without an express instruction of His Czarish Majesty"

The terms of the covenant seemed reasonable indeed. One would not blame the Cossacks for acquiescing to them without much hesitation, and particularly at the time when they were in good need of protection and support. To their surprise and eternal chagrin, however, they found that the document so solemnly executed was insofar as the Russians were concerned only " a scrap of paper". " Consequently the conflict between the Ukrainians and the Muscovites began immediately after the compact was entered into.

In uniting eith Muscovy, Khmelnitsky with his supporters reckoned on a better harmony of the two nations than was experienced with Poland. One favorable underlying cause for

this, thought he, was the similarity of Faith which they professed. But it did not take them long to find out that there was a wide gap between them which could never be filled.. In the first place during the revolts in Ukraine under Khmetnitsky, all the nobility was driven out of the country. There were no more lands possessed by the lords,nor any subjects in bondage. The peasantry were free to till their own soil. Those in the towns led uninterruptedly their professional lives, while the Cossacks served in the army. Each of these classes elected their own officials who served in a representative capacity. The clergy including the priests, bishops and metropolitans were all appointed and dismissed according to the will of the majority. At the head of all organizations was the Hetman who was the first citizen of the Republic, but who too was accountable to the masses.

Quite a different state of affairs existed in Muscovy. There the people as a whole had no political or other rights. They were in bondage, serving their lords in a more oppresive servitude than the Ukrainians had to do some years previously. There was no franchise in the election of government officials. The Czar appointed these out of the nobility who were even more inconsiderate and unreasonable in the treatment of the common people than were the Polish nobles.

As to religion, there was originally no difference, but as time went on divergence in ritual and other formal matters gradually became apparent. There was a still greater difference

between the two countries in their standard of education. Throughout Ukraine were found public and high schools. Students were sent abread to acquire higher learning. Printing presses were at work and knowledge was rapidly being diffused all over the land. The Muscovites were uneducated. For the advantage of the nobles the opening of schools was discouraged and forbidden. No printing was allowed. But, when one enterprising printer named Khvedorovich ventured to print a few books he was accused of getting support of the Satan and had to flee from the country to save his life. In short, the whole system, political, social, and educational was in contrast to that of Ukraine. The Muscovite nobles and rulers were jealous of progressive Ukrainians, for their humbled subjects began demanding rights which they saw their neighbors were enjoying .

THE DOWNFALL OF UKRAINE

It was, therefore, in a large measure owing to the circumstances that Muscovy at its first opportunity set to work to bring Ukraine to its knees and to establish a different order therein. Contrary to solemn obligations, it concluded a secret Convention with Poland with a view to the partition of Ukraine. Presently Russian contingents were sent against Ukrainian Towns, and it was evident that Russia had no intentions of respecting the autonomy of Ukraine as agreed at Pereyaslav.

This encroachment upon Ukraine's independence provoked

great dissatisfaction among the Ukrainian masses who would not be ruled by the Russian Aristocrats. In 1658 the Ukrainians under the leadership of Ivan Vihovsky rose against the Muscovites and defeated them in 1659. The Poles succeeded in occupying Ukraine of the Right Bank in 1660, but were forced to abandon it four years later. In 1666 by the Peace of Andrusov, the Czar regained the Left Bank.

There were now two Hetmans in Ukraine, one of the Right Bank and the other of the Left Bank of the Dnieper., but they were too weak to struggle against two powerful nations. Two of the Hetmans Ivan Vihovsky and Demian Mnohohreshny who opposed their rule were expeditiously done away with. The former was killed by the Poles, while the latter was tortured and later exiled to Siberia by the Russians. Another Hetman of Western Ukraine Petro Doroshenko a sincere champion of Ukraine's liberty fought long and heroically for his country, but his forces were finally exhausted, and he died in a Russian Prison.

SWEDEN AND UKRAINE VERSUS RUSSIA.

In 1687 Ivan Mazeppa, of whom Lord Byron in his poem entitled "Mazeppa" says:-

"Of all our band,
Though firm of heart and strong of hand,
In skirmish, march, or forage none
Than Thee, Mazeppa! on the Earth
So fit a pair had never birth,

Since Alexander's days till now,

As thy Bucephalus and Thou;

All Scythia's fame to thine should yield

For pricking on o'er Flood and Field"

was elected Hetman of all Ukraine. He could not bear to see his people abused and enslaved by Czar Peter I who then occupied the Russian Throne. Mozeppa said that the ranks of Ukraine's army were badly depleted and that it was a waste of energy to try and resist a great force with his scanty army. He looked around for assistance and succeeded in inducing Charles XII of Sweden to become his ally. The fatal Battle of Poltava was then fought in 1709. Both the Ukrainians and the Swedes were defeated by the army of the Czar. Hetman Mozeppa downhearted and discouraged fled to Turkey. This ended Mozeppa's career as a ruler and patriot, but he is still remembered as much by the Russians as by the people for whom he fought. This is amply evidenced by the fact that to this day he is being cursed from the pulpit of the Russian churches. Very often too, we find in the Russian Press the word "Mozeppintsy" which to them is a word of scorn denoting the people from which Mazeppa descended. Since this battle the history of Eastern Ukraine is that of a gradual destruction of the independence of the people. The country was deprived of its own rulers and Czar Peter became master of it. The first thing he did was to take his revenge on the inhabitants who dared torevolt against his supremacy.

He made them drain swampy lands, dig canals and build fortresses. From overwork and disease they died by the thousands. During the five years,from 1721 until 1725, 20,000 Cossacks thus lost their lives. He ruin of Ukraine was at hand. Hardly anyone was left to stand up for its liberation. When Hetman Paulo Polubotok was intrepid enough to defend the rights of his country, the Czar cast him into prison at St.Petersburg where he died in 1724.

At the death of Peter L in 1724 matters did not take their course for the better. For Menschikoff, who ruled in the name of Catherine I carried on the same policy with respect to Ukrainians as his predecessor. At the accession of Peter II in 1727 some changes were made. Daniel Apostol was elected Hetman of Ukraine and in 1728 by an imperial Ukaz Ukraine was granted self-government. Unfortunately in 1730 the Czar died and the Hetman soon after him. The future rulers abandoned the old policy and the next Hetman Razumovsky appointed by the Czarina in 1750 found himself powerless to reconstruct the lost kingdom, for the Czarina's intention was to completely suppress the Ukrainian national idea.

During this vaccilation of the existence of the Ukrainian Kingdom there was one strong hold left which for a considerable length of time defied the Czar's attempt to reach and weaken it. This was the Zaporogian Seech on the Dnieper. True, during the war between Peter and the Mozeppa the Seech was to a large extent

ruined; but the Zaporogian Cossacks still stoof their grounds. However, as soon as Czarina Catherine II ascended the Russian Throne in 1775, she sent a large army against them. The Cossacks defended their fort with superhuman heroism, but they were greatly outnumbered and were therefore eventually routed, and the Seech was completely demolished once and for all. The last Ataman of the Cossacks, Petro Kalnishevsky was sentenced to life imprisonment for defending his country. With this said event passed the last vestige of the indence of the once free and great Republic of Ukraine.

Being familiar with the line of conduct of the Muscovite rulers with respect to the Ukrainian nation, it is not difficult to conceive what followed their destruction of the Seech.

The Czarina lost no time in distributing the people's lands amongst her Generals and to Noblea. Any one who opposed her schemes was severely punished. Many were sent to prison or executed, and many others exiled into Siberia, and all possible means were employed to persecute the Ukrainians. Prohibition of publication of books in Ukrainian,begun sincethe Battle of Poltava, was strictly adhered to. With the introduction of serfdom in 1783 every person belonging to the poorer class became merely a "res" under submission of his lord .

Of course in spite of banishment and persecution the Russians could not destroy all the Non-Russian element, some of it had therefore to be assimilated. The term "Rus'" began to

be used as a synonym for Muscovy, and was later intended to to include Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland and all other nations within the Russian Empire. Soon the term "Muscovy"was also to be forgotten and only one name "Russia" was to be used, the idea being to make Russia a melting pot of the various races therein where all would soon forget their nationality and become Russians. With regard to Ukraine, the Russians named it "Little Russia" as if to show that there was really no difference between the Muscovites and the Ukrainians and that they were of common parentage with the former. In fact even a few decades ago the word "Ukraine" was forbidden to be used, to designate a nation, and persons using it were punished for treason. No wonder, therefore, that one now finds so little information in the encyclopaedias which would enlighten him as to the position of Ukraine formerly occupied as a nation.

Since towards the end of the eighteenth century Ukraine found itself at a very low ebb insofar as its liberties were concerned, we hear practically nothing of its people. When people are overburdened with a heavy yoke, there is little opportunity for national development. But, to be considered as being of no account amongst the nations is a disgrace against which the instinct of every self-respecting member of a nationality strongly rebels. Nor would the Ukrainians with their brilliant historical past stand this infamy. The spirit of emancipation and advancement did not cease to work in the minds of the

progressive Ukrainians. Prohibitions, punishment, Siberia, death none of these would daunt their spirit. In 1846-7 a few Ukrainian intellectuals set up in Kiev a secret political organization which they named "The Confrerie of Saints Cyril and Methodius" which strove to free the Slav nations and to make them all independent and confederate under the protection of Russia. It would have serfdom abolished and liberty of thought, religion and public speech procured. The society was short-lived, however. Before it had time to put its schemes into operation it was unearthed and the members punished by imprisonment. With this unfortunate event the intellectual Ukrainians for a number of years felt themselves constrained to be resigned to their fate. The Russian government began to employ more systematic means then hitherto to keep down the Masses. Education in the Mother tongue was denied them, while even the Muscovite Schools were few. In addition, the government manufactured "Vodka" and other strong drinks for the purpose of crippling the peasant's mentality.

After the Crimean War in 1856, a wave of social reforms went over Russia. Improved conditions in other countries roused in the inhabitants of Russians a strong feeling for a change. In order to at least party satisfy their demands, Czar Alexander II in 1861 abolished serfdom. With this horrible restriction of their personal liberty taken off, the Ukrainians lost no time in organizing educational bodies, and immediately began the

work of alleviating the masses from the intellectual torpor imposed on them by the Russian Autocracy. The Polish landlords, who had some say in political matters of the country, under pretext of fearing a peasant revolt, objected to this movement. The government heeding their apprehensions closed the Ukrainian Schools and clubs, proscribed books published in Ukrainian and deported all those connected with the initiation of the movement.

From that time on the Russian government would at some time allow some freedom of the press, while at other times it would limit it according to its whim. The importation of Ukrainian books from Galicia where Ukrainian writers fled to escape the severe censorship , was strictly censored, and their index expurgatorius was a very lengthy one. This oscillation of extension and limitation of rights underwent considerable change following the Revolution in 1905-6. Newspapers commenced to be published, literary societies were formed and numerous libraries and reading rooms were opened. Popular books were also published; these were in great demand and helped considerably in broadening the intellectual and national horizon of the masses. This activity was soon found to be unsafe to the security of the State, and the societies conducted in a language other than Russian were ordered to be closed. Through this the Ukrainians and the Jews suffered most. The pre-war period commencing in 1906 finds Russia busy issuing ordinances, by the Duma, prohibiting publications , fining editors, or arresting them, and using various

methods to stop the expansion of the Ukrainian national movement, but all this proved ultimately to be of no avail.

Let us now go back to consider that part of Ukraine which was called "Ukraine of the Right Bank" which was under the sovreignty of Poland but virtually under the control of the Polish landlords. There, after the defeat of the Ukrainians, the Cossacks ceased to exist as an organization. The Polish nobles persistently maltreated the common Ukrainian population. The people could not bear it very long so they rose in revolts. Companies formed were called "Haidamaki" (meaning Highwaymen) , but they were not highwaymen in the ordinary sense of the term, for their motives were to a great extent political. These bands went round attacking and robbing the nobles and then concealing themselves in the woods and mountains. Occasionally they would be badly reduced in numbers after a clash with the army of the nobles, and would cease their operations for a time, but the ill-treatment of the people by the lords would only make them rise again. In the year 1768 a Zaporogian Maksim Zalizniak joined one Gonta, and the two with their "Haidamaki" began to take the upper hand over the nobles. The nobles were obliged to seek assistance which they obtained from Czarina Catherine II, who sent an armed force and quelled the rebellion. The insurgents who escaped being killed in the battle were captured and dealt with in a barbarous manner. Their bodies were mutilated by amputation of the limbs and by flaying the helpless victims. Then the vanquished "Haidamaki" seeing

that nothing could be done in liberating themselves and their countrymen from bondage, became unwillingly resigned to their fate and abandoned their method of taking a revenge on the tyrants by means of occasionaly raids on them.

Presently the Polish aristrocratic rulers through ambition, selfishness, and unpatrictic management of their country's affairs, brought it to an inevitable economic ruling. During the years 1772-1773 followed the partition of Poland. Ukraine of the Right Bank was awarded to Russia. Galicia which had fallen to Poland and for nearly 500 years remained under its brutal domination, was awarded to Austria. Several years later in 1775 Bukovina which was lost to the Ukrainians since the Tartar invasions, and was for a long period of time part of Roumania, became incorporated into Austra-Hungary. With this the Austrian-Russian period of the history of Ukraine set in.

Austrian, Ukraine, i.e. Galicia and Bukovina touch the Russian frontier and are a natural continuation of Ukrainian Territory in Russia. The people of these provinces continued for a long time to call themselves "Rusini" i.e. Ruthenians, and that is why one is often called upon to explain the difference between the terms "Ukrainian" and "Ruthenian" As a matter of fact there is no difference between the two, apart from geographical differences in the territories which they occupy. Nowadays when one speaks of Ukrainians, he invariably includes those people who are referred to as Ruthenians, wherever they

be. It may be noted that since the closing of the last century there has been a strong tendency among the Ukrainians of marked national aspirations to eliminate the term "Ruthenian" altogether, and to use only the one general name "Ukrainian".

EASTERN GALICIA

Ordinarily when referring to the province of Galicia an Ukrainian has in mind Eastern Galicia, the capital of which is Lviv (Lemberg). Western Galicia is populated by the Poles and is regarded even by Ukrainians themselves as Polish territory.

The fate of Ukrainian Galicia has been very similar to that of Russian Ukraine. Upon the incorporation of Galicia into Austria, the province was united with the Duchy of Cracow, and the government of the newly formed portion of the Austrian Empire was entrusted to the exclusive control of the Polish oligarchy. Of course in theory the Austrian constitution gave the Ukrainians equal rights with the Poles, but in practice this was not so. The Poles made Galicia their imperium in imperio. They continued their attempts to trample on the rights of the Ukrainian people and to keep the political power in their own hands. Through "Gerry-Manderry" and other corrupt manipulations of the electoral districts, the Ukrainians who formed 75% of the population of the province were greatly outnumbered by the Poles in their representation in the Parliament in Vienna ; all the political offices were filled by Poles. The Ukrainians were denied the

privileges of higher education by the limitation of the number if schools they were allowed to build. And, when later they had launched a campaign for a separate Ukrainian University, which idea was to a certain extent meeting with the official approval at Vienna, the Poles did all that possible to prevent the establishment of the proposed institution of learning.

The reasons for this usurpation of political power by the Poles are not far to seek. The Polish landlords were strong even at the time of the Partition of Poland. Their former political prestige continued and was recognized by Austria, While the Ukrainian Peasants who were deprived of their intelligentsia and who could not very well stand up for their rights, received practically no consideration from the Government. The landlords were allowed to retain the socage system and Polonization of Ukrainians was persisted in. Polish schools and churches were built in purely Ukrainian districts. The Poles also endeavored to colonize the province with Polish settlers, placing them on land taken away from the Ukrainian peasants. Such were the attempts to merge the two nationalities into one. This was a similar scheme to that contrived in Russian Ukraine. There were naturally some differences in their methods of arriving at their goal, but their ultimate purpose was the same. For instance, the Russians Russianized a great number of the Ukrainian intelligentsia by permitting only those who spoke Russian to occupy important positions. And, with regard to Ukrainian language, they derided

it as being merely a jargon or a dialect of the Russian, while their solgan with regard to Ukraine was "Ukraine never existed, does not exist and must not exist" The Poles, on the other hand, though they also succeeded in Polonizing many Ukrainian intellectuals somewhat in a manner resorted to by the Russians, yet, as far as language was concerned, they could not claim that Ukrainian was similar to theirs.

The attempts on the part of the Poles to completely Polonize the Ukrainians were not wholly successful. At the beginning of the 20th century we see a ray of light piercing the dark cloud of oppresive tyranny. Ukrainian patriots, writers and poets for decades past have been doing the good work of enlightening their brethen, and their work began bearing fruit. This was better faciliated than in the Russian Ukraine owing to the fact that in Austria serfdom was abolished in 1848, while in Russia, about thirteen years later. The common people realizing their position of inequality with regard to political rights began to demand their rights more and more vehemently. In 1904 Ukrainian peasants urgently demanded their rights of freedom in elections. They were met by an armed Polish gendarmerie which shed their blood for their audacity in asking for what they justly deserved.

The strife went on, for the Ukrainian national sentiment could not be suppressed. The Polish aristocracy spared no

efforts in their policy to keep the Ukrainians down. Persecutions of Ukrainian intellectuals continued. As a result of this Miroslav Sichinsky, a student at the University of Lviv on the 12th of April 1908 uttering the words " This is for the grievances of the Ukrainian people" shot and killed Count Andrew Potocki, Governor of Galicia. Immediately the Polish "Prawica Narodowa" (People's Right Wing) proposed a secret Council to decide upon the best methods that could be used against the Ukrainians. Some of the schemes which were discussed at their meeting and decided upon to pursue are as follows:-

At a meeting held on the 15th of May 1908 the first speaker was Dr Stanislav Smokla, Professor of the University of Cracow. He said in part:

"The Ukrainians, as well as the Russians, and White Russians, are not Slavs but merely a conglomeration of different Asiatic tribed. This is proven by the dark hair of the Hutzul, which can not be seen in other Slavs, and which accounts for the wild character of the whole Ukrainian race.

The Ukrainian members of Parliament are not representatives of their people, thus no relations can be had with them. Ukrainians in general are not worthy of being spoken to, except the "Moskophils" (A Ukrainian party in sympathy with Russia. Though born Ukrainians they are directly opposed to them) who behaviour is exemplary and whose help we must seek in destroying the Ukrainians."

Another speaker, Dr. August Sokolovski, a Gymnasium professor said:

"I second all that has been spoken by the former speaker. I condemn the Ukrainians as an unsatisfied people whom we cannot satisfy. They cannot live without hatred towards the Poles.

We thought they would help us against Russia, but they have meanwhile taken a liking to such rebels and cut-throats as Khmelnitsky, Gonta, Zalizniak. Thus every Ukrainian is now a Haidamaka"

This is not time for parleying. The proper thing to do now is to defend our territorial situation in Rus'. If the Moskophils are able to help us in this respect let us pretend to be their allies and friends."

The next speaker was Father Chotkovski, professor of the University of Cracow, and a great enemy of the Ukrainian clergy. He said:

"I have been for 21 years a close student of Ukrainian history and I have come to the conclusion that the Ukrainians have no right to complain against the Poles. The Ukrainians hate the Poles and constantly strive to do them harm. They are a nation of fools, sluggards and questionable characters. With such, honorable warfare is impossible so they must be destroyed in every possible way."

The following day on May 16th 1908, the participants in the meeting of the Prawica Narodowa convened in stately manner

and continued the discussion of the Ukrainian question. It was decided that the Ukrainian must be crushed unmercifully while the Moskophils must be enticed by various promises in order to win them over against the Ukrainians, "But we" yelled one of the speakers " are not afraid, and we shall march forward cold-bloodedly over hundred of bodies with contempt for the Ukrainian barbarians. Therefore, march on, sons of great ancestors, and soldiers of liberty, and a Poland will arise, greatcomplete, undivided, from sea to sea"

The second meeting of the Prawica Narodowa for consideration of Ukrainian extermination was held 18th of May, 1908.

It was resolved that:

Agricultural schools should be established in Western Galicia only. Poles to be brought in free of charge, their expenses to be paid out of the public treasury; Ukrainians to be allowed only on payment of a large fee so that they might be unable to profit thereby. In this way the culture of the Polish peasant will be enhanced while the Ukrainian peasant will languish in darkness and misery.

The Ukrainians should by no means be given a University, because it would be a factory for the umaking of a Ukrainian intellectual class which would be dangerous to our plans.

" We must seek allies beyond our boundaries",they said,"and engender in them enmity towards the Ukrainians"

Then Dr. Louis Kolankovski said in part:

"The schools must be utraquised , positions must not be given to Ukrainians, and in the East all offices should be filled by Pan-Poles. Get busy for the Ukrainians are threatening us! I think that Rus' must be destroyed."

The final speaker Dr Marion Sokolovski in conclusion said:

"What must be done has been reiterated by others. I merely want to add that an edition of the history of Ukraine must be published in the Polish spirit, for the whole history of Rus' in Ukrainian is intended to spread hatred towards the Poles"

One cannot but call this a project for the destruction of Rus'. But, if the Polish aristocracy deemed that they had some justification at the time to concoct such plans to annihilate the Ukrainians of Galicia, it would seem , in view of the facts of history, quite strange that they would consider this question in a similar manner some two hundred years before when their subject people were much weaker, and the danger of national upheaval was comparatively remote. Yes such was the case. The Polish nobles at the beginning of the 18th century had their minds made up as to how to destroy the Ukrainians. One of the Polish nobles in the year 1717 drafted thirteen ways which would aid them in their work against the Ukrainians, and it will be interesting to compare these with the resolutions of the Polish Council just referred to. Some of them are as follows:-

To strive to live on friendly terms with Russia, who might seek to look after the interests of Orthodox Ukrainians in the

Polish state. Thus if Poland would live in friendliness with Russia, the latter might not pay attention to Poland's actions towards Ukrainians. Having destroyed the Ukrainian race and increased her own strength, she might then be able to cope with Russia.

Ukrainian nobility, notwithstanding whether they were Greek Catholics, and all the more if they were Orthodox, must be kept out of all prominent positions, especially such wherein they might become rich and famous and thus an asset to all Ukrainians. This should be enforced by a separate law. No Pole should live with a Ukrainian on friendly terms, unless there is some profit thereby. When in the company of Ukrainians, to ridicule their rites as much as possible so that they would rather renounce their nationality and rites, than bear such ridicule.

Wealthier Polish nobles must not accept Ukrainians as servants, especially in a capacity whereby they might acquire a fortune and education. Only such Ukrainians should be accepted as might be expected to turn apostates. In this way they will be compelled to live in ignorance, poverty and contempt, and will thus gradually degenerate. And further, if any one should wish to escape this low status, he would have to turn an apostate.

The greatest difficulty will be found in dealing with Ukrainian Bishops and clergy. These bishops must be hoodwinked so that they will not be able to see what is going on about them, while the clergy must be overburdened with such hard labor as

to deprive them of all initiative.

The priests must be kept in the greatest possible ignorance, for an ignorant pastor will not be able to enlighten his followers. The best means to this end would be: To keep them in great poverty.

In order to destroy the Ukrainians more readily, all advances upon the Poles must be carefully exaggerated, so that it may appear to the world that Poles are waging a just warfare against the Ukrainians. If authentic facts are lacking, they must be invented. What is till better: Let us fabricate letters hostile to Poland, to the Poles and the Roman Catholic religion, with signatures of their priests and bishops attached, and secretly scatter these seemingly Ukrainian letters. This will give us a valid reason for destroying the Ukrainians.

In this way we will arrange so that the Polish kingdom will be inhabited by one nation united by love, peace and harmony, that Roman Catholicism will progress by leaps and bounds, that we will grow stronger. For it must be well understood that if the Ukrainian race is left to exist, whether as Orthodox or Greek Catholics, our supremacy must always remain insecure. On the other hand if we Polonize them, it will in the first place destroy Russia's hope of taking them from us, and in the second place we will strengthen ourselves through them against Russia- in which God help us! Amen !

The above facts hardly require any further comment to show

the political relations of the two nationalities. One thing is evident, and that is, that the Ukrainians have set the Poles thinking on more than one occasion that they are a force which cannot be dismissed heedlessly out of consideration, but must be reckoned with.

The Russians too, seeing that the Austrian Ukrainians are more progressive in their national movement than the Ukrainian subjects, began to fear their influence spreading over Russian Ukraine. To counteract this threatening evil, the Russian Government commenced to send Russian clergy and other agents to Galicia for the purpose of corrupting the Ukrainian national ideals therein and thus destroy the source of danger.

UKRAINE IN THE GREAT WAR.

The pre-war days were, in so far as the Ukrainians were concerned, days of lively preparation, preparation both in Austria and in Russia not for war and bloodshed but for a peaceful re-establishment of the old Ukrainian Democracy. The stormy years of 1905 - 6, during which the people voiced their grievances, compelled the Russians to relax in some of their prohibitions. They were prevailed upon to investigate the restrictions placed on the use of the Ukrainian language and on the Ukrainian movement as a whole. One of the outcomes of the inquiries was the decision of the Petrograd Academy

that the Ukrainian language was distinct and separate from the Russian. This was the first admission and affirmation of the Russians themselves that the Ukrainians were justified in their claims to the existence of their language and literature. This was a great victory indeed.

In Austrian Ukraine, in spite of the Polish usurpation of priority in political rights and the Russian Russophil propaganda headed by Count Bobrinsky to Russianize the Ukrainian element, the intelligentsia and through it the peasants, who were able to discern the difference between friend and foe, kept on organizing educational institutions and thereby coping with the adverse influences and making headway in the cause. To the Ukrainians these were the days of hope and prayer, but to the Russians the tragedy at Serajevo was long overdue, for, a happening of that character could easily involve them and give them a pretext to advance against Austria and to destroy this intellectual Piedmont for the Ukrainian movement.

That the anxiety of the Russians concerning this impending peril was not without foundation is well evidenced by the fact that one of the first incidents in the war was their invasion of Galicia, during which the whole of the territory inhabited by the Ukrainians was occupied by Russian troops. The new Governor's avowed object was the Russification of Galicia. Immediately Ukrainian schools were closed and Russian language was introduced. The Holy Synod too, tried hard to impose Orthodoxy in the occupied area. The Uniate Archbishop of Lviv, Count Andrew Shepticky was arrested

and sent to Russia for imprisonment.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The year 1917 proved to be the climax of the struggle of various forces within the Russian Empire, resulting in internecine war, the destruction of the old order and rather laborious attempts to establish a new one. To the outside world it appeared as if the disturbance was due only to economic causes and to the unbearable autocratic rule of the Czar. Unquestionably these were the primary causes, but, it must be remembered that political injustice with regard to the various nationalities inhabiting the country, also contributed to the uprising. Among the aggrieved nationalities were the Ukrainians. And, it soon became clear that pari passu with the struggle for agrarian and other reforms, went the Ukrainian national movement of regeneration.

Soon after the commencement of the revolution, namely, on March 16th, 1917, an Ukrainian National Rada (council) was formed at Kiev. It was composed of Ukrainian intelligentsia, representing mainly the thought of the Ukrainian Social-Democrats, Social-Revolutionists and Social- Federalists, as well as of the non-partisan Democrats. Professor Michael Hrushevsky of the University of Lviv, the noted historian, sometimes called "Little Father" of the Ukrainian movement, was elected President.

On April 19th the Ukrainian National Congress was opened at

Kiev. At this Congress the name of the Rada was changed to Ukrainian Central Rada, as it had to represent not only the Ukrainians, but the other nationalities of Ukraine as well. The representatives in Ukraine were then admitted to it proportionally to their percentage of the population of the country.

In answer to a proclamation issued by the Rada, an Ukrainian Army Congress was called in Kiev in May. The soldiers organized the Ukrainian Military Rada, recognized the Ukrainian Central Rada as their supreme governing body, and promised it support. A resolution was also passed in which an immediate nationalization of the army with respect to Ukraine was demanded. Organisation meetings of peasants and working men were held, and an active organized campaign in which people of all walks of life took part and which was kept alive particularly through the untiring efforts of school teachers and students of the High Schools and the Universities, soon spread over the whole country. The result was that in a short time the governing body was augmented to 650 members. At the meetings the main issue was to demand the full measure of autonomy for Ukraine within the Russian Federal Union. Accordingly, the Rada, through its Central Committee, sent a deputation to Petrograd requesting the Provisional Government to recognise the Rada and to proclaim the principle of Ukrainian Autonomy. Besides this, it demanded among other things, the immediate acceptance of representation at the Peace Conference and consideration of issues in connection with the fate of Galicia

and the Ukrainian territories occupied by the Germans; the appointment of a High Commissioner for Ukrainian affairs; the drafting of Ukrainians into Ukrainian regiments; official recognition of the Ukrainian language; and a grant of funds for administrative purposes.

The delegation met with disappointment and had to return to Kiev empty handed. The several demands of the Rada were not met. Prince George Lvoff, the first Premier of New Russia, declared that the political question was one to be decided in the name of the whole Russian people at the meeting of the Constituent Assembly. M. Kerensky, the Russian Minister of War at the time, immediately went to Kiev for the sole purpose of discussing with the Rada one of the most important of their demands, namely, the separation of the Ukrainian national army from the Russian Forces. Among other things Kerensky told the Ukrainians as follows: "We consider it impossible at the present moment to regroup the armies on the principle of nationality; after the war we can deal with the question of changing the form of grouping the army, but not now. For this reason we have stopped the organization of Esthonian, Lettish and other national detachments".

The evasive reply of Prince Lvoff and the unfavorable point of view of Kerensky provoked a storm of indignation in the Rada and particularly in the radical group.

In spite of the moderate attitude of Hrushevsky, who claimed that the idea of federation will in Russia play the same part as in the United States of America, saving the country from disunion, and some of the other leaders who were of the same opinion, the Rada, after several days of secret session, passed a resolution declaring that the Provisional Government had acted against the interests of the Ukrainian people. Several days later Manifesto called the "First Universal" which was approved on June 24th 1917, was issued by the Rada. The proclamation was couched in terms that cannot be criticized as being too extreme. It asserted in the opening lines that "Without separating from Russia and without breaking away from the Russian State, let the Ukrainian people on its own territory have the right to dispose of its life, and let a proper government be established in Ukraine by the election of an Ukrainian National Assembly, a Diet, on the basis of universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage. Only such an assembly has a right to issue laws which affect the entire Russian State. No one knows better than ourselves what we want and what are the best laws for us. No one better than our own peasants knows how to manage our own land. For that reason we wish, after all private, State, Czarist, Ministerial, and other lands have been handed over throughout Russia to the various peoples, and after a constitution has been drawn up by the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, that the constitution and

and public order in our Ukrainian territories should be entirely inour own hands, that is, in the hands of the Ukrainian Diet." The document proceeds with an assertion that "henceforth we alone shall regulate our life" and then calls upon the Ukrainian people to co-operate with other nationalities living in Ukrainian territories and to help organizing the Autonomy of Ukraine.

The Manifesto was immediately spread broadcast over the land, and a counter manifesto by Prince Lvoff went unheeded. Within a few days the new Ukrainian Government had been formed under the name of General Secretariat. Among the members appointed were Vinnichenko, President, Petlura, Secretary of War, and Yefremov, Secretary for International Affairs.

The Petrograd Government became alarmed at the developments of the Ukrainian movement, and after negotiations with Kerensky and others, who came to Kiev for that purpose, conceded the Ukrainian position so far as to recognize the General Secretariat as the highest administrative organ. The relations between the General Secretariat and the Provisional Government from that time on, even in a greater degree than hitherto, continued to be of a controversial nature. The Ukrainians persisted in asserting their rights, while the Russians were powerless, owing to the existing state of war, to deny them same. After the recognition of the General Secretariat by the Provisional Government, the Rada, having scored an undoubted victory, issued on July 29th, 1917, another "Universal" in which it alleged its

willingness to await the decision of the Constituent Assembly. At the same time the constitution and procedure of the General Secretariat were outlined in detail.

But the alarm of the Provisional Government grew to the extent that it attempted to take away from the Ukrainians what it had previously granted them. Kerensky issued an "instruction" to the Rada limiting its powers as well as those of the General Secretariat. In protest to this the Ukrainian Cabinet resigned. And, at the time of the Bolsheviki's rebellion the Ukrainians, seeing that the Russian attitude towards them was hostile decided to remain neutral.

THE PROCLAMATION OF THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

On November 20th, 1917, the Ukrainians issued their third Manifesto which read in part as follows:

"To the Ukrainian people and all the peoples of Ukraine! An hour of trials and difficulties has come for the land of the Russian Republic. In the North, in the Capitals (Petrograd and Moscow), a bloody internecine struggle is in progress. A central Government no longer exists, and anarchy, disorder and ruin are spreading throughout the State.

Our country also is indanger. Without a strong united and popular Government Ukraine also may fall into the abyss of civil War, slaughter and destruction.

People of Ukraine, you, together with the brother peoples of Ukraine, have entrusted us with the task of protecting

rights won by struggle, of creating order and of building up a new life in our land. And we, the Ukrainian Central Rada, by your will, for the sake of creating order in our country and for the sake of saving the whole of Russia, announce that henceforth Ukraine becomes the Ukrainian People's Republic. Without separating from the Russian Republic, and preserving its unity, we take up our stand firmly on our lands that with our strength we may help the whole of Russia, and that the whole Russian Republic may become a federation of free and equal peoples."

Then followed the decrees by which land was to be transferred to the peasants, labour was to have control over industry, an eight hour day in all factories and workshops was established and death penalty abolished. Further, a guarantee of liberties won by the Russian Revolution, namely, freedom of the Press, Speech, Religion, Assembly, Union, Strikes, inviolability of person and habitation, and the right of using local dialects in dealing with all authorities.

Meanwhile, there came a complete downfall of the Provisional Government and the rise to power of Lenin and Trotzky. The Bolshevik government did not seem at first to be opposed to the Ukrainian national claim to be constituted a separate Republic, especially in view of their desire to live in peaceful federation with the new Russian Republic. What seemed to them to be of no little concern were the social conditions therein. The Ukrainian peasants were small proprietors whom

the Bolsheviki labelled as "capitalists" and "bourgeois", and therefore, not in accord with their conception of an idal form of government for the whole of Russia. This pretext, they asserted, was a justification to denounce the Ukrainian Rada, which according to them was made up of the bourgeois . Following up in their schemes the Bolsheviki initiated a civil war against the Ukrainian People's Republic. This war, particularly round Kiev and Odessa, was waged intermittently throughout the winter, terrorising the population and disabling the Rada from maintaining order in the country. The unfortunate state of affairs necessitated another appeal of the government to the people of Ukraine. This appeal was,

The Fourth Manifesto of the Ukrainian Central Rada.

The Manifesto was endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Rada on January 24th, 1918, and goes beyond the preceding ones in many respects. It begins with a declaration to "the people of Ukraine" that "due to their power, Will and word there was created on Ukrainian soil a Free Ukrainian People's Republic, which was a dream of their forefathers, who strove for freedom and the rights of the working classes".

It further announces that in order to frustrate the Petrograd government the Ukrainian Central Rada declare that from date the Ukrainian People's Republic is completely free and desires to live in friendly relations with Austria, Russia, Roumania, Turkey, and other neighbouring nations. Then it provides for the nationalization of all private landed property including forests, waters,

mines; all branches of commerce and industry, including state monopolies for banks and for the production of coal, iron, leather etc; shall be under the management of the Republic.

In concluding, the Rada appeals to all the subjects of Ukraine for their unwavering support of their newly won liberty and the Government of the Republic. A short time afterward circumstances compelled Ukraine to enter into a separate peace treaty with Central Powers.

UKRAINE MAKES PEACE

Warfare at home coupled with the invasions of the Austro-German forces, brought upon the Ukrainian population starvation, disease, death and ruin. The trouble at home was in fact sapping the life of the people even more so than the war with the Austrians and the Germans. It was the Bolsheviki, therefore, who were responsible for the Ukrainians being thrown against Germany. On February 9th, 1918, at 2 a.m. Ukraine entered into a peace pact with the Central Powers, which was the first Peace Treaty in the Great War and in which the Ukrainians thought they saw their own salvation since it would give them a free hand to cope with their domestic troubles. The treaty was signed at Brest-Litovsk and was entitled:

"A Treaty of Peace Between Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, on the One Part, and the Ukrainian People's Republic on the Other".

This treaty of peace provided for immediate evacuation of occupied territories; establishment of full diplomatic relations; mutual renunciation of indemnities; and until a specified time, a reciprocal exchange of the more important surplus supplies of agricultural and industrial products for the purpose of covering current requirements. Touching on the boundary question, the Ukrainian boundaries were to be so drawn as to include the Province of Kholm, but without taking in any of the Ukrainian territory in Austria.

There seems to be no question as to the validity of the treaty signed by the Ukrainians. During the plenary session of the Peace Conference at Brest-Litovsk, which was presided by Dr. Von Kühlmann, representing the German Government, a question was raised as to whether the Ukrainian Delegation had the authority to represent diplomatically the Ukrainian People's Republic or whether the Delegation of the Petrograd Government wished to continue to represent the interests of Russia as a whole. Hereupon Trotzky, Chairman of the Russian Delegation, made the following declaration:

"Being informed of the Note of the General Secretary of the Ukrainian People's Republic, which has been communicated by the Ukrainian Delegation, the Russian Delegation, for its part, declares that, acting in full recognition of the principles of the right of self-definition for every nation, it finds no objection to the participation of the Ukrainian Delegation in the Peace negotiations, even if this should involve a complete

secession of the latter from Russia".

It may be noted that besides Russia and the Quadruple Alliance which acknowledged the independence of the Ukrainian Republic, Great Britain and France too, early in 1918 recognized it as an independent State and appointed for Ukraine their officials to represent their respective countries. The Ukrainian Government was duly notified of said appointments.

PEACE WITH CENTRAL POWERS A TRAGEDY TO UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

It was only too soon after signing the Peace Treaty when the Ukrainians discovered that they had repeated the mistake of some 250 years ago, when by the Treaty of Pereyaslav Ukraine recognized the supremacy of Russia.

The Ukrainian Rada, in its appeal to the German nation solicited moral support and good-will in the reconstruction of the new Republic. The appeal by no means carried with it the import that they were to meddle in the internal affairs and to interfere with the administration in Ukraine. But, the Germans were hungry, and what more, rapacious. Under the pretext of aiding the helpless Ukrainian population against the Bolsheviki forces, Austro-German troops overran the country, occupying cities, seizing war stores, confiscating food-stuffs, and meting out penalty to everyone who dared to oppose them. Their demand that Ukraine should turn over to them 85% of its grain and all of its sugar, except that needed for local consumption, was far

from reasonable. When this was denied them they went on seizing all food which they could lay their hands on, while protests from the Rada were ineffective. So that the Austro-German troops soon had control of the best strategic places of Ukraine. Several years later, the Germans themselves received a similar treatment in the French occupation of the Ruhr district. But, the French had some justification in their action against Germany while the Germans had none in their treatment of the Ukrainians.

All efforts of the Ukrainian Rada to clear the country of the invaders and to restore order in the country were futile. A complete anarchy prevailed. There was a constant strife between the Ukrainian Parliament (Rada) and German officials for supremacy. On April 25th the German Field Marshal, in order to"restore dicipline in the country", proclaimed martial law, At the point of the gun the German officials ordered the members of the Rada to carry out their commands. On April 29th, 1918, the tottering government hurriedly drafted a Constitution of the Ukrainian People's Republic, and that act ended the struggling existence of the Rada. On the same day a number of well-to-do peasants, who had never agreed with the Rada in their policy affecting the division of lands, held a convention at Kiev, and with the assistance of the Germans, proclaimed General Skoropadsky, former adjutant of the Czar Nicholas II, Hetman or supreme military chief of Ukraine.

This by no means settled the Ukrainian question. Later,

during the several years of Rakovsky's premiership of Ukraine, who in the summer of 1923 was appointed head of the Russian Trade Legation to Britain, the peasants constantly revolted. And, even now in the beginning of the year 1924, Chubar, the successor of Rakovsky in Ukraine, finds that his subjects will not give him peace until they are in fact and not merely in theory allowed to govern themselves.

THE CASE OF EASTERN GALICIA AFTER THE WORLD WAR

In the year 1918 a dissolution of the Austrian Empire was effected. Czechs (Bohemians), Roumanians, and Serbians carved out for themselves out of the old empire, territories which ethnographically belonged to them. Quite naturally the Ukrainians also, in accordance with the principle of self-definition, declared, in November of the same year, Eastern Galicia together with Northern Bukovina, as the "Western Ukrainian Republic". A central government was organized and a President elected. An old man, a great Ukrainian patriot in the person of Dr. Evhen Petrushevich, formerly President of the Ukrainian Representation in the Austrian Parliament, on being fervently urged by the Ukrainian National Congress which met on October 19th, 1918, consented to take upon himself the solemn obligation of a President.

The Western Ukrainian Republic had not, at the time of its coming into being, made known its position with respect to the Ukrainian People's Republic. This was probably due to

the chaos existing in the latter country, but there is no doubt that when normal times had arrived a close federation of the two would have been considered.

Immediately upon the proclamation of the Republic, the Poles decided to hinder its development and took up arms against the Ukrainian Government. The Ukrainians of Galicia now had the Bolsheviki, the Roumanians and the Poles to fight against. The result was that between November and the following mid-summer an even greater devastation of the country took place than during the former Russian invasions. Little help at home was available. For, at this time the Ukrainian soldiers had not yet been discharged from the Austrian army. They had purposely been stationed in Italy, Albania and Asia Minor, fearing that they might stir up a general Ukrainian movement in aid of the newly formed Ukrainian People's Republic. The only soldiers at home were those on furlough and 3.000 men of the "Landsturm". For three weeks this little army assisted by old men over sixty, women and girls, held half of the city of Lviv until the Poles, reinforced from Warsaw, Posen and Cracow, compelled them to evacuate. But the Ukrainians would not give up. Five months passed and they were still on the defensive. It was then that the Poles sent "Haller's Army" trained and equipped in France, but meant for a different purpose than that of shedding the blood of an Ukrainian peasant on the pretext of hurrying to subdue the Bolshevist element, which, as a matter of fact, did

not exist there at the time. The Ukrainian peasants could not indefinitely resist this well organized and well fed "Haller's Army". In may, 1919, they were forced to retreat altogether.

Meanwhile the Poles set to work to prepare false reports concerning the state of affairs existing in Galicia, on the strength of which reports they claimed a right to a military occupation of the country so as to keep down the illusory Bolshevist menace. The Supreme Council of the Peace Conference, without doubt, bona fide, but apparently without without carefully examining the situation on June 25th, 1919, authorised the Polish Republic to occupy Galician territory. The authorization was merely for a military occupation, however, the Supreme Council reserving the exclusive right to decide, at a later date, the political status of Galicia. Of course, the Poles had demanded that the territory in question be awarded to them unconditionally. But, even though this was not done, they took advantage of the favorable decision and chose to treat the population as they pleased. One thing that the Ukrainians could not expect from the Poles was mercy. It would be difficult to intelligibly recount the barbarism which a nation that had itself but recently risen from under the oppressor's heel is guilty of. Arrests, imprisonments, beating with lashes, executions even without trials, were every day occurrences. They even went so far as to dissolve the Ukrainian Citizens' Committee, whose function was to distribute relief to widows, invalids and orphans out of the funds sent by their countrymen in Canada and the United States. Many other

Ukrainian Relief Agencies were shut down by Polish authorities.

They went still further; the University of Lviv, to which students of all nationalities were being admitted during the Austrian regime, became closed by Polish authorities to all Ukrainian students, since they could not show evidence of having served in the Polish Army. All Ukrainian professors were dismissed therefrom. Their attempts at conducting private classes were forbidden. Thereupon a secret University staff was appointed which to this day, between interruptions, delivers lectures underground and arranges extra-mural courses. However, by this method only a very limited number of students can be reached. In order to properly pursue their studies, Ukrainian students were compelled to establish a University in another country. On October 23rd, 1921, they founded a private University in Prague, Czecho-Slovakia, where some 1200 students enrolled. It is said that the Poles looked askance at the Czecho-Slovakian Government for allowing the Ukrainians the privilege of educational development of which they were deprived in their native land.

The situation of the public schools was no better than that of the University. Here were deliberate expulsions of Ukrainian teachers and the turning into Polish of the Ukrainian schools.

But the Poles could see that these methods alone were not sufficient to Polonize the country as speedily as they wished. The 12.1% of the actual Polish population made up of large land-

owners would hardly convince the world that Eastern Galicia is ethnographically a Polish territory. They, therefore, in spite of the Allied Governments' express stipulation to the contrary, brought into Galicia Polish colonists from outside the border. In the early part of the year 1920 alone approximately 60.000 persons of these imported immigrants were allotted farms in Galicia. Then in 1921 came the taking of a census, which was by no means a fair one. For, many Ukrainians, especially women, in order to avoid a knock from the butt of a Polish gendarme's rifle, were constrained to say that they were of Polish nationality. Many who would not deny their nationality were tortured by the Polish soldiers and gendarmes, while others sought refuge in the forests. Through such methods and through falsified official statistics did the Poles try to hide the real facts concerning the population of Galicia.

The Ukrainian population for several years suffered at the hands of the Poles an oppression which surpassed the worst that Russia and Prussia had ever practised on them. The Galician Ukrainian Government, which had been elected by the majority of the people of the country was driven into exile, and there was no power to protect the helpless clergymen and the peasants who were subjected to all kinds of humiliations, chicanery and persecutions. Appeals to the outside world against the usurped rights and the brutality of the Poles were, owing to strict censorship, practically impossible. And, if any news regarding the conditions in Galicia leaked out it went unheeded.

Finally some information reached Great Britain which set the British House of Commons to discuss the matter. On July 6th 1921, Lord Robert Cecil asked the then Premier Lloyd George the following questions: "What is the present situation with regard to Eastern Galicia? Which international body is now looking into the question? Has any attempt been made to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants as to the future settlement of their country in accordance with the policy declared on June 25th, 1919, and is there any truth in the report that the Poles are settling colonies there?".

To these questions Mr. Harmsworth, Under Secretary to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, replied as follows: "Eastern Galicia is at present in the military occupation of the Poles by virtue of a decision of the Peace Conference in June, 1919. Its ultimate allocation has not yet been decided upon, but by Article 91 of the Treaty of St. Germain, the rights of Austria have been transferred to the Allies and Associated Powers for disposal. The Supreme Council is the body competent to effect such disposal. The answer to the third question is in the negative, and to the fourth in the affirmative." (Parliamentary Debates, Commons, N.S., Vol. 144 p. 394.)

The statements made in the British House clearly show the limitation of rights which the Polish Government was given with regard to the administration of Eastern Galicia. In defiance of the decision of the Peace Conference, the Polish Government continued to maltreat the inhabitants and endeavoured

to put off the final solution of the question of Galicia by the Peace Conference, while in the meantime it promised to recognize Roumania's claim to Northern Bukovina and Ukrainian territory which had been annexed by the former country, and also, after making peace with the Bolsheviki, recognized their claims to Central and Eastern parts of Ukraine in return for obtaining their acquiescence in Polish claims to Galicia. Besides these, the Czecho-Slovakian Republic, too, had a proposal from the Poles in the nature of a barter.

Meanwhile the whole Ukrainian population, together with many Jews, earnestly demanded the discontinuance of the Polish occupation of the country. Even some prominent Poles like Ernest Breiter, for many years a delegate to Vienna Parliament from Lviv, protested against the Polish invasion of Eastern Galicia. Ukrainians all over the world made strong efforts to induce the League of Nations to consider the fate of Galicia and to recognize the popular government selected by the people. Many of the Ukrainians of Canada and of the United States of America, desiring that their countrymen be relieved from their unhappy plight, entertained hopes that Great Britain might assume protectorship over Galicia. But Great Britain, though it manifested its goodwill towards the matter, especially through its representatives from the Canadian Parliament, who brought the question up at Geneva, had its hands full of problems and could not very well do much more for the Ukrainians than it did. However, it still has an opportunity to render assistance to the Ukrainians and will do so if Premier

Ramsay MacDonald continues to press his suggestion that the Treaty of Versailles be revised.

At last Poland was ready for a decision of the Galician question. Its foster mother, France, being desirous of seeing Poland increase in power so as to have a strong ally for protection against Germany and Russia, would favor and support to the utmost its greedy desires for the annexation of the coveted territory. On March 14th, 1923, the Supreme Council of the Leagueof Nations awarded Eastern Galicia to Poland.

To millions of Ukrainians who had been interested in the Ukrainian cause, and who had been helping materially and morally and endeavored , particularly during the past few years to show the world their just demands, this decision was as a sudden thunderbolt struck from heaven. It was contrary to the point of self-determination of nations raised by the deceased ex-President Woodrow Wilson, and so much promulgated during the war; contrary to fairness of dealing with questions of international character, and contrary to all sense of justice in the treatment of subjugated races .

That is the way in which the Ukrainians regard the final and fatal solution of the important Galician problem, and their convictions concerning the matter are in a large measure impelled by the fact that they know from past history that the covenant binding the Poles to grant full autonomy to the Ukrainian population in Galicia would never be carried out. Nor were their suspicions unfounded. The present treatment of the

Ukrainians, and particularly of those engaged in educational and religious activities, only too well bears them out.

And now, one would be prone to ask what the Ukrainians intend to do with regard to the land of their forefathers handed over to the exclusive control of the Poles. The following may give us some idea of their future plans and intentions; On March 19th, 1923, four days after the final decision, thousands of people took part in a public Ukrainian demonstration which assembled on St. George's Hill in Lviv (Lemberg), and with right hands raised repeated after the former Vice-President of the Austrian Parliament, Professor Julian Romanchuk, a grey haired old man of eighty-two, a patriach of the Ukrainian people of Galicia, the following oath:-

"We, the Ukrainian people, do solemnly swear, that we will never submit to Polish sovereignty over us, and that we shall take advantage of every opportunity to rid ourselves of the loathful yoke of bondage, and to unite ourselves with the whole of the great Ukrainian nation into one, independent, and a united Commonwealth."

With such determinations put into effect, and with better facilities nowadays than in olden times for national development and emancipation, there is no doubt but that the Ukrainian people with the enhanced realization of co-operation and unity, will before long emerge from the present chaosand will establish a State in the land of their forefathers. Surely a people

numbering forty million souls, cannot perish and go into oblivion, but with proper unified action on the part of its leaders, and with the assistance of other freedom-loving nations, will eventually rise to power and take its place among the nations of the world.

+ + +

The foregoing is merely a skeleton of the history of Ukraine. But, it is hoped that through historical facts submitted as concisely as was possible, the origin, rise and fall of a nation, and its attempts at rising once again, would at least partly be elucidated. Through all the changing years of a desperate struggle for existence, and throughout the vicissitudes that fortune or misfortune may have brought the Ukrainians, they must needs have left their imprint on the sands of time, and we shall best see this by considering their literature.

+ + + + +

PART TWO

UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

+++++

UKRAINIAN ALPHABET

Printed Characters	English Equivalent	Printed Characters	English Equivalent
А а	a	Ф ф	f
Б б	b	Х х	kh(ch)
В в	v	Ц ц	ts(tz)
Г г	h	Ч ч	ch
Ґ ґ	g	Ш ш	sh
Д д	d	Щ щ	shch
Е е	e	Ю ю	yu
Є є	ye	Я я	ya(yah)
Ж ж	je(zh)	Ь ь	a softening
З з	z		consonant.
И и	y		
Й й	y		
І і	i		
Ї ї	yee		
К к	k		
Л л	l		
М м	m		
Н н	n		
О о	o		
П п	p		
Р р	r		
С с	s		
Т т	t		
У у	u(oo)		

UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

The Ukrainian Language.

No doubts are nowadays entertained or arguments advanced against the general conception that the language of a people is one of the chief instruments whereby a unity of that people is effected, and an individual national entity obtained. Geographical position of certain inhabitants, and the consequent necessity for frequent social intercourse tend to a centralization of the primary, and the most essential means of that intercourse , which means are embodied in a language. So that in the early history of the evolution of language, as is seen in the theories of eminent philologists like Max Müller and others, we find that words most needed by a certain family or clan gradually gained prominence and became generally accepted. By a union of several clans a similar process took place. Each clan contributed to the making of a language, yet each also must need have lost something of its own. This for the general good of all, however, since, otherwise, the difficulties of organizing the inhabitants into a body politic would have been at that time insurmountable, and a formation of a State however crude would have been out of question.

It is presumed that the Ukrainian language had its origin similar to that of other languages. But, to say anything more about it would be encroaching upon the field of philologists, which

is also beyond the scope of this essay. One thing may be noted, however, and that is , as far as the Ukrainian language is concerned it has been from prehistoric times a separate language. For, historic records(some Russian writers'coontentions to the contrary notwithstanding), do not reveal any proof as to when the Ukrainians, the Russians and the White Russians used one and the same common language. The Ukrainian language is believed to have become differentiated from the Slavonic group of languages during the 18th century A.D. This differentiation apparently could be prevented neither by the common Kievan State, common Christian Faith, nor the common to Kiev and Halitch, Smolensk and Novgorod literary Church-Slavonic language, brought into the country from Bulgaria.

With the exception of the national differences of some local words in different parts of the country, the Ukrainian language followed a speedy course of development keeping its distinct characteristics.

Like all other languages, we find in Ukrainian a great number of foreign words and roots. The names of the majority of rivers and mountains in Ukraine were given by the former inhabitants of non-Slavic origin. During the making of the history of the Ukrainian people, traces of various foreign linguistic elements were left on the Ukrainian language, and especially of those peoples with whom they had occasion to come in contact. Persian and Arabian words may be found in the

language from very remote times, in all likelihood from the time when the Ukrainian language was part of the one Slavonic language. Then, many words were in the early days assimilated from the Goths, later from the Normans, and then from the Germans. Each nationality contributed words pertaining to trades or matters in which they specialized and predominated. With the influence of Byzantium came the Greek names mostly in connection with matters relating to the Church. The Romans too, in their attempt to counteract the Greek influence over the Europeans left marks of their words on the Ukrainian language. Numerous wars with the neighboring nations also had their effect, and additions were made to the language from languages of the Turks, Huns, Magyars, Bulgarians, Khozary, Pechenihy, Polovtzi, Finns, Tartars, Italians, Poles, Russians, and White Russians. With the expansion of trade and commerce, with travelling, emigration and immigration, words of many other languages were brought in, the language becoming enriched also by a number of French and English words. and particularly English during the last thirty years since the beginning of Ukrainian immigration into Canada. The result is that now the Ukrainian language contains words borrowed from many nationalities, and in all probability is even a greater mixture then say, the French or the English language.

The Ukrainian Literary Language.

While it is true that the unwritten language is a predecessor of the literary language, it is also true that the

tendency of the former is localism while that of the latter is centralism. The Ukrainian unwritten language has much local coloring, depending on the part of the country in which it was used. But, unlike the languages of many other nations, this language of the people did not immediately upon the introduction of printing also become a literary language. With the conversion to Christianity the Ukrainians accepted the old Bulgarian book language used in the ecclesiastical books. Together with these ecclesiastical books there were also imported books of a lay character. For this reason it was rather advantageous for the Ukrainians and particularly for the educated ones living in the cities, and later for the Russians and the White Russians, to learn and adopt this ecclesiastical-Slavonic language. And, since the clergy continually resorted to this language, the common people too, who were in those days forced to give up worshipping idols and to attend the Christian Church, gradually unconsciously absorbed this new element into their speech. But, at the same time one must not forget that a language emanating from the common people cannot easily be forgotten, and so, for a long time there were two languages; one, that of the common folk, peasant, national, the other, that of the clergy, the court and the noblemen.

During the Lithuanian rule over Ukrainian and White-Russian territories, the official language used was White-Russian. And, when this rule was well established in Ukraine the Lithuanians infused Polonizm and White-Russianism into Ukrainian written or

literary language, not only in Ukrainian lands under Lithuania, but also in Poland. The new language could be well understood by both the White Russians and the Ukrainians.

Meanwhile, Ukrainian writers, eager to retain the spoken Ukrainian and yet to write books of an educational character, used this language as much as was possible. But, they also resorted to the necessary ecclesiastical-Slavonic words which were influenced by the Southern Slav languages known as the Middle-Bulgarian. White-Russian and Polish words were also used. The real Ukrainian quite naturally, and especially through national songs, finally predominated and took the coveted position in Ukrainian Literature. It took many years before this could be accomplished, this being due to the fact that under normal conditions written literature becomes a continuation or extension of spoken literature, if one may term it so. But, normal conditions in Ukrainian history, as we have already seen, were a rarity, so that the educated class for a long time maintained an indifferent position with respect to the common people and their language.

We know that in the spiritual and in the intellectual life of the people the geographical position of its country plays an important part. Thus, when the English were already reading the legend about Boewulf and the lyrics "Widsith" and "Deor" of the Anglo-Saxon period, in which is found the first recorded English speech, or even at a somewhat later period when the Latin works of Bede were being studied, the Ukrainians had not yet even so much as dreamt of having a literature of their own. In fact the

contemporary history of Ukraine is really only legendary. But, if we go even one century later, we look in vain for a literature compared with literature of other nations. The reason for this is not difficult to find. The Ukrainian people occupied an area very rich in products of the soil and mineral wealth, but a territory which was not very favourable to a peaceable development of cultural life. Ukraine comprised a boundary line between the barbarian and the civilised worlds. Consequently, at the time that Western Europe enjoyed at least periodical peace and was developing educationally and culturally, to Ukraine fell the lot of warding off the constant invasions of the barbarian hordes and thereby shielding with its breast the Western European countries. But a time came when the Ukrainians, through heroic struggles, freed themselves from the foreign yoke, which contest entailed much effort and which cost them many victims. With their emancipation they embarked upon a path of cultural and educational pursuits. The first great effort made in this direction is attributed to Volodimir the Great, to whom we have already referred.

The history of Ukrainian Literature may be divided into three distinct periods, viz: The Ancient, the Intermediate and the Modern period. The Ancient period begins in the 10th century and extends until the conclusion of the 15th; the Intermediate period dates from the beginning of the 16th century until the end of the 18th; the Modern period begins with the 19th century and lasts until the present day. Along with the prevailing

influences upon Ukrainian Literature, that of Byzantium in the Ancient period and of Western Europe in the Intermediate period, we must also consider the Ukrainian written or literary language i.e., the ecclesiastical-Slavonic language in the Ancient period, and with an admixture of the spoken language and Polish elements, the Slavonic-Ukrainian language in the Intermediate period. The third or the Modern period, dating from Ivan Kotliarevsky and his translation of Virgil's Aeneid is characterized by enhanced distinct national and patriotic tendencies and a clear conception and use of the Ukrainian language.

THE ANCIENT PERIOD

Ukrainian Literature on the Threshold of the Christian Era.

Like all other people during the primitive period, the Ukrainians were rich in legends, myths, and fables. Long before the invention of writing, they already had a store of old stories and even poems concerning their pagan Gods, their heroes, distinguished for valor in wars with various clans, and concerning their relatives, living or dead. These stories and poems were handed down by word of mouth from one generation to another. Without doubt, each generation subtracting therefrom or adding thereto such elements as the fancy of the age directed.

When history is first recorded it finds the Ukrainians still worshipping a number of Gods, but at that time, or it is surmised, even in pre-historic times, they are said to have acknowledged

one principal Deity which controlled all the others. (The recognition of a Supreme Being, therefore, like with other peoples, seems to have been the first step of the Ukrainians towards a cultural development). This was, of course, a wide field for the primitive Ukrainian on which to feed and satisfy the craving of his imagination. True, as much as is known of Ukrainian mythology, the Ukrainian Gods do not seem to have had their various functions and duties as well defined as in the case of the Greek Gods, so clearly portrayed by Homer. But, since they were conceived to have possessed human qualities, they could hardly avoid occasional feuds which supplied material for stories eagerly composed by their worshippers. Immortality of the soul was also believed in, and the spirits of the dead were supposed to be guardians of the living. But, most of these stories, however imaginative though they were, since they do not seem to have been recorded, went into oblivion.

However, we must not lightly dismiss from our minds the possibility of the existence of writing in Ukraine in the pre-Christian period. During several centuries before the Christian era in the land, a lively trade thrived on the shores of the Black Sea and along the Dnieper. Traders from distant countries flocked into Kiev. Byzantium, Poland, Czechia (Bohemia), Hungary and even the Orient, were represented. The Ukrainian traders also travelled to Byzantium, Prague, along the Caspian Sea, to Bagdad and other places. It is said that a portion of a certain Oriental city was occupied exclusively by Ukrainian traders. The centre

of Eastern European commerce was, of course, the city of Kiev. According to Hrushevsky, Ukrainian culture was first to develop here to a comparatively high degree. So that, even the first Ukrainian Chronicler regards the tribes further away from Kiev and the Dnieper as being half savage and living an uncultured life.

Having in mind the trade in which Ukrainians were engaged, it is hard to believe that a people in that stage of development could have got along without some form of writing whereby it would commence to create what we later called literature. It is reasonable to suppose that figures necessitated by commercial dealings must have been used. Then too, some knowledge of geography was essential to all who travelled into other countries. We, therefore, come to the conclusion that some form of writing was used in those days. But, in what form it was is still a mystery to all investigators. If there was a writing, the traces of it were apparently wiped away by the old Slavonic writing which came with the Christian Faith. Immediately at the beginning of the new era we see a vigorous struggle of the new with the old world against the latter's ballads, music, beliefs and customs. The old Pagan writing is presumed to have perished in this conflict.

A question then arises as to what became of the pre-Christian Ukrainian Literature, that is, the oral literature, if one might style it so. The answer to this must be the same as in the case of the writing - it must have perished in a similar way.

Proof of this could probably be established at least by the fact that the ecclesiastical literature, warring against the national literature, often reveals the latter's characteristics. Bohdan Lepky, an Ukrainian author, says that in the middle of the 11th century Metropolitan Ivan, writing to a monk, denounced the old religion and advised the clergy to convert the people from Paganism, and witchery, and to anathematize those who celebrate weddings with singing and dancing and without the marriage ceremony of the Church. Other matters of reproach bythe clergy were public entertainments and ordinary singing which was considered by the clergy to be performances commanded by the devil. The Princes themselves were often criticised by the Greek patriarchs for following the common people in these customs.

In the customs of the times is disclosed a whole world of pre-Christian poesy, where amusement, art, religion and life were all moulded into one whole. The strength and universality of this old order are seen in the later records of the Chroniclers who, looking back from Christian times, were influenced by this ancient poesy of the people, reconstructed at times complete stories and accounts.

With the advent of Christianity and the contemporaneous introduction of writing, a new culture came into Ukraine where it came into conflict and for many years coped with the local old culture. During this combat the Christian culture either wholly subdued or altered the local culture, but, at the same time, it itself underwent considerable changes depending on the soil

in which it took root. What really happened was that the old customs and traditions were unconsciously retained. And, the early Christianity in Ukraine was simply the spirit of Paganism, so inherent in the masses and greatly cherished, dressing itself in a cloak which it was either induced or compelled to put on. (Recurring evidence of this will be found in the progress of the essay). One of the earliest examples of the above is a legend about St. Andrew, which legend dates immediately from the introduction of Christianity into Ukraine, and is considered to be a legend of purely Ukrainian origin. The narrative pictures a passage running from Greece across Ukraine by way of the Dnieper River and further North to the Baltic Sea; from thence over the sea to Rome. While preaching the Christian faith, along the shores of the Black Sea, Apostle Andrew once came from Sinop to Kherson of Tauria, where he learned that not far off was to be found the mouth of the Dnieper River. He wished to go to Rome and set sail from the mouth of the river. While he was thus sailing upstream in company with his disciples, he happened to stop for the night by the shore at the foot of the mountains. When he arose the next morning he pointed towards the mountains and said to his disciples: "Behold, the grace of God will fall upon these mountains and thereon will be founded a great city and God will build thereon many churches". Then the Apostle climbed the mountains, blessed them, and, after having prayed, erected a cross on the top of the mountain upon which later Kiev was built.

Not only prose but poetry too was being recited for years before a chronicler picked it up and preserved it. Some of it was very simple without any embellishment, as for instance, the following which does not rhyme:

"Michael is saddling a horse
His daddy good naturedly enquires;
Sonny! Wherefore art thou saddling the horse,
Daddy! I'll saddle the horse
And drive to the Czar
To conquer a kingdom.
But e'en tho' a kingdom I do not acquire,
I shall at least gain in wisdom
O, daddy mine! ".

The writer recalls meeting an old Ukrainian of eighty-four who could neither read nor write, but who could entertain a crowd for a whole day by reciting these old ballads. It is remarkable how they could be preserved, for, many of them to this day travel only through speech. Unfortunately, the historical background which gave birth to so much of this poetry was lost. Not infrequently an explanation is attempted of an old verse, but the attempt is a failure, for, one cannot be satisfied with an interpretation of the remote past which interpretation is merely a product of imagination. But, even in spite of this shortcoming, the verses are enjoyed for they savor of something closely human, real and natural.

The Christian Era.

Although Christianity had already found favorable soil in Ukraine at the time of the accession of Volodimir the Great to the throne, it was upon him that the responsibility fell for the official christening of the whole of the people. He had the choice of either the Western or Roman type, or the Eastern or Grecian type of Christianity. To Volodimir the Eastern type appealed as more attractive, and he chose it. This election decided in a very large measure the course that culture in Ukraine was to take in the years to come. History is very clear in dealing with the differences which then existed between the two Christian Churches. To add to the dissimilarity, the Eastern Church developed different traits peculiar to the locality in which it spread.

The Ukrainians, having accepted the Eastern type of Christianity, automatically commenced to belong to the Eastern World and to share in the Byzantine culture. This culture was of a considerably high order, since Byzantium had just passed its golden era. The Greek literature was now at the disposal of the Ukrainians, which was a great aid to a spiritual development of the Ukrainian nation. But unhappily, too great stress was laid on religious literature, with the result that this was practically all that was gained from the Greeks. Another unprofitable result was that the Byzantine Christian literature was opposed to every foreign material and would not tolerate the Ukrainian Pagan literature which it encountered as soon as it came into the land.

This accounts for the scarcity of the Ukrainian Pagan literary material in the early literature.

The Beginning of the Ecclesiastic-Slavonic Literature.

Two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, who lived in Solun on the Aegean Sea, in the middle of the 9th century, are credited with the inauguration of this literature. Both of them were well versed in the Scriptures, knew thoroughly several languages and particularly the Greek and the Bulgarian, which languages were very important at this time. The older of the two, Methodius, was also a diligent student of Philosophy.

About the year 858 a delegation came to Constantinople from the Khozary with a petition for a learned clergymen. King Michael III and patriarch Potey sent them the two brothers. Their missionary experience among the Khozary was a good preparation for the new field in Moravia and Panonia. The Slavs of these lands had been already converted to Christianity by German and Italian Missionaries. For that reason their services were conducted in the Latin language which they could not understand. In order that a more successful propaganda might be carried on, the two brothers decided to translate the more important church text books into Bulgarian. But the first thing which was necessary was a Slavonic Alphabet. This Alphabet was invented by Cyril in 863. The majority of the letters were borrowed from the so-called Greek "Liturgical writing". The alphabet was soon after adopted by the Ukrainians, and the characters thereof became known as "The Cyrillics". With the translations that

were made at this time a foundation was laid for a Slavonic literature at first in Bulgarian and later in ecclesiastical-Slavonic language. The golden age, under Simeon (893-927) marks the great progress made in Bulgarian literature. Many Greek and Byzantine works were translated into Bulgarian, thereby greatly enriching this literature. Besides this, much native literature was being created. Both the translations and the original works, however, were of a spiritual character. Such Greek classics as the works of Homer, Sophocles, Plato, Aristotle and others were not then known to the Bulgarians. To the Southern Slavs came only fragments of classical works through which they became somewhat familiar with philosophy, astronomy and other sciences. It is sad to say that the Bulgarians, under the foreign influence, did not succeed in preserving their old national legends, poetry and ballads which they must have had during the age of Paganism.

But even what the Bulgarians had acquired they eventually had to lose. For some time the influence of Byzantium inthe land was rather strong. But at the beginning of the 11th century when Bulgaria lost its independence and fell politically under Byzantium, its church was lost as a national organization and with it the progress in literary development became paralyzed.

The reference to Bulgarian literature was here necessary in order to get a clear idea of the beginning of the Ukrainian literature, for, the former had pretty well laid a foundation for the latter. The Ukrainian king, Sviatoslav, by his invasions of Bulgarian territory along the Danube River, weakened it. And,

while Ukraine subdued Bulgaria with force of arms, the latter nation gained a cultural victory over the former. Quite probably, even before officially adopting Christianity, the Ukrainians used the ecclesiastical-Slavonic text books. When the Christian religion became general in Bulgaria, the Bulgarian original and translated literature spread widely over Ukraine. Mostly everything written or translated by Cyril and Methodius and their disciples in ecclesiastical-Slavonic in Moravia, Bohemia and Bulgaria, and much of what the Bulgarians had during the golden age of their literature, was brought into Ukraine where it was greatly welcomed owing partly to a rather proximate similarity of the two languages. It was accepted, and on this suitable material Ukrainian literature was built up.

Once the basis was laid, the making of the literature went on at a rapid pace. The Bulgarian language, being then more akin to the Ukrainian than it is now, the Ukrainians found it easy to borrow therefrom all that they considered valuable and useful. This was more practicable than translations from the Greek language which very few people in Ukraine knew. To this is accountable the fact that at first valuable works of Greek authors encountered difficulty in gaining access into Ukraine. The ecclesiastical-Slavonic language used by Ukrainian writers did not long remain unaltered. In spite of the efforts of the clergy to retain its identity, the writers often unconsciously omitted what was foreign to the Ukrainian ear and infused material and qualities of the purely Ukrainian national language. In consequence the imported

language gradually became Ukrainianized under the unfluence of the latter's national phonetics. The "Cyrillics" too, which were at first square-shaped and every letter written separately, became in course of time transformed by writers, who, in order to gain rapidity, wrote connecting all the letters in each word.

Thus we attribute to Christianity the trend that culture took in Ukraine immediately after translations of religious literature appeared in the country. The clergy, of course, propagated the Christian religion, and the city people offered little resistance,but, the peasantry could not as easily see the advantages in accepting the new Faith. To give up the old beliefs which had become part and parcel of the life of the people was a condition to which they could not easily assent. Hundreds of years wererequired to effect the necessary change, and the struggle between the old and the new in the remote parts of the country is till on. It was so much contrary to the innate nature of the ancient Ukrainian to abandon his old creed, that even when accepting the new, it was merely outwardly, for, the essence of Paganism was retained and the two became much intermingled. It may be observed that various features of the Pagan Gods have been given to many of the Ukrainian Christian holidays and retained until the present day . e.g. St Ilia has usurped the function of Perun, the Ukrainian Pagan God of Thunder. It is now St.Ilia who is supposed to be rumbling over the heavens during a storm. A religious Ukrainian peasant even at the present time believes that he should not mow hay on the holiday

of St.Ilia, for fear of incurring the wrath of the Saint who might set fire to it. Characteristics of Paganism are especially apparent in Ukrainian Christmas Carols, in the observance of Easter and the holiday of St.John.

It is said that during the early stages of this "dual belief", the clergy strictly denounced it, but their efforts were of no avail. At the present time, of course, the very obvious features of Paganism are scarce, while others became so much a national ingredient and so harmless to Christian Faith that all join in observing them.

The Pagan features were moulded in with Christianity mostly by the common people through their "unwritten literature", but the writers themselves were not exempt from incorporating them in their works. In this way a compromise was being arrived at between the two, and the growth of a real national literature was assured. The religious material in this literature was of primary importance, but one must not on account of this, disregard other material either of local origin or brought by merchants who travelled in foreign countries.

The Eastern Church in Ukraine was not altogether free from rivalry with the Western Church. In warring against Rome's propaganda, the development of polemic writing was the outcome. But these writings were practically all of Grecian origin, and as such had no influence upon the masses. The Byzantine polemic writings were very bitter in attacking Roman Christianity

in Byzantium . Hence the rigidity of tone which was carried also into literary form in Ukraine. Polemics were also engaged in between Byzantium and the Jews, but the Jewish religion was not threatening to oust the Eastern Church in a way in which it was possible for Rome to do. The ante-Semitic writings were therefore of a milder tone, which style was also imitated in Ukraine.

Notwithstanding the resort to controversial literature in Ukraine. the foreigners therein were always tolerated. Consequently Kiev, the capital city, boomed, various institutions founded there, thrived, and it became the centre of Ukrainian culture. From the 10th until the 13th century Kiev was considered to be the leading city in Eastern Europe. It was particularly rich in costly Churches and Monasteries. Here was found the well-known Pechersky Monastery which became the cradle of ascetic Christianity in Ukraine. It gave the Ukrainian literature such men as Ilarion, Theodosius, Nestor and others. For a long time important works were produced in this Monastery and Grecian translations made therein were disseminated all over the country, and even amongst the Russians and the White Russians.

In Kiev were edited the first compilations concerning the political and social structure in Ukraine. The compilations of statutes termed "Ruska Pravda" (Laws of Ukraine), compiled by order of Prince Jaroslav the Wise, in the 11th century who was the first man to make an attempt to have a record of Ukrainian laws in the native language, shows the character of Ukrainian

social life in Kiev in the earliest stage of this development. Later compilations made about the 12th century contain statutes on legislation by Volodimir Monomakhus. , There were also manuscripts written, but not many of them written before the Tartar invasions were preserved. One of the earliest manuscripts was the so-called "Gospel of St George" written about 1120 by direction of King Mstislav for his son Vsevolod.

In the middle of the 12th century smaller centres of learning in Ukraine were also known. Such places as Turiw, Halitch, Volodimiria, Volhynia and Kholm exhibited a vivid educational movement. The beginning of education was merely the reading of books, organized courses of studies were started later, but even then they were intended primarily for students going into religious work. But, it was not long after this that a general education of all who wished it followed. Reading and writing, arithmetic and Greek was taught in and around Kiev, while in Western Ukrainian lands, Latin and German was also taken up. Education, however primary , was then considered a profitable achievement, for it was generally believed that to be able to read the Gospel for oneself was already half the battle towards salvation of the soul. But, the height of learning in the more cultural centres consisted in a thorough knowledge of Grecian rhetoric.

This animated educational life in Ukraine eventually made it possible not only for the common people to gain in knowledge, but also , as already mentioned, for the neighboring peoples to profit by the spread of Ukrainian literature. Due to this fact the

Russians in particular became possessors of some valuable works, the origin of some of which can now be traced only with great difficulty. Apart from this, it was really a fortunate thing for the Ukrainian literature, since it escaped destruction during the Tartar menace, a fate which overtook the bulk of Ukrainian literature. Many other Ukrainian works gave the Russian authors material which they used in their writings, adapting it to local needs. Such material as was made over beyond recognition cannot, of course, now be claimed by the Ukrainians. But there is at least a satisfaction that it did good to someone. The books and manuscripts which were preserved in Russia were mostly all of a religious character. They were kept in libraries of the Churches and Monasteries. All books of lay character were strictly censored, and everything obnoxious to the Church, or which did not comply with the requirements of the library authorities, was discarded. There were also lay libraries owned by princes, merchants and others, but they were destroyed by the Tartars. That literature of lay character was a valuable asset of the Ukrainians before the Tartar invasions, is strongly evidenced by such writings as "Slovo Pro Pohhid Ihora" (A Hymn or Song concerning Prince Ihor's March), fragments of the epoch of "Druzhina" (a Suite), and a number of historical novels.

The Ukrainian Translated Literature .

As we have seen above, Byzantine literature did not find

an easy access into Ukraine. But a substantial amount of it came and was well utilized . The Ukrainian translated literature came either from the Southern Slavs or was translated on Ukrainian soil from the Greek language into ecclesiastical-Slavonic. In translating from the Greek an Ukrainian, while interested in the context, at the same time recast it according to his own taste and the purpose which it was meant to serve. The translator usually remodelled the works translated, giving them national characters. This was done by means of interpolations and remarks inserted at the time of translating. When this was being recopied, everything foisted in was included as if it were part of the original.

The oldest Ukrainian Chronicle shows that Yaroslav, the Wise, engaged many writers or learned men of the time to help him translate Greek works into ecclesiastical-Slavonic language. And, since traces of Byzantine character are found in Ukrainian literature from the 9th until the end of the 15th century, there is no doubt that the work begun by Yaroslav was continued for a long time after his reign. The translated literature was greatly appreciated because of the superior culture which it carried with it. It, therefore, quite legitimately, had a marked preponderance over the original literature in Ukraine. Consequently the translated literature was imitated in many respects by the contemporary original literature. The resemblance may still be noticed in Ukrainian poetical works, stories, legends, tales and even songs.

Of the religious literature which found its way into Ukraine the Old and the New Testament were the first and the most important. But, along with these, various biographies of saints and church service books were also brought in. Church dignitaries lost no time in translating works of practically all of the well-known Greek and Latin Ecclesiastics and Christian teachers. There were also scientific, geographical, historical books and novels. With the exception of the last, all were being diligently studied in the more cultured circles. The novels were much read by the common people who found in them something which satisfied their spiritual longings because of their general affinity with the Ukrainian national or unwritten literature. It also took of the old national Pagan poetry, which was persistently objected to by the clergy. The novel was an adequate substitute for it. It was free from the attacks of the clergy, furnished food for a man's fancy, and at the same time satisfied his ethical and religious necessities and also his aesthetic and artistic tastes. The translated apodryphal books were cherished perhaps even more than the novels. They were in a way religious and were interesting as offering something new which was not to be found elsewhere. Reading of these books tended to materially influence the new Christian mental horizon of the Ukrainian.

The Ukrainian dream-book of to-day reminds one of the time when the Apocrypha was introduced amongst the people. From the beginning of Christianity the Apocrypha were accompanied by legends which had their beginning before the time of the

appearance of the Bible. As a matter of fact the legend was quite desirable and was made use of as an auxiliary to the Bible. It was, as it were, a bridge from Paganism to Christianity. For the masses the legend was a substitute for the ante-Christian national poetry; for the educated and the writers it supplied material for a high artistic poetry and creative work. The legend was so popular that it finally stood as an emulator of the Bible itself. But, notwithstanding this the Apocrypha, since they were an aid to the spread of the Bible , all of them unless directly in conflict with it, were allowed to be spread among the people. They came into Ukraine from Byzantium by way of Southern Slavonia . They were translated by the Ukrainian pilgrims who visited the Holy Land. Along with religion Ukraine also adopted Church architecture of Byzantium, its ways of painting Icons, interior of the Churches and other things. In the Mosaic art of the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev, built in the 11th century the legend is illustrated. A picture of Virgin Mary is painted relating the circumstances concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin.

The Apocryphal writings explain many problems and answer many questions arising in the study of the Bible. They dwell broadly concerning the creation of man and his downfall, Abraham, Moses, David and Soloman, the life of Christ, the Apostles, religious Martyrs and others.

Of the Apocrypha based on the New Testament, probably the most popular ones are those concerning Virgin Mary and Archangel

Michael visiting the Inferno where Virgin Mary seeing people in extreme agony sympathizes with them and wishes that they be pardoned. These had a marked effect on the Ukrainian contemporary and later original literature. Among the common people they provided ample material for the interpretation of the Bible, for superstitious stories and books on foretelling the future. In Italy similar Apocrypha gave rise to Dante's "Comedy".

Missionaries going among the people brought with them the translated Byzantine Bible. The most favorite part of it with the people seems to have been the Paalter. It was easily understood and the poetry therein was attractive. The fact that it was used in schools as a text book until the 19th century speaks for its popularity. The book served many purposes including that of reading at funerals and foretelling the future.

The books prepared for the conduct of religious services and those containing biographies of saints are considered to have been of great literary value . The former were always very poetic, especially those prepared by Solodkopivetz, Damaskin, Kritsky and other Christian poets. As to the latter, "The Prologue" which contains brief life histories of many saints, was undoubtedly a very popular work. Then were also biographical writings dealing with the lives of the friars and other men leading an ascestic life. An interesting storey is preserved of a certain priest who, when walking in the dessert along the River Jordan, met a lame lion which held out its paw appealingly

as if asking for aid. The priest attended to it and the sore soon healed up. Since that time the lion became very much attached to him and followed him wherever he went. He also looked after his Ass while out in the pasture. At one time while he was away the old priest died. The lion returning would not rest nor eat until he saw his master . Nothing remained but to show him the grave where he lay buried. When this was done and the lion became convinced that his best friend was gone, he made a loud roaring sound, struck the earth with his body and died.

Other important works were those of the early priests who have later been canonized for recognition of their contributions to the Church . Writings of St.Ivan Zolotoustey (the Golden-Lipped), were perhaps the most widely popularized. They had a subtle poetic touch and were interesting to read. After him comes St.Basil the Great, who is a close second with his detailed accounts of the lives of the Monks and of fasting. Besides these, there were other compositions worthy of mention. These were the Dialogues, treating the problems of Christianity. The effect of these questions and answers was a better understanding of the abstract doctrines in the Christian religion and its dogmas. But, of the Ukrainian translated literature no works contain as much variety of information as the two compilations of Prince Sviatoslav, the first of which appeared in the year 1073, and the second in 1076. The earlier one is being preserved in the Russian Synodal Library, and the later in the Public Library at Petrograd. They contain translations from the Greek and embody a concise

encyclopaedia of Byzantine culture. Among other important things, the earlier compilation also contains an Index or Register of the prohibited books. Another compilation of the 13th century is the "Pchela" (a Bee). It is a collection of short, wise sayings or aphorisms selected from various writings both religious and secular. The mixing of these adages with the national proverbs of Ukraine was indeed very elevating. This probably accounts for the high quality of proverbs which one often hears from a very simple and uneducated Ukrainian.

Some historical and geographical works and a little on natural science had been translated. History was embodied in the Chronicles. These dealt with the history of the world as it was known in the Middle Ages of Byzantium. True to the spirit of the times, the Chronicles were written in a religious sense. One of the most important of the Chronicles was that of Ivan Malala which dates back to the 16th centurt A.D., which originated in Antioch and shows evidence of Eastern culture. It contains much political material from Grecian Mythology, depicts the Trojan War and King Alexander of Macedonia. What was learned of geography was acquired from the Ukrainian Topography of a Byzantine writer Kozma Indikoplov of the 6th century A.D., and a contemporary of Justinian. The explanations of Indikoplov regarding the position and the function of the earth and the heavenly bodies are quite in accord with the religious conceptions as they then were, but, they are contrary to all the findings of modern astronomy. However, they show us that even in those times the people

were interested further in the world than merely around them.

Before closing the sketch of and reflections on the Ukrainian literature derived from translations of foreign authors, one ought to say something of the novel. Some of the very interesting novels were those which told of the wild and tame animals, their life and speech. They were contained in one book and were of Hindu origin. Several centuries after they first appeared in the Hindu language they were translated into other languages. In the 11th century Simeon Sit translated the book from the Arabian language into Greek, from which language it was translated into Southern Slavonic. A great deal of moralising is done in these tales, and the animals are considered to be gifted with human senses and qualities. They talk amongst themselves and act as if they were human beings. Sometimes they are made to answer questions and to converse with the people. They are brought in usually for the purpose of deciding some important spiritual problem in the life of Man.

Other early novels were about King Alexander of Macedonia. They were really not so much historical as fabulous tales about the King. Among the Southern Slavs, these tales, which first appeared in Bulgarian, in the 15th century gave place to the ones translated into Serbian. The latter were more romantic and were full of miracles and aphorisms. More than that, they gave the hero, King Alexander, a Christian character.

Then, Vozniak tells us, there were novels describing the Trojan War as we know it, and a novel about the Kingdom of India ,

which novel is contained in the earlier compilations of Prince Sviatoslav. This novel was very widely known in the Eastern Slavonic countries and left strong marks on the written and unwritten literature of the people who were familiar with it. Besides this novel and that on King Alexander, other Eastern novels were brought into Ukraine. The story about Varlaam and Josaphath is of even greater literary value than the former two, since, while in the other two christian spirit was only partly manifested, the last one is an artistic recasting of the story from a Mohammedan into awholly christian one.

Original Literature.

While the influx of foreign literature into Ukraine, and along with it, foreign culture were during its educational awakening rather rapid, it is encouraging to note to simultaneously with these, there also came into prominence some valuable productions of local talent. Without question the works brought in and the information and teachings thereof spread among the people, gratified their desire for knowledge and led them to consciously or unconsciously follow them. But the progressive individuals did not stop there. In them was aroused a creative desire, at first very likely to imitate the works of foreign writers, by borrowing such things as plots and style, and trying to reconcile them with local conditions and the taste and spirit of the people, but presently to produce something which had been lived by the people and was the subject of their aspirations.

It would be well to have records as evidence of the earliest

writings on Ukrainian soil, but unfortunately such are not to be trawed. There is no doubt but that the Ukrainians had a literature of their own in the 10th century A.D., yet we have no documents to prove this strong hypothesis. The jealous ages have preserved for us some thirty manuscripts of the 11th century and sixty-five of the 12th century. In view of the Tartar pogroms on the South-Eastern Slavs and the later tragic fate of Ukraine, only a very small part of the manuscripts written have been saved.

One might easily surmise the character of the early writings among the Ukrainians. The matter of greatest consequence to their spiritual life was, of course, religion. Paganism had been strongly rooted in the land for centuries before Christianity came. When Christianity was introduced, it devolved upon the promoters of it to see that it became well established. Consequently the priests were the first to use their pen to combat Paganism. They tried to convince the masses that there was one God who created all the forces of nature, and all creatures for the sole purpose that they might serve Man. In gratitude for this they were expected to endeavour to please their Creator, to meditate upon Him and to exalt Him. Travelling musicians, actors, and acrobats who were instrumental in spreading the national music and poetry and who received a warm welcome wherever they went, were denounced as dangerous. All these worldly things, said the priests in their cynicism, were building "a road that leads to destruction". The early religious writers who came into Ukraine from Byzantium in the 11th century dwelt on

this, and the same precepts were adhered to by the native Ukrainian clergy.

The first of the original Ukrainian writers of the time were LukaZhidiata and Ilarion. Zhidiata (1035-1059) Archbishop of Novgorod appointed by Prince Yaroslav, was a devout christian, active and prudent. His teaching was simple yet convincing. He advised above all, "to believe God, his Son, and the Holy Ghost, as taught by the Apostles, to love one's neighbor and truth, to speak only what comes from the heart". These written sermons were quite simple but they were clear and logical, and therefore acceptable to the people.

A different man was Metropolitan Ilarion of the same period. Ilarion was, for some time, a priest at Berestov near Kiev. He dug a pit on a neighboring hill on the Dnieper, where Pecherskey Monastery now stands. There he prayed and sang at times for hours. Prince Yaroslav, who had a summer resort at Berestov, went there often and came to know and like Ilarion. He induced the Bishops to elect him Metropolitan of Kiev, which they did in 1051. Ilarion was the first Ukrainian who held a position which was heretofore occupied by Greeks. Ilarion differed from Zhidiata in that he was highly educated as compared with the meagre education of the latter. He was also of a philosophic turn of mind, while the other was not. Ilarion is distinguished for his originality in creative power, clever use of rhetorical figures and poetical tropes.

An important work of Ilarion which was written between the years 1037 and 1050, treats of the Laws of Moses, the Grace of Christ, and of Volodimir, who christened Ukraine. The treatise is a composite work, therefore. Its aim is to depict and make known the coming of Christ on earth for the salvation of mankind. For this coming of Christ, the Old Testament was to prepare them. It is full of symbols and rhetorical figures, is built on the contrasting of the Old and the New Testaments, out of which contrast a moral is drawn. The Old Testament is the Law or Judaism, the New Testament is Grace or Christianity. The author makes this contrast in order to prepare for another parallelism, i.e., contrasting Pagan Ukraine with that of Christian times. He gives credit to St. Peter and St. Paul and other saints for having made it possible for the Christian religion to reach his country. Then he goes onto praise Volodimir the Great for having had such good sense and clever intellect "as to find out who was the real and only God-the Christian God". He goes on dwelling on the Prince's great work in converting the idolators, and his good deeds among the people. The author follows him up entering into Heaven where he is in full glory. He asks him to pray for his native land, his people and also for his son, Yaroslav. The treatise ends with an ardent pathetic prayer which has been later adopted by the Church.

The treatise of Ilarion is an artistic lyrical work on a religious theme. The author makes use of all the characteristic qualities of Byzantine orators, including symbols antitheses and parallelism. Apocryphal influence and the lives of the saints are

in marked evidence therein.

Zhidiata and Ilarion represent two separate schools of thought. The former, the popular school, and the latter the so-called higher school. Some of the followers of Zhidiata are: Theodosius Pecherskey, Monomakh and Nestor; those of Ilarion, Klim Smoliatich, and Kirilo Turivsky.

Owing to the fact that higher education was not then general, the popular school of thought had no difficulty in its growth, and so there was a decided pre-eminence of it over the other. There was nothing obscure even for a man of ordinary intelligence in the productions of this school, since there was nothing hidden behind the elegance of form as was the case with the productions of the higher school. It is for this reason that even some of the writers of the latter school tried to make their writings as simple as possible, and that in this method were written most of the Ukrainian books on the lives of the saints and also many historical works.

Theodosius Pecherskey.

Pecherskey was born in Vasilkov between the years 1035 and 1038. He spent his childhood and boyhood days in the Kursk in Chernihov, where his father held a high government position. He was studious and clever and read much. While still a boy he became very much interested in religious work. When he was thirteen, his father died. On several occasions he tried to run away from home. Finally he managed to join a company of merchants with whom he got to Kiev, where he joined the monastic order.

He was then about nineteen years of age. In the monastery he showed a great liking for his work and made rapid progress in his monastic career. A few years later, when vacancy was created in the Pecherskey Monastery, he was appointed head of it. When Sviatoslav forced his older brother, Iziaslav, to leave Kiev, Theodosius criticised him severely for it, both in public and by sending letters to the Prince himself. He tried to convince him in his "epistles" of the injustice which he had done to his brother, and compared him to Cain and tyrants. The Prince became enraged and had him deported. Thereupon the brethern of the Monastery, disconcerted at his action, persuaded him to revoke what he had said; he recanted and afterwards became a very intimate friend of the King.

The efforts of Theodosius were in the direction of establishing in the Monastery the asceticism with which he became familiar by reading Byzantine literature. He made strict rules concerning worship, diet and work. He denied himself and his companions sleep and other conveniences of this life to the extreme. This resulted in frequent desertions of the monks from the monastery. In his teachings Theodosius encouraged his brethern to love God to the extent of making great sacrifices for his sake, to patiently and sincerely fulfil the precepts of the monastic order, and to abhor the world, and everything belonging to it. He fought against idleness and incited all within his influence to action. In his methods he was direct but simple and kind, and when speaking of himself he spoke with great humility.

Theodosius' valuable contribution to literature are a few hymns and prayers.

Volodimir Monomakh.

Volodimir Monomakh's father, Vsevolod, was a well educated man. He knew five languages and was a great lover of books. His son, Volodimir, imitated him much in this respect. His mother was a daughter of Constantine Monomakh, King of Byzantium. From her he inherited self-control, carefulness, coolness of mind and ability to take advantage of conditions and circumstances, and a strong Christian Faith. During his father's rule he was in the habit of assisting him considerably so that, on his accession to the Kievan throne in 1113, he proved himself a competent successor to his father.

As an author, Monomakh is known for his "Pouchenia" (teachings) and "An Epistle to Prince Oleh Sviatoslavich", which constitutes one composite work. As to the time in which they were written, there is a diversity of opinion among archaeologists, but it is generally conceded that the date could not have been outside of the years 1099 - 1125.

The "Pouchenia" show that they were carefully planned. The author sets out his purpose in the introduction and describes the circumstances under which he undertook the task. The division of the work is in two parts, the first of which is made up of abstracts from the Psalter and writings of the Ecclesiastics, and the second, of his original material. In the first part the condition of the sinners and the righteous is outlined. In the

borrowed writings of the Ecclesiastics he at first shows the qualities of a righteous man, and then urges the people to endeavour, through tears and prayer, to rise out of sin. He first taught the duties and obligations of man towards God and then towards his fellow man. Man should not only try to get rid of his sins but also to avoid sin. This he can do by remembering the poor and the hungering, by protecting human life and not killing a person even though he should deserve it; by being humble and ready to serve God and man. In order to give his teachings the maximum reality, Monomakh resorts to his autobiography whence he cites instances in his own life which would serve as precedents for others. He reviews his military expeditions, administrative problems, and his efforts in making the State secure and keeping order therein.

This method of teaching is of Jewish origin. The heads of Jewish families before their death used to give certain advices to their children as to the way in which they ought to live in order to succeed in life and to prepare for the life after death. The Ukrainians first got models of the method when Christian literature was brought into the country. The chronicler records Yaroslav the Wise's counsel to his children, where he said: "I am now departing from the world, my sons; have love in your hearts, for you are brethern of one Father and one mother. If you love one another God will be with you and will humiliate your enemies, and you shall live in peace, but if you live in hatred, quarreling and warring amongst yourselves, you will

forfeit the land of your fathers and grandfathers which we have acquired by hard labor".

The fundamental characteristic of Monomakh's writings is his humaneness . This quality was apparently acquired from a close study of the Psalter which, as he himself admits, was his favorite source of material.

Klimentey Smoliatich.

This writer with Kirilo Turivsky, both of whom were outstanding figures in the style of writing initiated by Ilarion, are also considered to have been the most prominent leaders in Ukrainian thought in the 12th century.

Smoliatich, who was a monk, was in July 1147, elected Metropolitan during the reign of Prince Iziaslav in the same way as Ilarion, that is, without the consent of the Patriarch at Constantinople. This was a cause of intermittent strife between him and the Patriarch who would not, under any circumstances, agree to confirm the appointment, holding that this would be virtually sanctioning the independence of the Ukrainian Church. Smoliatich was a great student and philosopher, but possessed inferior talent to that of Ilarion and Turivsky.

The writings of Smoliatich consist of several "Poslania" (epistles) in reply to the attacks on him for his improper appointment. The first "Poslanie" was sent to Prince Rostislav Mstislavich. In it he insulted a priest named Toma Smolensky, who was a close friend of the Prince. A reply was made but it did not reach

Klimentey. When the Metropolitan heard of the purport of the reply he sent a "Poslanie" to Toma, which is the only writing that has come to us. In his "Poslanie" Klimentey rejoins to the attacks made upon him. Toma is said to have accused him of displaying his philosophy and of having often referred to Homer, Aristotle and Plato, and that he had been making unfair remarks concerning Hrihory, a teacher of Toma. Klimentey answered by saying that if he ever wrote anything philosophical, he did it only for the Prince and not for him and that he had no intention of insulting Toma's teacher, for he really held him in very high esteem and in fact regarded him as a saint. His reference to him was only necessitated by his desire to show that Toma did not get the full benefit of his teacher's instructions because he did not understand him. Then, too, even if he understood him well, he could not have been very much the better for it since Hrihory was not well versed in literature, and so could not be expected to be able to teach much. In his defence Klimentey goes on to say that "the only worldly wealth which he possesses is a little plot of ground for his grave at which he looks seven times a day when on his way to church. He who knows the depths of a human heart, even God Himself, knows that Klimentey prayed that he might liberate himself from authority; this was granted and Klimentey cannot go against the Will of God. As regards philosophy, there are in the Bible many places which have to be interpreted symbolically".

He explains the references to the parables of King Solomon

and to the miracles of Christ, claiming that none of them have any meaning without allegorical illustrations. He therefore employed the allegory exclusively and symbolism in general. In spite of this, however, his learning and a deep sympathy for his devoted flock kept him within the bounds of reality.

Kirilo Turivsky.

Kirilo Turivsky was born about the year 1130 - 1134 at Turova, which was then, owing to connections with Kiev, one of the centres of culture in Ukraine. He was a son of a wealthy family. And, since there lived at the time in Turova a Grecian Princess who married an Ukrainian Prince, it was possible for him to learn the Greek language and to become familiar with Byzantine and Bulgarian literatures. He was admitted to a monastery while still young, where he practised rigid asceticism and studied with great devotion. Proving himself to be a man of strong intellect and good principle, he was appointed by the citizens of Turova their Bishop about the year 1165. He is supposed to have died about 1182.

Turivsky composed sermons for most of the Ukrainian holidays, many prayers, canons, and treatises on religious subjects. Fortunately a better fate befell his writings than that of Smoliatich, for quite a number of them have been preserved to our day.

An interesting parable is attributed to this author. It speaks of a rich man who planted an orchard of grapes. To obviate any possibility of the guardians thereof helping themselves to the

fruit, he got a lame and a blind man to watch it. One of them could see but could not walk, the other walked but could not see. But they devised a plan whereby they were enabled to join their powers of seeing and walking. This they did by the lame man mounting on the shoulders of the other. It was then possible to reach the grapes. The vine dresser, enraged at their actions, cast them into prison. In the parable, the rish man signifies God, the blind man the soul of man, the lame man the human body, and the stealing of the grapes the fall of man through sin.

Turivsky's sermons are very real and poetic. A good example of his Sunday sermons is that on the lament of Virgin Mary, which reads as follows:

"The creatures suffer pain along with me, O, my son, seeing your unjust death. Woe is me, my child, Thou Light and Creator of all creatures."

He then has her review and bewail the tortures and the tragic death of Jesus and ends the lament with,

"Woe is me, Jesus, how dear to me is the name! As stand the earth whereon Thou art suspended on the cross, Thou Who hast built it on the waters in the beginning; Who hast restored sight to many blind, and with Thine Word brought the dead back to life again, through the Will of Thy Godliness.

Come ye and ye shall see the mystery of God's intelligence, as the cursed death has fallen upon the One who revives all".

But perhaps even more poetic qualities are shown in the

following Sunday sermon of Turivsky;

"To-day the sun manifests its brilliancy, rises high up and joyfully warms up the earth; for a spotless Sun, even Christ Himself has arisen from the grave and rescues all who believe in Him. To-day the moon, having descended from a higher level, pays tribute to a greater Light: The old law with its Sabbaths and its prophets, as is evidenced from the Holy Bible, is ended, and the law of Christ is observed and praised on a Sunday. To-day the sinful Winter is ended through repentance and the ice of unbelief has thawed through the knowledge of God: For, the Winter of serving at the Pagan altar has been replaced by the Apostolic teachings and by Christian Faith, and the ice of dark unbelief has thawed from the sight of the ribs of Christ. To-day the Spring manifests itself and revives the creatures of the earth; stormy winds breathe calmly, multiply the produce, and the earth nourishes the seed and yields green grasses. For, the Spring is the beautiful faith of Christ, which, through christening regenerates the being of man; and the stormy winds are the contemplated sins which, through repentance have changed into virtue and multiply the products profitable to the soul; and the earth of our being, having accepted as it were a seed, the Word of God, and perpetually permeated with the fear of Him, gives birth to the spirit of salvation".

The quality of the writer's works is very high, which accounts for the reason that Russian and even the Serbian Churches translated some of them and incorporated them in their religious

books. Turivsky used some material of foreign origin, but he used it as a skilled artisan. He omitted everything that was not in harmony with the new surroundings and supplied the gap thus created with appropriate material. In his prose and poetry he was a real poet, speaking rhetorically and "dressing the theme", as Bohdan Lepky says, "with numerous figures of variant colours, with comparisons, parallelisms, symbols, exclamations, pictures in nature, in a word, stretching before our eyes a mosaic canvass of variegated little stones, metals, pearls, which scintillate, dazzle our eyes --------."

This is true of most of his works, but the same cannot very well be applied verbatim concerning his prayers. Unlike his other writings, his prayers are distinguished for their simplicity and directness in the expression of thought and feelings. In perfect accord with the characteristics of church prayer, they constitute a lively, hearty, and deeply felt communion of man with God. The ability to bring about this effect made Turivsky a poet-hymnologist.

The six writers just considered were the foremost personalities in the religious-educational movement of the two schools above mentioned. Amongst these, Nestor also holds a very prominent position. But, since he is a unique figure amongst the Ukrainian Chroniclers, we shall treat of him under that heading. They left records of their work, some of which escaped destruction or loss, and have been saved to our time, which enables

us to get at least fragmentary information concerning the life and progress in Ukraine on the threshold of its joining Christendom. But, besides these authors there were also many others who had not contributed as much and cannot, for obvious reasons, be here considered. Then, too, it is reasonable to conjecture that there were some authors none of whose writings have come to us, and these are therefore altogether unknown, or, some writings which we now have may be easily placed to the age to which they belong, but the author's name is not to be found on them. There are many writings of the 12th century belonging to this class. Some of the more important ones are as follows:-

"A Hymn of Praise to Prince Rurik", composed in his honor in return for his rebuilding of a wall of a certain monastery; "A Hymn for the first Sunday of Lent"; "A Hymn for all Saints' Day"; In this last mentioned Hymn the Ukrainian martyrs Boris and Hlib are extolled. All these belong to the higher School. Then there are writings of unknown authors of the lower School. For example, there are twelve very brief and simple sermons for certain holidays, which are supposed to have been written by one author; also eight sermons for the Lent period. An interesting "Pouchenia about God's Punishment " were written about the year 1067.

The purport of "Pouchenia" is that God punishes for sins with death, hunger, drought, invasions and such like. It brings out the people's superstitious beliefs and their mode

of living which was contrary to the teaching of the Bible. They would, for instance, discontinue their journey on the road in front of them being crossed by a horse, a pig, or a fox. If anynone sneezed, any person hearing it was obliged to say "na zdorovlia" meaning," for your health"; It may be noted that this practice is still in vogue among the Ukrainian people, and they are at a loss to understand why an Anglo-Saxon when he sneezes excuses himself. The "Pouchenia" were also opposed to all form of foretelling, witchery, playing on the flute or other instruments, and particularly to drunkenness. There was a handy and widely popularized custom of drinking a glass of liquor at religious festivals after every "Tropar" or a prayer to some Saint. Consequently on such occasions many prayers were said, and each one comforted himself that the more prayers he said, the more pious he looked. But one can well imagine that the comfort could not have been of long duration. The "Pouchenia" suggested that only three "Tropars" be said at the banquets; namely, before dinner,to the Lord, before the completion of dinner, to Virgin Mary, and then the last one to the Prince. It was argued that it was not the servants of God who initiated the idea of saying numberous "Tropars", but the bellies which desired to drink much.

To the class of literature under consideration belong two important narratives, namely, that concerning Volodimir the Great, and Boris and Hlib. These narratives , though they

are generally attributed to Jacob Monakh, and are without question an Ukrainian product, are really so far of doubtful origin as to their authorship. The former is an exaltation of Prince Volodimir for accepting the Christian Faith.

The author is very simple and polite in his introduction and begins by saying:

" I, miserable Jacob, having heard from many about the Godly Prince of all the Ukrainian lands, Volodimir, the son of Sviatoslav, and having collected little from the many of his virtues, have written this down, concerning his sons, I understand by this: the saints and the glorious martyrs Boris and Hlib".

He goes on to show how by the Grace of God the conversion of Ukraine to Christianity came about and eulogizes the virtues of the Prince.

The reference to Boris and Hlib has led the researchers to believe that Monakh is also the author of the story about them. The story is rather pathetic: When Boris was returning to Kiev after his march in search of the Pechenihy, news was brought to him that his father was dead. Thereupon he wept bitterly, for his father loved him more than all the rest. Sviatopolk who was already guilty of many atrocities sends a messenger to tell Boris that he wishes to divide with him his inheritance and that he wants to live with him in love and peace. He then goes to Vishhorod and organizes an army of "Boyars" (a wealthy class) at the head of whom is one named Putsha. " Are you all fond of me? he asks. To which Putsha replies:" We are all willing to lay our heads

for thee". Then Sviatopolk orders that his brother be located and killed. They all promise to do as he directs and go forward to meet Boris. Boris with his army is stationed on the bank of the River Alta. His soldiers try to persuade him to march against Sviatopolk and occupy the Kievan throne. He refuses ,answering "I will not lay my hands upon my brother, he has taken the place of my father for me."

His soldiers then desert him, and he is left with a small number of servants. Boris has premonitions of grave impending danger, so before bedtime he prays ardently. He awakens very early, rouses his priest and has him conduct the mass, in which he himself joins. The messengers of Sviatopolk at this time approach the tent and sing Psalms telling Boris that there is someone lurking in the neighborhood of the tent. He than appeals to God asking him why he is being thus persecuted. After the mass he prays before the image of Christ asking that he be made worthy of dying a death of a martyr. At this time there is heard the tramp of horses' feet, and Boris shudders, weeps and prays ardently. The priest and a boy call his attention to the fact that he is dying innocently, namely, for not deciding on going against his brother. The messengers now enter, there is a glistening of weapons and a clatter of swords. The body of Boris is pierced through with three swords. The boy weeping asserts, " I will not leave thee, my dear lord". For this Boris places a golden garland upon his head .. Boris wounded

runs out of the tent, and when the assassins cry out,"Why do we tarry?. Let us complete the work which we were commissioned to do" , Boris asks that they give him a moment's time to pray. He is allowed to do so and prays repeating that he is innocent. After the prayer he directs :"Brethren, you may now complete your work that my brother and you may have peace."

The account about Hlib is that his father is seriously ill and calls him to him. Hlib sets out from Murov to Kiev, but his horse 's leg being broken he could not go beyond Smolensk. There he took a boat and set sail for Kiev. On his way he receives a message from Yaroslav dissuading him from going to Kiev and saying that his father was dead and his Brother Boris was killed by Sviatopolk. Hlib wept over the news, but proceeded on his voyage. When a boat of Horiasir with his crew was sighted he became exhilarated and commenced to paddle towards them. When he came near them and expected a hearty welcome, they looked sullen , and when the two boats were side by side, Horiasir's men leaped into Hlib's boat. They drew their swords which sparkled like water; his oarsmen became stunned and their oars fell from their hands. When Hlib saw their intentions he looked at them appealingly and said:" Do not take my life,dear brethren , wherein have I insulted my brother and you my lords? If I did anything wrong, take me to your Prince and my brother and lord. Have mercy on my youth, by my lords, and I am willing to become your serf- If you desire my blood, I am in your hands." They

grabbed him and he called upon his father. mother, brothers, Yaroslav and Boris, and commenced to pray. Then the damnable Horiasir directed that he be killed. This was done by Hlib's cook named Torchin who did it with a knife.

In the further struggle between Yaroslav and Sviatopolk, the latter, defeated and discouraged, becomes hopelessly ill. Long after the pursuit is ended he cries out in his bed, "Run, we are pursued, woe is me!". In this state he dies, and, while his grave gives out a repelling odor, those of the martyrs emit sweet perfume.

The Kievan-Pecherskey Paterik.

The "Paterik" is an important compilation of writings on the lives of the saints etc. It was closely connected with the Pecherskey Monastery and contains much valuable information concerning the beginning of the monastery, the life of the monks in that institution, songs about the building of Pecherska Church, various "Poslania", miracles, relations of the Government with the monastery and other material. The "Paterik" was started early in the 13th century, and in course of time much was gradually added to it. It was read much and was in great demand, since it furnished writers and archaeologists with the information which could not be obtained elsewhere. During several centuries after thefirst appearance of the "Paterik", it was re-edited several times.

Various episodes contained in the compilation are identical with episodes concerning the lives of Byzantine saints, but this

is attributed to the religious spirit of the times. There were many legends current among the people, many of which were of foreign origin, though this was in most cases forgotten. These legends were utilized by writers who brought Ukrainian saints and heroes into play. Numerous wonderful deeds of valor and enviable qualities were attributed to them. The narrations contained in the "Paterik" bring out the conception of ancient Ukrainians, according to which fasting and denial of sleep were regarded as remarkable victories of the soul over the body. It showed particularly clearly the typical struggle of the necessities of nature with the ideal of monastic brethern. The style of the writings of most of the narratives is simple and clear and free from rhetorical embellishments.

Ukrainian Pilgrims.

To the original Ukrainian literature also belongs the literature of the first Ukrainian Pilgrims.

The religious and moral teachings in Ukraine met with great success. Sometimes the new Faith was not accepted in its original form, for, Paganism existed too long in the country to be easily cast away. The two became mixed especially among the common people who were naturally very conservative. But it cannot be said that the people themselves saw or would admit that they saw what was happening. To them it was all Christianity, that is, of course, excluding those in the remote districts which the new Faith had not reached. All those converted became faithful adherents to the Christian religion. It presented to them as

great a fascination as did Paganism formerly and perhaps in some respects greater. They heard of the Holy Land, the places where Christ, the Apostles and many persons of the Old Testament used to live and were buried. Some became so enthusiastic over the stories told of these places that they decided to see them for themselves and to offer their prayers there. Those who travelled to the Holy Land became known as "Palomniki". The term is derived from the word "Palma", palm tree, a branch of which visitors to Jerusalem used to bring back as a souvenir.

It was considered a great honor and a sign of piety to be a pilgrim. Pilgrimages, therefore, became so common that they were detrimental to a proper economic development of the State. The practice necessitated, in the 13th century, the prohibition of it by the State. The injunction was repeated in the 13th century.

However, from the historical and literary point of view, pilgrimages were not useless. Many pilgrims, on their return home, related in word or in writing what they had seen. Some were given to self praise, or, in eagerness to make their narratives as interesting as possible, added many episodes, digressing from the true account. But, this alone does not take away the value of the stories in the light of their contribution to literature.

One of the best known Ukrainian Pilgrims who visited Jerusalem at the beginning of the 12th century was Danilo. His book entitled, "The Palomnik of the Monk Danilo , a narrative

about his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the cities, the city of Jerusalem itself, the sacred places which are found near this city, and about the Churches of the Saints". The short title of the narrative is "Podoroznik" (a traveller). The historical and literary value of the book may be judged from the fact that in the 19th century it was translated into French, Greek and German languages. In this book Danilo shows clearly that he was an Ukrainian patriot. He narrates his interview with King Balduin of Jerusalem, whom he went to see on Good Friday at one o'clock in the afternoon and before whom he bowed to the ground. The King said to him, "What is your desire Ukrainian Patriarch?". And Danilo replied, "Your Royal Highness, I beseech you for God's sake and for the sake of the Ukrainian Princes, I too, wish to place a lamp over the Sepulchre of our Lord from all our Princes and from the whole of the Ukrainian lands, and from all the Christians of Ukraine". The King granted his request, and he went to the market, bought a glass lamp, filled it with pure oil, "without water". He brought the lamp"and placed it", as he says, "with his sinful hands over the spot where lay the unspotted feet of our Lord Jesus Christ". He continues the story, telling about a miracle whereby on Easter night a light came from Heaven and lit this lamp from the Ukrainian lands "while none of the Latin lamps became enkindled". He tells us another interesting thing which he saw. This was a stone under which lay the head of Adam. A cross was stuck in a crevice of the stone. At the time Christ was crucified, the blood which flowed down, washed the head of

Adam, together with the sins of the whole of humanity. On his journey back he states that he passed the Cypress Island, and claims that he saw a cross, on the island, made of cypress, and which was suspended in the air without any support. He bowed to this cross.

Danilo claims that he spent sixteen full months in Jerusalem alone and two years in Palestine. He had a moderate amount of money with him and could afford to pay conductors who were familiar with biblical places and could show them to him.

The author's work is really a diary of his journey with a detailed description of what he saw. The subjects which interest him most are purely religious subjects. He describes, in a topographical order, Jerusalem and the neighboring holy places, then further, the holy places of Galilee together with some of the places of Syria.

The narrative of Danilo was written in full detail, and none of the places mentioned in the Bible which were of any importance, were omitted. His writing is simple and clear and it was, therefore, read by many people. In the 15th century and later the information given by him was sought by many pilgrims and used by them to direct them in their journeys and to help them locate the places mentioned in the Bible.

The Chroniclers.

The desire of a people to learn something of its past and to record this information for its posterity, gave birth to chronicles. Their origin, therefore, dates back to the beginning

of the development of the national-historical and political consciousness of a given nation, and so, they are of inestimable historic and literary value since they contain the essence of a people's past history, progress and ideals. The basis of the early records kept by a person or a family were the stories handed down by word of mouth. Such was presumably also the case with clans and nations. The chronicler, from his love of literary work and from patriotism, undertook to put in writing the myths, legends, ballads and other stories of the people.

The Ukrainian chronicles, in spite of diligent researches, are not to be found in their simplest form. The oldest that have come to us are already composite documents or compilations of apparently several documents containing records of important historical events, novels, ballads and so forth. Ukrainian Archaeologists have therefore a difficult task in their researches to determine from the character of the various parts, as to what were the relative periods of their first appearance before the subsequent insertion of them in the chronicle. Shakhmatov looks for the first traces of chronicles in Novgorod, where in 1017 the authorities of Novgorod inserted in the chronicle their "Pravda" or Laws. On this chronicle the Kievan chronicle, which appeared in 1039-1040, had considerable influence. The first part of the chronicle comprises to a great extent the work of Teopemtey. The document is continued in the Pecherskey Monastery by Nikon the Great, who, in later years became head of the monastery. The chronicle contains, amongst other things, an

account of the foundation of the Metropolis of Kiev by Yaroslav the Wise, the christening of the Church of St. Sophia by Metropolitan Teopemtey, the quarrel between Prince Yaroslav, the tales of Oleh's marches against Constantinople, about Princess Olha, Prince Ihor, Sviatoslav, Volodimir, and other early rulers and their victories. Obviously, many legends concerning these rulers were told to the writer of the Chronicle, for, he has recorded some exhaustive information about the Ukrainian princes. An example of such is the tale about Prince Oleh. Oleh is said to have enquired of the soothsayers as to how he will meet his death. He was told that his favorite horse would be the cause of it. Thereupon he ordered his horse to be kept always in the barn, to be fed but never to be taken out for riding. Several years later, when Oleh returned from his march against the Greeks, he enquired about the horse. On being told that the horse was dead, he laughed in derision of the soothsayers. Then, in order to see with his own eyes that the horse was really dead, he wished to be shown the skeleton of the animal. On approaching it he stepped on its skull, from which a venomous snake leaped out and fatally stung him in the leg.

At the time of the first appearance of the oldest Kievan Chronicle, the Bulgarians had already written records of their life and history. By examining the oldest Ukrainian manuscript, it can be noticed that a great deal of the method and phraseology had been borrowed from the Bulgarian writings of the same period.

The extension of the Kievan Chronicle is called the First

Kievan-Pecherskey Chronicle. To this chronicle the writers continued to gradually add further material, and the result was the Second Kievan-Pecherskey compilation. Much is said in it as to how the name of Kiev was derived from one named Key, and how, where formerly sacrifices were offered to the devils, now churches appeared with golden steeples, which churches were full of monks. The records show the character of religion in Ukraine in the 11th century, the internecine struggles between Ukrainian princes, the wars with the neighboring nations and the stories about the heroes and the martyrs.

Nestor.

Undoubtedly the greatest figure among the early Ukrainian Chroniclers was Nestor, who is generally called the First Ukrainian Chronicler. In the year 1112, Nestor, a man who had passed his sixtieth year, undertook to compile a document which proved to be a great source of information down to our day. He called the compilation "Povisty Vremennikh Lit", i.e., narratives of past years. Nestor's work was in part a remodelling of the original manuscripts which he well amplified by skilfully incorporating in them numerous written and unwritten narrative material. He described the relations that formerly existed between Ukraine and the Byzantine lands, and recounted the story concerning the origin of the Slavic Alphabet. He also included in the narratives several important treaties entered into between the Ukrainian princes and the Greeks, namely, the Treaty between Prince Oleh and Kings Leo and Alexander in the years 907 and 912; the Treaty

between Prince Ihor and the King Roman and his sons Constantine and Stephen in the year 945; and, the Treaty of Sviatoslav and Tsimiskley in the year 971.

In his writings, Nestor made no attempt to exclude the current legends and other narratives of the people. His accounts are, therefore, tinged with a lively spirit of the age. showing the country and particularly the Kievan territory in peace and war, and the idolized princes in their full glory as servants and protectors of the people. Besides ably arranging the material on hand as a chronicler, Nestor also expresses his own views on various matters, and he is, therefore, in a sense, also a historian. The result is that by his "Povisty Vremennikh Lit", he laid a basis for the Ukrainian history from its remotest period.

No question can now arise as to the authoriship of the "Povisty", although, true enough, doubts had been previously entertained in regard to the matter. Polikarp, who was a well-known writer in the middle of the 13th century, has, by his reference to him wiped away any existing doubts as to the writer of the narratives, though it cannot be denied that certain parts of them is a work of other authors. Polikarp made extensive use of Nestor's compilation, so did other writers after Nestor. One of the important later compilations was the so-called Ipatian Codex, which had its origin in the Ipatian Monastery in Volhynia, and which was completed about the beginning of the 14th century. In this and in another, Laurentian Codex were recorded the greater part of the narratives of the "Povisty Vremennikh Lit". In the

Ipatian Codex the part referring to the "Povisty" is under the heading "The Narratives of a Monk of Theodosius Pecherskey's Monastery concerning the Past Years, as to the Origin of Ukraine and as to who was the fiest Ruler thereof". It may be seen that the heading includes a rather complete account of the past history of Ukraine. The author commences his narratives with Noah, for, following the Bible, he believes that Noah's posterity begot the nationalities. He then passes on to the Eastern-Slavic races rehearsing their history and characteristics. Here he dwells on the beginning of the Ukrainian State, the first Ukrainian Princes and the events in Ukraine, the building of monasteries and the appointment of Metropolitans. Something is also said about the social and religious life of the people. The Chronicler interprets phenomena in nature as being the manifestation of the Supreme Being. According to him, the cause of all acts of man is in God, who instils noble thoughts into the minds of the princes, who sends fear on the infidels, and who sends down numerous misfortunes in order to divert the Christians from evil deeds.

In course of time, Chronicles appeared in various parts of Ukraine, among others a Galicio-Volhynian Chronicle of some significance. This Chronicle deals with the era when Kiev lost its prestige as the greatest city in Ukraine from the political and economical point of view, and when in the middle of the 12th century the Western Ukrainian territories rose into prominence and came into rivalry with Kiev, and when culture got a good start and literature thrived. Naturally, therefore, the local chroniclers

were able to proceed with the work similar to that done by their predecessors in and around Kiev. The Galicio-Volhynian Chronicle has one outstanding characteristic which distinguishes it from the other earlier chronicles, and this is that the authors of it show an intellectual superiority over those of the former. They make no mention, for example, of the heavenly signs and miracles as do the earlier authors. On the other hand, they make references to Homer and Greek Chronologists, with which they appear to be familiar.

It would be interesting to trace the making of the chronicles in detail, but this process would necessitate much time and space. Most of them are elaborate documents, showing that men who compiled them were diligent students of the history and the literature of their people. The style of the narratives brings out the simplicity of the national legends and folklore. Various struggles and wars are described in detail. The chronicler was invariably a patriot and exhibited his patriotism in the warmth with which he wrote his articles. Another fact which shows this, is that apart from certain imitated characteristics as to style, the Byzantine Chronicles had no influence on the Ukrainian. The fact that they show Christain spirit in their works in the same way that the Byzantine writers did, is due to the rapid growth of Christian ideals in Ukraine in those times. But, though it must be conceded that considerable material recorded is permeated with a strong religious feeling, there is a considerable amount of it of entirely secular character. Many varieties of chronicles

appeared, each depending on the conditions of the country, time and place of which they treated. And, though generally speaking, they lack in one important particular as to the method of narrating, and that is, they fail to show the cause of events and simply show us persons and things act, as it were, in a pantomime, yet the chroniclers made them interesting by showing vigorous life in them, poetic traits and reality. They are fond of bringing nature into play; they weave into their narratives interesting epical episodes; they show an ardent seeking for truth, no matter what the expense, and spareno efforts to make their narratives as thorough and complete as possible and in the best language available. These high qualities of the Ukrainian Chronicles put them on a very high pedestal in the eyes of a student interested in the development of Ukrainian Literature.

Poetry.

If it were not for the chroniclers very little, or probably nothing, would now be known of the early Ukrainian poetry. In the chronicles are found both the poetry in its original form and style, and, even much of the prose is poetic. The fact that the ancient Ukrainian Literature had to be translated from the Slavonic script, in which the chronicles were written, hardly takes away the beauty of the works, for the similarity of it to modern Ukrainian is so close that an educated Ukrainian can understand it without much difficulty. The similarity of the two is far greater than that of the Old English to Modern Engligh.

But before going on to consider some of the old poetry,

it will probably not be amiss to recall the fact that what poetry has been handed down to us is a very small fraction of what had actually been composed by the people, some of which was put into writing while some travelled from generation to generation merely by word of mouth. Looking back into history we find that of the various marks of the ancient Ukrainian culture, their poetry has been one of the greatest sufferers. Against it militated the times, people and events. In the beginning of the second part of the thesis were mentioned the Greek ecclesiastics, who in their zeal to permanently establish Christianity in Ukraine, endeavored to their utmost to completely stamp out all the remains of Paganism. This included the people's poetry, their songs, music in any form, entertainments, any appearance of pleasure and poetry in human life. We must remember, too, that poetry in olden days was more a part of a man's life than it is now, since it emanated directly from the heart of the declaimer; he had it in his mind all memorized and did not have it all in writing as we have it to-day. Poetry and the intrument which produced it were in olden days inseparable, and, when repressions on the people were exercised, much was lost. But what has escaped destruction, is of high literary and artistic value. This is true of old Ukrainian poetry and the fact is acknowledged even by foreign critics. Professor Brückner, in commenting on the Ukrainian Chronicles, states that when he compares them with those of the Northern people, the latter appear unpoetic, dry and unreal. Professor Pipin acknowledges that they are vivid,

dramatic, contain many details in connection with the events of the time, and a poetic spirit which is seldom found in chronicles of other nations written contemporaneously or at a later date. These opinions are easily borne out by the contents of the manuscripts which are available. Vestiges of the old ballads with their fragrant poetry are to be found in such narratives as the one dealing with the prophetic Oleh, Olha and her revenge on the Derevliani tribe, Sviatoslav, who was as light as "a beast of the forest", the attempt of Rohnida-Horislav to slay Volodimir the Great, the seizure of Kiev by the Pechenihy tribe, the wars of Sviatoslav with the Polovtzi in the Spring of the year 1093, and other narratives.

The earliest poetry is, of course, that of pre-Christian period. In course of time when Christian Faith became the basis of national beliefs, the Christian legend took the place of the old heroic Epic. Hence in a historically-critical analysis of the Ukrainian literature one comes in contact with interesting types of plots and poetry of different periods. In the Galicio-Volhynian Chronicle, a reference is made to "Spivetz", (singer or poet) named Mitus, who had refused to serve King Danilo. A poet named Boyan, after whom many choirs and dramatic societies even among the Canadian Ukrainians have been named, seems to have enjoyed great popularity and his fame spread throughout the Slavic world. He became a synonym of the ancient Ukrainian poetry and also, to a certain extent, the father of Slavonic song. Boyan lived in the beginning of the 11th century and made compositions on the lives and careers of the Ukrainian princes and on their domestic feuds. The author of "Slovo O

Polku Ihorevim", pays a great tribute to the poet in saying;

"Hey, Boyan, thou Nightingale,
Of the renowned ancient hero!
If to-day thou could'stbut sing us
Of the battles of Ihor!
If thou would'st dart as a nightingale
Over trees of thought — of contemplation,
Or soar high on the wings of an eagle
Yonder, where the skies slope downwards
And relate in wreaths of fame
The triumph of our moment,
Speeding in the steps of the Trojan
Over valleys on to the heights".

He continues the poem showing how Boyan arranged musical accompaniments to his own verses:

"Boyan was a master singer ....
He would recall the past years,
Conflicts of the ancient ages, ..."

Further in the poem praises are showered on the old ruler Yaroslav, bold Mstislav and the handsome Roman.

Ukrainian epic poetry indeed holds an important position in the chronicles. The chronicles contain metrical compositions of very remote times, and in them may be found the old epic songs. These lyrically-epic songs arose usually as a result of some memorable event in a community. They contained three important elements, namely, a narration of the event, an expression of the

people from becoming Polonized; 3) The period of the "Haidamaki" (robbers or freebooters), who as a last resort in fighting their oppressors, formed into bands and plundered the property of the Poles and distributed it among their own aggrieved people. The Duma about the hero Bayda is even to-day recited and sung in practically every Ukrainian home, both among the educated and uneducated classes. It is sung with such warmth and vigor as if Bayda's life were but a very recent reality.

The "Bilini" (tales of old times), in view of the poetical spirit of the time, bore a close resemblance to the Dumi. They belonged to the oral literature and were sung by wandering minstrels who disseminated them far and wide amongst the people. Some writers who are not very familiar with Ukrainian literature seem to be under a misapprehension as to the origin of the Bilini. The Encyclopaedia Britannica, when referring to them in the article on Russian Literature, treats of them as being a purely Russian type of poetry, though in classifying them it includes the Bilini composed in honor of Volodimir, Prince of Kiev, who, as we have seen was an Ukrainian Prince. There are, at the present time, in existence Russian Bilini, but they originated in Ukraine among the Ukrainian people. Sufficient proof of this is contained in the poems themselves. The recurrent mention therein of such Ukrainian cities as Kiev, Chernihov and the River Dnieper bears this out. More than that, they paint pictures which are entirely foreign to Russian scenery. Then too, the context of the poems points to historical events such as the wars with the Eastern

tribes which beyond doubt took place between them and the Ukrainians and not the Russians. In addition, a long list of Ukrainian historical persons including Princess Olha proves conclusively that the Bilini first sprouted on Ukrainian soil and were first given expression to by the poetic Ukrainian minstrels.

In view of the above, it may seem strange as to why this type of poetry vanished from Ukraine and only left behind it evidence of its former existence. The underlying reasons for this are not far to seek. In the first place, on the fall of the Kievan State and with it the "Druzhina", among which the Bilini thrived, there was no one left to promote them. Them too, a Bilina is a re-echo in poetry of certain events which had happened. It is sung in the place of its birth until the happening of another event which by its temporary importance overshadows the former event in the eyes of the people and the poets. The new events become a subject for new Bilini, while the old ones pass into oblivion. This is especially true in cases where the more recent events are in no wise related to the former ones. In Ukraine shortly after the times which produced the Bilini, a period of the Tartar, Turkish, Polish and Muscovite menace set in. During this period the minds of the people, by fate of circumstances, turned in another direction. The people and the poets composed and recited poetry — the Cossackian epic poetry in particular. The Bilini which were introduced into Russia from Ukraine found there a favorable soil and principally in those remote parts where wars or disturbances seldom took place. There they were preserved until the literary age came on

effect which the event had upon the poet, and the commendation of the heroes of the event.

Another reference of considerable importance which shows the existence of Ukrainian epic poetry is made in the same Galicio-Volhynian Chronicle under the date of 1251. It states that when King Danilo, together with his brother, Basil, returned victorious over the Yatviaki, the poets eulogized them in their songs. Then again, the Polish Chronicler Dlugosz relates under the date of 1209 the war between a Polish King and the Ukrainian Prince Mstislav, the Bold. On Mstislav gaining victory, the Ukrainians signified their exaltation by loud and emphatic applauses of approbation, saying, "O, thou wonderful light, Mstislav Mstislavich! Thou undaunted falcon!" ...

It is rather unfortunate that most of these old epics with the change of historical events lost their original form, but, at the same time though they are transformed into prose narratives, we must consider them of value in so far as they serve as a connecting link between the old and the new era in Ukrainian literary productions. Traces of the ancient Ukrainian epic are particularly noticeable in the so-called "Dumi", which are a type of ballads. They may be divided into three groups:
1) The songs of the "Druzhina" (prince's suite), treating of the princes; 2) The Cossack period when the Cossacks endeavor to keep Ukraine free from the control of the Polish Lords, and to prevent the Roman Catholic religion, thrust upon the Ukrainians by the Poles , from taking root in Ukraine and thereby save the

and saved them from total loss.

The old Ukrainian "Koliada" was another form of poetry. Koliadi were carols sung on the occasion of a holiday in honor of some Pagan God. They were later used to eulogize a prince, and for this reason, when now examined, are found to be of epic character. The Koliadi, which were composed in more recent times, correspond to the English Christmas Carols. But a great number of Ukrainian Christmas Carols, even those which were composed for purely Christian purposes and at the time when Christianity had already taken a firm root in the land, are characterized by a strong tinge of mythology, Paganism and characteristics of the epic. However, these qualities in the Carols do not in any way detract from their worth and beauty. On the contrary, they do in fact enhance the charm because of their naturalness, superstition and their reality in dealing with gods, demi-gods and men.

While the Koliadi held a significant position among the songs of the people, there were numerous metrical compositions of a purely national character. Some of them were merely repeated in rhyme while others were sung. Even more so than in the case of the Carols, neither the poets of the verse nor the composers of the music to the national songs are ascertainable. The product was spontaneous, coming direct from the lives of the people. Like the Carols, many of which had their origin in a triumph or a tragedy of some national hero, the national chants were the outcome of some event of great consequence. Among these, probably the most important incidents were wedding celebrations, funerals,

and partings between members of a family. As an example of the last mentioned, an extract may be cited from "Rusalka Dniestrova", which is, literally,

"Gateman, gateman! Open thou the gate!
But who hails from behind the gate?
The servants of the Duke;
And what gifts do they bring?
Spring bees.
Ah, these will not suffice!
Then we shall add to these.
But what will you add?
A young maiden
Crowned with a wreath of a rue."

The composition is of a very simple structure indeed, but it serves to illustrate the point raised. It is noteworthy, however, that in spite of their simplicity and, at first appearance, trivial context, verses similar to the above have been handed down by word of mouth from age to age, and it is not unusual to meet even nowadays an illiterate Ukrainian peasant who can recite them until one wonders if he would ever run short of his material. The peasant delights in declaiming the verses to anyone who lends him his ear, even in the fields during an intermission in the work. But he is in a still better humor and more willing to do it during any kind of festivity. For example, at christening, wedding or funeral celebrations. He would then reiterate affairs and happenings from ages long past. He would probably dwell upon the days

of Paganism, the treatment of his people by the Gods, then, upon the glorious days of the Ukrainian Kings and Princes and their heroism in sacrificing everything to save their country from the wild hordes. In fact he would recite anything that he learnt from his father or grandfather which appears to him real and important, including such an event as the kidnapping of a pretty maiden by the Tartars and carrying her away into the land of the infidel.

It is fortunate for the cause of literature that in comparatively early days there was evolved a division of labor in so far as the making of Ukrainian culture is concerned. So that, with respect to Ukrainian literature, while there were common poets and minstrels who were not concerned much with what was to happen to their verses in the future, there were minstrels or poet-laureates who often recorded much of what they composed. They were minstrels of the Princes, they lived in their courts and composed poetry exalting an eulogizing their sovereigns and their deeds. With them they went to war in order to witness their courage and chivalry, upon which qualities they later dwelt in their compositions. Outstanding among these minstrel poets is said to have been Boyan above mentioned, who is presumed to be responsible for the celebrated poem on Prince Ihor's March. Boyan is considered in traditions to have been of a semi-divine origin, since he is said to have been a grandson of God Veles (an Ukrainian Pagan God), and a prophet and poet. He is said to have been very popular, not only because of his masterly compositions concerning the princes, which works showed careful planning unlike the ordinary village songs

heretofore considered, but also because as a minstrel, he gave expression to them, which exhibited great skill and charm of his production. It is with proper justification that the commentators have likened him to a nightingale and have compared the speed of his thought to the swiftness of a squirrel leaping from tree to tree, a wolf racing upon the ground, and the eagle soaring beneath the clouds. The principal work of Boyan which was organized and put into form by an unknown author and which follows, is worthy of individual consideration. This particularly in view of the influence it had upon the later literature of Ukraine.

"A Song Concerning Prince Ihor's March". (In the original): "Slovo O Polku Ihorevim".

Critics agree that the "Slovo" is not only the best Ukrainian poem written before the coming of the Tartars, but that it is in general the most forceful expression of the thoughts and feelings handed down from the ancient era.

The theme of the "Slovo" is based on the march of four princes of Sivershchina, namely, Ihor, Vsevolod, Volodimir, and Sviatoslav against the Polovtzi (Polovians).

The Polovtzi or Kumans was a horde which migrated into the Steppes along the Black Sea after they annihilated the Khozari and drove away the Uzy who camped there between the years 1060-1064. The warlike wild hordes of the Polovtzi had wrought irreparable harm to the Ukrainian inhabitants. They occupied the wide stretch of land from the Ural to the Danube, where for

two hundred years they had their savage way in retarding the development of Ukrainian culture, ruining the economic wealth of the country and beating back Ukrainian colonization from the South. Having well established their settlements on the Steppes, the Polovtzi became a constant menace to Kievan and Pereyaslav territories. Volodimir Monomakh, being quite powerful at the time, subdued them on several occasions and thereby checked their aggression. Unfortunately when domestic trouble arose among the Ukrainian princes, the Polovtzi were invited to assist them in their wars against each other, with the result that the hordes again became powerful. And in the middle of the 12th century are once more a dreaded enemy of the Ukrainians. Once again Monomakh asserted his power. In the summer of 1184 and in the following spring he recruited a large army, and with the assistance of Yaroslav Osmomisl routed the ranks of the Polovtzi and even captured the Khan himself together with his sons.

Prince Ihor and other princes of Sivershchina were invited to take part in the campaigns against the Polovtzi, but they were reticent with regard thereto. Yet, when they saw the success of the other princes and in particular of Sviatoslav, they became jealous of their growing power. Thereupon Ihor, with his brother Vsevolod and with his nephew, armed his suite, and in the beginning of May 1185, started out on his ill-fated march. The poet relates in verse the departure of this army in words to the following effect:

Prince Ihor mounted his horse, stepping into the golden stirrups and set out on his march, his fearless suite following

him. When, alas, he and his army behold a bad omen: the sun became eclipsed and the whole of his suite became obscured. Ihor's army became sad, for, the eclipse of the sun portended misfortune. But Ihor himself was not affected. "Rather that they cut us up into pieces than that we permit them to take us into captivity", said he to his suite.

Further on the march, his brother Vsevolod joined him. Again natural phenomena signify bad omens. Shadow is cast before them barring their progress ahead, a loud groan is heard in the darkness wakening the fowl and the beast, and Div, the God of shadow is heard to give a terrific yell from the top of a tree. On the first day, which was a Friday, the Ukrainians overcame the ranks of the Polovtzi. But on the following day nature manifests new omens: black clouds emerged from the sea and in them flashes blue lightning. Stormy winds blow from the sea upon the ranks of Ihor; the earth groans, the rivers are filled with troubled waters, dust covers the fields, the standards hum. The Polovtzi rush out from all quarters like bees from their hives, but Vsevolod fights heroically against them. The battle is kept up for two days. The wind and the sun were of great assistance to the Polovtzi, while the Ukrainians, who were not accustomed to these unfavorable elements were gradually becoming exhausted. Hoping to reach the water where they could refresh their parched tongues, they dismounted their horses and continued the struggle on foot. On Saturday Prince Ihor was wounded in the left arm. The next day the divisions of Chernihov became routed and commenced

a retreat. Prince Ihor took off his helmet in order that he be recognized and hoping that they might return, but he was not heeded. Meantime the Polovtzi cut him off from his army, and this decided the battle. Most of the soldiers were killed, and Prince Ihor, Vsevolod, together with their suite, were captured alive, the two brothers, Ihor and Vsevolod, parting on the bank of the River Kayala. Only fifteen men escaped and returned home to relate the sad tidings.

About this time Sviatoslav was preparing for his third march against the Polovtzi. While at Chernihov he learned of the ill-fated march of Prince Ihor and wept bitterly when he reflected upon the outcome of the disharmony among the princes. He tried to organize an army in order to rescue Ihor, but failed. Meanwhile the Polovian Khans attacked Ukraine. Where, outside of Volodimir Hlibovich, who, when defending Pereyaslav, was wounded three times, very little resistance was offered them.

Prince Ihor remained in Polovian captivity until the following Spring. To his surprise, his captors treated him civilly and their general attitude towards him was no worse than a man of higher culture could expect. He was allowed various privileges of a free man, even to the extent of going out hunting, though, of course, he was constantly under surveillance. For a patriot, however, this was no consolation and he longed to go back home where his wife, Yaroslvna, weeps for him and beseeches the winds to take her over to him, while she cannot even leave the city of Putivel, for the Polovtzi hold it under

siege. In her lament she says:

"Like a Cuckoo I'd fly to the Danube,
I'd dip my sleeve in the River Kayal,
To wash the bloody wounds of my own Prince,
Winds, O stormy winds, why did you sweep the fields,
And blow the enemy's arrows
Straight 'gainst the armies of my Prince?
.... I'm weeping, weeping bitterly,
My tears I'd send to my beloved
In the grey dawn of every coming morn".

The chances of Ihor's escape are many, yet he is reluctant to take advantage of them. But when news reaches him that, as soon as the Polovtzi return from Pereyaslav, they intend to execute him, he makes up his mind to flee. With the aid of a converted Polovian named Lavur he slipped out of the camp and crossed the river. All nature sympathizes with him and comes to his assistance. The mists cover the earth so as to conceal him from the enemy. When he comes to the River Donetz, he enters into a conversation with it. The Donetz is very hospitable to him; it offers him the soft green grass which grows in abundance on its silver banks, for a rug, and envelops him in its warm mists under the shadow of the green trees. In vain the two Polovian Khans, Hza and Konchak endeavor to overtake Ihor. He reaches his native land, and the sun once again shines in the heavens in its full splendor. He comes to Chernihov where he finds his brother, Yaroslav. From thence he goes to Kiev to meet another brother, Sviatoslav. And

there was great rejoicing in the land. The princes and the people welcomed him everywhere, and much was said about their intentions to take a revenge on the Polovtzi. With this the poem comes to an end.

Such were briefly the historical circumstances as related in the Ipatian Codex of 1185 on which the poem is based. With the exception of a few things added and poetic symbols employed for the purposes of embellishment, the context wholly answers to the historical facts contained in the Codex, though for reasons unknown to us the author does not enumerate in detail all the events connected with the march. In fact, in some places he merely intimates the incidents which took place, so that, without the aid of the information in the Codex of the same date, some passages would really be quite obscure. On the strength of this it is presumed that the author was not a member of Prince Ihor's Suite and took no active part in his march.

The poem on Prince Ihor's March begins with,

"What, brethern, if we sing
A song in the olden fashion
About Ihor, 'bout his army,
And their military passion!
Let us sing then, as it happened,
As we heard it and as know we,
For, to sing as did great Boyan
Is not now so customary".

But in spite of the import of the introductory lines which refer to an historical fact, the author is very much under the influence of Boyan, whom he seems to revere in a great degree and whose song and music in general he praises in a wonderful manner.

Prince Ihor appears on the scene when he takes his place at the head of his army, and in spite of the bad omen interpreted from the eclipse of the sun, declares:

"Either this day
To march towards the Don, or never!
I long to break the point of my lance
Yonder at the far end of Polovian lands".

Prophesying the downfall of the army, the singer stops to reflect on the quarrels among the princes to which he attributes all the future perils of the army. He particularly blames Oleh Sviatoslavich, who "sowed seeds of discord, as darted the bows of an arrow". Then he describes to us the battle in brief, striking, and unusually plastic words. He does not enter into details, but simply relates general impressions and causes us to feel as if we were in fact hearing the fading din of the battle, and as if we were really witnessing the fight for life between Asia and Europe.

When the poet arrives at the point where, in the middle of the third day of the battle, Ihor is apparently beaten once and for all, and when the sad parting of the two brothers takes place, he observes, "The grasses bowed down weeping, tall trees bowed down, they bent down low and grieved". The poet again very skil-

-fully introduces natural phenomena which has an even greater effect than the signs of bad omen which appeared at the beginning of the march. At the beginning the signs were well made use of in the poem, for they kept the reader in suspense as to what was going to happen next. Here the forces of nature come into play and thereby make us realise not only the outcome of the battle but also that the situation is so grave as to arouse the sympathy of the whole of surrounding nature for Ihor and his army.

The poet then changes the scene and takes us back home to Kiev. Here Prince Yaroslav has a horrible dream. He dreams that he is lying on the mountains covered with a cloth of mourning and drinking poison of bluish color. The cowans flock around him, cawing .... When it was explained to him that the dream signified the defeat of Ihor, Sviatoslav became greatly moved. With tears in his eyes he rehearsed the departure of Ihor and Vsevolod, and then dwelt on the necessity of harmony among the princes and a united action for the purpose of defending their native land and freeing Ihor from captivity. But here the poet is pessimistic, for the princes do not seem to heed his admonitions. He sadly recalls the reigns of the first Ukrainian princes who were the pride of their country. Here the poet is, as it were, interrupted by a woman's voice, who is Yaroslavna, the wife of Ihor, and who, tearfully reprimands the River Dnieper and asks it why it does not bring to her on its blue billows her beloved husband. She also grievously reminds the sun how, during the battle it mercilessly

scorched the gallant suite of Ihor, thereby weakening it and hastening its defeat. Her prayers are not passed unheeded — Ihor escapes from captivity.

As already stated, the poem ends with great rejoicing. The Donetz assists Ihor and all nature is at his service. When he steps on Ukrainian soil, the poet shows us not only his countrymen who are exhilarated to the extreme, but nature once more. This time it is again the sun. It will be remembered that signs of bad omen commenced with the eclipse of the sun, who is the giver of light, life and happiness. When Ihor returns the sun again shone brightly, indicating that he and his people were once more free from danger. For indeed, when Sun-God showed His interest and approval of Ihor's escape and return, a bright future of the Prince and his nation is assured.

While reading the poem one is reminded of Homer's "Odyssey", owing to a touch of mythology, whough the mythical element could not, on account of the Christian era in which the poem was written, be as prominent as it is in the Odyssey. But probably it does not call to our minds any other poem as much as it does Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner". There the elements played a very important part in the whole story, but there they went into extreme. So that, when the Albatross began to be avenged, one could almost see and feel the horrible sights surrounding the ship. In the "Slovo" there is the eclipse of the sun but there are, I think, more manifestations of nature which are pleasant. For example, the conversation of Donetz River with Ihor and the brightness of

the sun at the conclusion.

As to the leading thought in the poem, it is unquestionably the love of one's country, a boundless love, but at the same time sound and sane. In the second half of the 12th century the Kievan State was very much disorganized, for therein arose various political organizations with different political, economical, and sometimes even national tendencies. The fear of one another's power led to jealousies among the princes. Consequently each one endeavored to weaken his rival and to become possessed of as much power as was possible to attain. The tragic consequences of the Ukrainian Princes are very graphically depicted by the author of the "Slovo". The poet brings before their eyes a dreadful picture of their national enemy, the Polovtzi, and his greatest hope is that all the princes who have been allotted portions of Ukrainian territory would unite into one solid body politic for the purpose of combating their common enemy.

Warm patriotism emanates from the whole poem. The poet has carefully reflected on the past of his native land, candidly looks on the present, and foresees what the future may have in store for it And, as to his prophesy, it may just as well be here said that his mind and feelings must have been tuned to the incoming premonitions, which to the great grief of the whole Ukrainian nation were not long in becoming realized when the Tartars came swarming into the country like ants plundering the property and massacring or carrying away the inhabitants. Seeing the existing chaos in

his country, and being conscious of the coming danger, the poet gathers up all the forces at his command and warns the princes and the leaders, "Change your course, or else destruction awaits you". The emphatic warning has a great effect. And, it brings us to the realization that the battle is not between some two rulers for a piece of land, but it is a struggle for life or death of two cultures, of two worlds and two races. The author sees Ihor's mistake in setting out with two weak a force, but, at the same time, he does not reprimand him for his downfall, for he sees he did it because of love for his country, and so, he is a hero. He, therefore, calls on the princes,

"In your stirrups for Ukraine
For grievances 'gainst Polovtzi
And for the wounds of our Ihor —
Beloved son of Yaroslav!".

The author very ingeniously interspersed the poem with figures and analogy from nature, the worth of which could only be well appreciated if the whole poem could be here transcribed. The epic element is reconciled wonderfully well with the lyric, the world of reality with that of fancy, and the national song with the literary traditions. The real world is represented by the princes, princesses, Polovian Khans; while the fantastic world are the supernatural powers, the echoes of Ukrainian mythology, and nature. A study of the poem shows that the writer was not only a learned person, but also a genius in his line. For, only a genius could produce a poem which could stand the test of ages,

and which is imperishable as a literary masterpiece.

The Decline of Ukrainian Literature.

The environment and circumstances are always a great factor in moulding the destiny of a nation. So that its history, and its culture always have an indelible stamp thereof. In the case of the Ukrainian people it is impossible to conceal the fact that they appeared on a definite historical arena some centuries after the nations of Western Europe had been already rapidly progressing in their well-defined aims in national and cultural developments. The Classics, which early gained admittance and which took root in the West, were an invaluable fountain from which these nations constantly drew out and are still drawing out precious jems and adding them to their local traditions and thereby vastly enriching them. But this was not so in Ukraine. Two decisive factors in the Ukrainian historical life were, the establishing of the Kievan State, and the introduction of Christianity. The former effected the union of the various Ukrainian tribes into one people which gave them a beginning as a nation, while the latter gave the Ukrainians much of their early translated literature and left its strong mark on all their earlier literature. As we have seen, Byzantine culture gave them a moral standard. It therefore had, to a certain extent, an influence on their creative art. However, from the point of view of the free expansion of literature, it cannot be said that Byzantium, through

its missionaries, was very tolerant. In this respect strict conservatism was adhered to, with the result that what was brought in was taken as such without much or any alteration.

Quite naturally, however, from the earliest days of Ukrainian history, original works have been produced by bards and writers who loved and studied their people and the trend of events in their history and put down in writing their observations and sentiments. We have seen that from the remotest times poetry and tradition of the people endeavored to express themselves through the select ones, and that this was much enhanced by the invention of writing. Of course, it was rather unfortunate that from the beginning of writing in Ukraine a certain drawback in the making of literature had to be met with. This drawback was the persistence of writers to write in Old Bulgarian, while the common people spoke Ukrainian. This was due to scarcity of schools where the people could be educated in their own language, so that, when they ventured on a literary field they would write in that language. But we are glad to note that, notwithstanding the obstacles, when the people once commenced to create a literature and to put it into proper form, the process was kept up. The early Christian literature, owing to its conservatism was at first stereotyped, and therefore the progress thereof was slower than it otherwise might have been. But, knowing human nature, we could always expect a change. And, a change did come, for, the Christian ideals about brotherhood, compassion, and righteousness gradually became tinged with the social character of the people. They became inured to the social and political conditions

of the day. We see this very well borne out by the teachings of some of the princes during the period of the princes' Suites. One of them says, "Wherever thou goest, offer food and drink to the weak. Neither the guilty nor the non-guilty shalt thou slay or suffer to be slain. Remember the poor, etc."

Much of the original literature was a result of the intermittent struggles with the nomadic invaders. It was highly patriotic. It dealt with the burning questions of the day — the threatening dangers, and the heroism of the peoples' princes and warriors, the triumphs, defeats, joys and sorrows. These things could not but offer a favorable soil for a nation of bards and singers that the Ukrainians are reputed to be. Judging by what small portion of it has escaped destruction and has been preserved to our day by jealous times, their literature towards the end of the 12th century was already both voluminous and valuable. The Slovo Concerning Prince Ihor's March is an outstanding gem, and it is the climax of the first period of Ukrainian Literature. And, if a question is asked why was this literature not introduced to the world at that or at a later time, the answer will be found in the history of the people from then until the present day.

Early in the 13th century, in the year 1223 to be precise, the Asiatic hordes carried an overwhelming defeat over the Ukrainian princes on the River Kalka. This was again followed in 1240 when they moved as far as Hungary and on into Schleswig. They destroyed most of the large cities of Ukraine, including Kiev and the Pecherska Lavra therein, where, as we recall, was the

greatest and the best collection of literary works. The Lavra was left in ruins and could not be rebuilt until towards the end of the 14th century by order of Metropolitan Kiprian. The progress in literature was for a long time arrested, so that at the time when other Slavic races, as the Czechs, the Poles, and the Serbians were opening up universities and other higher institutions of learning, since the Tartars did not bother them very much, the Ukrainians were too busy defending their borders to stop and think about literature. The invasions were now too frequent and too destructive for allowing the fixing of the people's attention on anything but the struggle for existence, which existence was in great danger.

One might note by way of contrast that about this time there was a transition period in English Literature. The Norman Period (1066-1350) was a period during which English literature had undergone a complete change in its character. It commenced with the Conquest of England in the year 1066 by William the Duke of Normandy. But, let us examine what the normans brought into England which had a direct bearing on the country's literature and culture. In the first place they brought with them the culture and the practical ideals of Roman civilization. This was very much desired at the time when England had just passed its golden era in its literature and civilization, and when it needed infusion of new blood. Then too, they brought into England a strong national idea to replace the loose system of a tribal union. The result of this was a

stable, centralized government which was a great step in the political life of the English people. And, finally they contributed to English life a new language and literature which were proclaimed in Chaucer. True, the literature and the culture of the Normans could not at all measure up to that of the Anglo-Saxons. They were inferior in many respects. And, the reason why this new culture in literature predominated over the older, is simply because the Anglo-Saxons were a conquered people, and therefore, the conqueror had his way. But still we have something contributed by the Normans which has either literary or historical value. They left us Geoffrey's History; Riming Chronicles like Layamon's Brut; Metrical Romances, which were of various character, some of which were of considerable value as for example, King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table; and a considerable amount of the literature of the common people which included various ballads and Robin Hood songs. The Normans' presence in England was, of course, at first abhorred. For a time the two nationalities did not live a mutual social life, nor did they intermarry. But they remained in the country and were interested in its welfare, which fact goes to show that they would eventually become in a greater or smaller degree a benefit to the nation.

And now let us examine what the Tartar hordes bring and contribute to Ukraine, its civilization and culture. The answer is, what could one contribute if one possesses nothing himself. And indeed, the Tartars left nothing behind them that was worth while. With the exception of a number of words which the Ukrai-

nians acquired from them and added to their vocabulary, and probably a method of making one or two weapons, their unwelcome visits were of no benefit to the country. Mostly all that the Ukrainians can remember about them is their most barbarous warfare, their plundering of homes, whether or not resistance was offered them, their torturing and killing of innocent women and children, and kidnapping of beautiful maidens into their own country, where they forced them to become their wives. Some verses composed at the time by the people are to this day recited, an example of which follows:

"Ukraine is in mourning that 'tis hard to live:
Hey! the hordes have trampled to death her little children.
They have trampled upon the little ones, the older ones
they captured,
Bound their hands behind them, and drove them to the Khan".

Under such state of affairs it is plain to see that a proper development of a literature was impossible. Many of the inhabitants fled to the woods where they eked out a miserable existence by hunting the wild beast and picking berries, while those who remained at home did not even try to build worth while permanent residences as they formerly did, for it was only a matter of time when they would be destroyed. Still less could we expect them to direct their attention to the writing of prose and poetry. So that there was very little written for some time. And, when we consider the ways in which the Tartars destroyed everything they came across,

we can easily understand that they had no more respect for books or manuscripts than for any other property. Luckily, when the Russians ruined Kiev in 1169 they could not also destroy the Ukrainian culture. The latter conquered the Russians. They adopted the Ukrainian culture including literature which was at the time far superior to theirs. These they were then in a better position to preserve than the Ukrainians. And, though most of the literature had been Russianized, still it is gratifying to know that it did not completely perish. The Ukrainians have been able to identify aconsiderable amount of it and to claim it as their own.

Spasmodically between invasions of the Tartars there was something written which has come to us. Chroniclers left us records of several good sermons and epistles. Among these are the sermons of Metropolitan Serapion, who died in 1275 and who is said to have been very learned in the Bible. Like other churchmen of the time, Serapion laid great stress upon the proper and sincere belief in the Holy Word, for, he argued, the Tartar menace came as a punishment for the people's indifference to the teachings of the Bible.As to the epistles written, many of them were a result of the negotiations between the Pope and the Orthodox Church for a union. A few compilations of the 14th century contain a number of quite important works. But, most of them are a remodelling of the writings already known to us, and they are, therefore, not original. This alone points to the fact

that Ukrainian literature at this time was on the decline as compared with the literature of former times. Literature was also subject to foreign influence. During the 13th and 14th centuries the Southern Slavs, i.e., the Bulgarians and the Serbians made rapid progress in their literary fields. It was naturally, therefore, the Eastern Slavs, and among them the Ukrainians who copied what they themselves were not then in a position to produce.

The period just considered, being the first period in Ukrainian literature, it was necessary to go into it at some length. For, the beginning of a literature is probably the most important, since usually many of the later writings are either based on the original productions or bear a close resemblance to them. So that a careful study and a proper understanding of the foundation of Ukrainian literature will give us a good start and an interest in what is to follow.

THE INTERMEDIATE PERIOD

The Tartar menace had dealt Ukrainian civilization such a severe blow and had set the general progress in the country so far back that it took a long time to recover consciousness. And, when it did partly come to itself, we find it to be, by force of circumstances, not as an independent state but as a part of the Lithuanian Kingdom, and, for that reason, very soon after, as we have seen in the historical sketch, a part of the kingdom of Poland. The decline in literature continued to an indefinite time. But, it may safely be stated that it terminated about the beginning of the 16th century, when it budded out anew with new life and, at the same time, with substantial variations from the literary characteristics and tendencies heretofore considered. All this is due to the political, religious and social conditions which the country was in and which had a decisive influence on the Ukrainian literary life.

As it happens, a revival of learning in other countries also commenced about this time, and the preceding temporary torpor was due to various political and other changes. In England for example, the causes for a comparatively low standard of literature were the long war with France, the Wars of Roses, the Reformation which occupied men's minds with religious problems, and the attention which was at that time directed to the study of the Classics,

which left little time for the creation of native literature. But in England the revived interest soon created such valuable works as Erasmus' Praise of Folly, More's Utopia, and Tyndale's translation of the New Testament, and Malory's Morte d'Arthur. Yet this was only a foreshadowing of the golden Elizabethan period of religious tolerance which gave England and the world several great literary figures and teachers, among whom the foremost are Shakespeare, Spenser, Bacon, Marlowe and Ben Jonson.

Ukraine could not at this time attempt to compare with a nation like England in the field of literature. But some of the influences that affected the countries of Western Europe had also reached Ukraine. And, when it fell under the rule of Lithuania, which was rather tolerant with it, and which. like the Russians, assimilated Ukrainian ideals and accepted Ukrainian culture rather thanthrust its own upon them, it also directed its attention to learning. It is here then that we commence a new period in Ukrainian literature. This epoch is marked not only by a rebirth in national consciousness but also by a rebirth in literature as to its context, its form, ideals and general tendencies, and extends over a period of approximately three hundred years.

Since the causes for a revival of Ukrainian literature were both internal and external, it will be well, before going into some detail, to make a brief survey of these causes.

At the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453, the

learned Christians fled from the Mohammedans to Western Europe and settled in Italy. Here they continued their educational and literary work which was now much facilitated owing to the invention of the printing press. The Greek educators, who left Constantinople, while in Italy took a great interest in the Ancient Greek and Latin writers and in the arts of architecture, sculpture and painting. They began to import and publish the works of these ancient writers, and this latent knowledge soon spread far and wide through Germany, England, France. Bohemia, Poland and Ukraine. We all know how Classicism, then conservatively rooted in France, became so strong that it required as strong a man as Victor Hugo in the beginning of the 19th century to undermine it.

The first man to go to Italy for literary purposes from Ukraine was Frantz Skorina who received his degree of Doctor of Medicine at the University of Padua,and printed in Prague the first book in Ukrainian in 1517, which was a translation of the Bible.

Besides the so-called humanism which was being disseminated from Italy, and the invention of the printing press which gave literatures of many nations a strong impetus, there was another cause of no little importance. This was Luther's Reformation which started in Germany and affected, among other countries, also Poland and Ukraine. Ukrainians soon followed the example of Luther in writing religious and other books, not in Latin which language was known to very few people, but in their own tongue which the common people could understand and therefore

could derive benefit from the knowledge contained in the books. Of course during the Lithuanian sovereignty, the language used among the educated classes in Ukraine was White Russian which contains so much of the Ukrainian linguistic element that it is now more akin to Ukrainian than to any other Slavic language.

When in 1569 the Lithuanian-Ukrainian Kingdom was united with Poland, the communication of learning from Western Europe into Lithuania and Ukraine became much facilitated. The rulers, lords and the richer classes became interested in the general education in the country and established schools and printing presses. Prince Vasyl Ostrozhky in 1577 founded in the town of Ostrov a High School, and in connection with it, a printing press. This was the first High School in Ukraine and the first Printing Press of some importance. Ostrov was, therefore, the first centre of higher learning in Ukraine. The second educational movement took place in Lviv at the close of the 16th century where a High School was established. It was built by a society called "Bratstvo", organized about 1500, which had for its purpose the welfare and education of the people, and which, at the end of the 16th century had its own church, a hospital, a High School, and a printing press. As the only means of protecting and defending the church and the Christian Faith against the enemies, it entered a union with all the other Fraternities in Ukraine. From 1593 on the association was called "Bratstvo Stavropigiyske", signifying that it was independent from the Bishops and Metropolitans and recognized the Patriarch at Constantinople as its head.

The High School at Lviv soon got a name for being a great institution of learning. Students came from various parts of the country to study there. Able instructors were brought in from foreign countries to teach in the School. One of them was Arseney, a highly educated man, who with his students prepared in 1591 the first grammar of the Greek and the old Church languages. This grammar was immediately made use of at Vilno and the city became the third centre of learning.

But the fourth and probably the most important cradle of learning in Ukraine was the College at Kiev, established by a Kievan Metropolitan, Petro Mohyla, in 1633. Students in this college were taught, in the first place, Philosophy and Theology, then also the old Church language, Latin and Greek. Latin, however, was the only language in which the students were aloowed to converse. The aims of the college were both religious and patriotic, the intention being to turn out men who would stand up in defence of their religion and country. And truly the young men who got their training in this institution, did become the defenders of Ukrainian Faith and nationality. Many of them remained in their own country and spread knowledge among the people. They endeavored to come to a friendly understanding with the Poles and the Russians, and by united efforts, to clear the Slavic countries of the Turks, and, if possible, to go as far as to retake Jerusalem from the Infidel. Others went North to Moscow to start an educational movement there. For, the Russians were at that time quite behind the Ukrainians in matters of education.

Needless to say, this was a period of greatly enlivened educational activities in Ukraine. The leaders were naturally the clergy, and they had great sympathy for the common people, who were very subservient to their lords and the selfish officials. So that, all classes received some help from the college. And, probably more than by actual instruction did knowledge spread through reading of books which were written by teachers who taught in or were graduated from the Mohyla College. Much was written on religious subjects but historical works were also being produced. For, the wars with the Turks, the Russians and the Poles, supplied ample material for same.

Since the Ukrainians and the White Russians had in the 16th and 17th centuries much in common, and since they intermarried and lived on friendly terms, they were naturally both affected by the same changes in the general trend of events. And, when a certain class of Jewish polulation of the country attempted a reform in their beliefs by renouncing the "Talmad", and once more the popularizing the Old Testament and thereby approaching the Christian ideals, the Ukrainians and the White Russians became interested in the movement and were, to some extent, influenced by it. The Psalter, a book on logic, metaphysics and other books were translated from the Hebrew and were studied with interest by both nationalities.

As far as the Ukrainian people were concerned, great benefit was derived from these translations. For, they were put into a language which the common people could understand. Though,

it is true that the language used, and particularly in the New Testament, was not pure Ukrainian. Manuscripts then written show a conglomeration of old Church-Slavonic, Ukrainian, White Russian, Czech, and Polish words. At the same time every one who could read in his own language had access to the contents of the translated books. The translated works of Skorina account for much of the religious educational progress in Ukraine in the beginning of the 16th century. His Psalter appeared in the old Slavonic language, but with many Ukrainian notations and explanations. But all of his remaining translations were in Ukrainian. He had a threefold intention in editing his books, namely: from the moral point of view, a moral improvement and the bringing of good custom into vogue; from the religious point of view, the saving of the soul; and from the educational point of view, the teaching of knowledge and wisdom. Skorina's patriotism cannot be overlooked. In the preface of one of his books he remarks that the wild beasts which wander in the desert know their caves, the birds which soar in the air know their nests, the bees and the like defend their hives, and so the people too should have a great respect for the place where they were born.

After Skorina came several other writers who worked on the translations of the New Testament and hymns. Probably the most zealous worker on this field was Tiapinsky, who saw salvation of his country only in the study of the Bible and who forthwith took upon himself the task of translating it. He tried to arouse interest in all the Bishops and Priests to uphold the traditions

of their forefathers by undertaking to the best of their ability and, like himself, with great self-abandon to work for the cause of education among the people. Of course, it cannot be supposed that either the people or the clergy were altogether united in their work. The general education was naturally of a more or less religious character and was not uniform, firstly, because of the spread, particularly in Volhynia and Pidliashe, of a theory known as Anti-trinitarianism, conceived by Sotsina and purporting to discredit the dogma concerning the Holy Trinity, and secondly, because of the introduction of Protestant ideals into Ukraine, the chief among which was a closer examination and study of the Bible rather than believing blindly in all that was written. However the effect of the above two factors on the general progress of the people was not, it is believed, in any way harmful. On the contrary, it gave rise to public debates and tended to give the educational movement a life which otherwise it would have lacked.

The Existence of the Ukrainian Nation is Threatened.

The Lublin Union of 1569 had a dangerous effect on the Ukrainian nation in so far as its ethnic existence was concerned. This union indirectly brought Ukraine under the Polish sovereignty. And, since Ukraine was at this time only recovering from the severe blow which it had received from the unwelcome invaders from the East, its resistance to exterior influences was weak. Therefore Latin and Polish culture then spread in Ukraine rather rapidly.

This fact itself would not have been objectionable had not so many of the Ukrainian nobles who, because of unfavorable circumstances, became indifferent to Ukrainian national and cultural traditions and who, in order that they might be allowed to retain the old or be appointed to new important positions in the State, became Polonized. Polish language used in courts and other public offices called for the same language to be studied and used by the whole polulation. Along with this came the manners and customs. Consequently before long Polish culture, simply because Poland held sovereignty over the country, was regarded as superior to the Ukrainian, and the subject people, particularly of the higher classes, were gradually being assimilated.

There is no doubt that under normal conditions this absorption of Ukrainian nobility by Polish influential sections would have been beneficial to the Poles themselves. But, as a matter of fact, it was not beneficial to either nationality. The Catholic Church, which was well established in Poland and which taught and maintained a strict moral discipline, became during the Reformation disorganized. Yet this alone was not as dangerous as the fact that the priests became disloyal to it, became materialistic, and stayed in the profession merely for the purpose of gain. Their own morals were corrupt and their teaching could not have been any better. However, the Jesuits who commenced their work in 1564, reconstructed, after considerable effort, some of the things which the Catholic Church had lost during its dismemberment. The

Jesuits were zealous workers, and through peaching and public debates they succeeded in bringing many of the apostates back to the Church. But, it cannot be said that their schools and the instruction therein were not irreproachable. The teaching was confined to Latin, Greek, Rhetoric, Poetics, and a few other subjects, but none of which tended to develop individual thinking. Then, also, their schools were schools of privilege; a rich man's son had far better chances of being admitted to them than had a poor man's son, for they would bring a better material remuneration, and their influence on their relatives, would be of more value, for it would gain strong supporters of the Jesuit movement. While the movement, to a certain extent, did succeed, we can see that progress as regards the advancement of general knowledge was not very great, since in their conception theology embodied all knowledge. The sciences which always tend to broaden out man's view of the world, were carefully excluded from the curriculum.

The Ukrainians took advantage of what the Jesuit schools offered to give them, but from the national point of view, the character of the education was dangerous to them. Ukrainian students studied in foreign languages, and naturally, gradually came to like them. They, therefore, neglected their own language, and with it their traditions and culture, which, owing to their recent decadence, were now awaiting a fair opportunity to resume their developing process.

But the Jesuit schools were merely a forecast of the danger that was about to come upon the Ukrainian people and to threaten

their national life. The unhappy union of the Roman Church was the real danger. The political and economical disorder in Ukraine, lack of schools, and many other causes brought about a disorganization of the Orthodox Church. To these may be added the shameful corruption of the clergy, beginning with the High Patriarchs, some of whom were Greeks, and ending with the Priests. The higher officials of the Church were of course the greatest culprits, for, their treatment of those under them was very inhuman. They arbitrarily practised severe extortions upon their inferiors, and all this for material gain and pleasure. The clergy in general was in pursuit of worldly things and often lived in immorality. Such a state of affairs could not but shake the foundations of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The Poles saw this and, since they lost hope of Polonizing the Ukrainians and the White Russians through other means as quickly as they expected, they decided to thrust upon them Roman Catholicism and thereby hasten assimilation. They were obliged to act hastily, for the Russians, who for a long time recognized the authority of the Patriarch at Constantinople, severed in the year 1589 all connection with him and established their own Muscovite Patriarchate. It then became very probable that the Patriarchate might presently absorb both the White Russian and the Ukrainian Churches and thereby give Moscow a decided influence over White Russia and Ukraine. The Poles acted before it was too late and sent many missionaries into Ukraine. The chief one of these was Skarga who used clandestine means to effect his object. He wrote books

expounding . Catholic doctrines and criticising those of the Orthodox Church . In appropriate places he exerted considerable effort to eulogize some influential Ukrainians, as far example, Konstantin Ostrozky who was at that time the most distinguished official of the Orthodox Church.

Besides these means, some horrible repressive measures were employed. Polish authorities closed up the Orthodox Churches, suspended and abused the clergy, and therefore religious work was greatly hindered. This continued for some time. Hopes for a better future were diminishing day by day. Meanwhile the Poles carried on their propaganda and their negotiations with Church dignitaries for a union. It occurred to some Ukrainians that probably by uniting with Rome they would be choosing the lesser evil and that they would then be left alone to conduct their Church affairs without external interference. Accordingly, in 1595 two prominent heads of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, namely, Terletsky and Potey, after negotiations with the Polish King, went to Rome where they publicly announced their willingness to unite with the Roman Catholic Church. This was avery important event. When they came back they found that many people would not give up their Orthodox Faith. The result was that there were now two Churches in Ukraine instead of one as before. A conflict between the two immediately arose which continues up to the present day affecting Ukrainians all over the world, and attempts to conciliate the two Churches have proved futile.

As affecting literature the Church Union gave rise to a lively literary controversy which was at first adopted by the Fraternities. Presently a Bible published by the famous Ostrozka Printing Press, which constituted a very important work, was a strong and effective weapon of the Orthodox Church against Catholicism . And, outside of its use for polemical purposes, it was also invaluable as a religious text book. The Ostrozka Printing Press did in fact contribute a great deal to the religiously national polemics of the day, and it was a secure stronghold of the Ukrainian national,religious, and cultural life. Among the writers,whose works were edited here , were such noted educationists as Smotritsky, Surazky, Filaret, Ostrozky, Paloma, Melety and Vishensky. But while considering the work of this press one must keep in mind the Petro Mohyla College which together with the former was undoubtedly the foremost of the four sources of learning mentioned. Mohyla, who acquired his early education in the schools of Lviv and afterwards in the Universities in foreign countries was well equipped as a Church dignitary to lead in the religious-educational thought of the day. And yet his loyalty to the cause of education was perhaps of a greater consequence than his academic qualifications. That he was whole-heartedly devoted to the cause is seen from the fact that he not only wrote at his own expense on religious and moral subjects, but also assigned to the college all his wealth in order to make its existence and progress secure. Mohyla's dreams were in a great manner realized,

for, the men who graduated from his institution proved that they were qualified to carry on the plans initiated at the establishment of the college.

The above is a rather concise resume of the rapid changes which took place in Ukraine in the 16th century. Many details, of necessity, had to be omitted, for the intention is rather to show the striking turns in the course of events in contrast to past centuries, and thereby to establish a foundation for considering the new literary tendencies than to dwell at some length on matters of minor importance and not immediately relevant to the matter under consideration.

A New Literature Evolved.

The preceding survey of the religious, educational, and to some extent social state of affairs in Ukraine is a clear indication as to the subsequent productions in the literary field.

The age being a religious one, the writers centred their attention upon religious subjects. Considerable constructive work in Orthodoxy was done. Books of the Bible most appropriate to the time and likely acceptable to the people were being translated, studied, and even used in the schools as text books. Then, during the Reformation in Western Europe, the ultra-rays of which reached, however faintly, as far as Ukraine, gave cause for new ways of thinking and writing. And, finally the Church Union, in some respects good while in others bad, changed the whole order of things. As might be expected a heated struggle arose on Ukrainian soil between the Western Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox culture.

The struggle was, practically speaking, limited to religious matters, for religion was the burning question of the day. Insofar as Ukraine and Poland were concerned, however, the solution of the religious problem was backed up by political motives. The efforts of the Ukrainian clergy and writers were therefore exerted both for the protection of their traditional church and for the preservation of their nationality.

In view of the rather stormy period, and in view of the fact that the schools produced many learned men , a great number betook themselves to writing and defending the ideals which they favored. Of these writers only a few of the more prominent ones can here be considered.

Herasim Smotritsky.

Smotritsky's fame as a writer of learning and wisdom was so wide than Prince Ostrozky selected him for the task of editing the Bible. It is as yet unknown as to where he acquired his learning. He himself says that he got his knowledge by erudition and that he has never been to school. Nevertheless, he is considered to have been highly educated, and a Polish historian states that he was well versed in Greek, Latin, and Ecclesiastic-Slavonic languages.

Smotritsky was a strong adherent of the Orthodox Church and he used his wisdom to argue with great skill against the acceptance of the Catholic Faith by the people. It is said that through his writings against the apostates and the heretics he materially assisted the cause of Orthodoxy. An important work of his

is a book dedicated to Alexander Ostrozky. In the very beginning of the book the author addresses Prince Ostrozky as a descendant of St. Volodimir (Prince Volodimir). And, seeing in him one of the greatest strongholds of the Orthodox Church, he warns him lest he should waver in his beliefs. "It behooves the Prince to consider his position and youth", he says, "during which not only to waste one day, but even one hour is a serious loss". He calls his attention to the urgent necessity of youth to work on spiritual self-improvement and that to waver in religious belief is the most fatal catastrophe that can befall a man.

In another of his writings, entitled "The Key to the Kingdom of Heaven", Smotritsky cites passanges from the Bible and convincingly shows the superior principles of the traditional Church to that under the monarchical authority of the Pope.

The author, in a separate article contained in a book edited in 1587, takes a definite stand in opposing the adoption of the new, i.e., the Roman Catholic or Gregorian Calendar. "The result of this" , says he, "is great confusion not only in church life, but also in all social and other matters, and the cause of many unnecessary difficulties and losses." He begins in a very simple but effective manner:

"A poor man who by the toil of his hands and the sweat of his brow gainedhis daily bread, and out of this toil and this sweat had to give to his overlord , and to satisfy him as he was commanded, was accustomed to give to God his portion and to the lord his portion. Whereas now the same can never by any means be accomplished. Now

the lord orders him to work on holy days which were set apart for the praise of the Lord. He fears God, and he is also scared of the Pan (lord) ; he is constrained to neglect the greater and to serve the smaller. For he is told that the former is ever patient and ever sympathetic, while he knows that the latter lacks patience and that his sympathies are small. The holiday of the Pan will also arrive, a poor man would gladly work that day to alleviate his poverty, but is afraid of the Pan and dares not do so. And sometimes amidst all these tribulations he often not only does not remember the new holiday of the Pan, but also forgets his own old one, in which case he does injustice both to the Pan and to God, and with regard to himself, he is seldom or never unjust. Misery gnaws his flesh externally, while his conscience stings him from within. Whatever cannot be adjusted in the regular way, he is obliged to settle by murmuring, sighing, and with tears, and thus soothe his woe. So that one cannot say as to whether he oftentimes does not in this plight of his curse the man who effected the alteration of the Calendar".

Most of Smotritsky's other writings were also articles of criticism in respect of Catholicism, some of which were straightforward arguments, while others overflowed with irony and apt remarks whereby the ceremonies and the customs of the New Church were very dexterously ridiculed, the purpose being to turn the admirers of the ritual thereof away from it and to get those who had already joined the Church to renounce their adherence to it.

Ivan Vishensky.

Vishensky who became famous for his epistles was born at Sudova Vishnia in Galicia. He led a monk's life for some time on Mount Aton. He was the author of about twenty different works. Throughout his writings one can see an ardent love for his country and a strong desire that the Ukrainians worship with sincerity, for it is only herein that the author sees an assurance of real happiness on earth and beyond the grave.

One of the first of Vishensky's works is a book dealing with what he calls the Latin temptations. The author replies to a question as to what is temptation and the wisdom of a viser and refutes the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church with regard to the origin of the Holy Ghost, the superiority of this Church, the sovereignty of the Pope and Purgatory. The part of his criticism which has reference to the new Calendar is a striking denunciation of the methods of the Roman Church in persecuting the Orthodox Ukrainians and enforcing them to conform to the orders of the Pope.

In a positive manner he enumerates all the atrocities that the Roman Catholic Clergy "may commit" , as he says, on the helpless inhabitants and then go to Purgatory and be cleansed of all sins.

Vishensky's opinion with regard to Purgatory is therefore quite evident. As a moralist he sees in Purgatory a cloak wherein lies hidden the justification of the Pope and his clergy to abuse all the principles of Christian religion. He therefore severely condemns it, for he is very humane; he sympathizes with the masses and tries by his work to alleviate their afflictions. It is

because of this spirit in his work that he is considered to have been the greatest moralist in Ukrainian literature before Skovorada and Shevchenko, with whom we shall deal later.

Another of Vishensky's writings is also a moral work. He purposely copies the example in the Bible where Christ on the Mount is being tempted by Satan. But in the place where Christ stood some fifteen hundred years before, now stands an ascetic. Upon being asked a question by the ascetic, the demon commences a lengthy dialogue. He explains in the beginning that though ostensibly there are many Christians, yet the majority of them are after the riches and pleasures of the world, and so they continue to worship him. He has Satan say that immediately after the ascension of Christ into Heaven there wese a considerable number of people who were kindled with the love of Christ, and so Christ scored a victory over the Kingdom of Satan, but this victory was only temporary. Then Satan enumerates all the positions and prestiges which he is ready and willing to offer to the ascetic if he would only bow down before him and agree to worship him. In reply to all these temptations the ascetic resolutely chases Satan away from him and thereby prevents him from tempting him further.

In his "Epistle" to all the inhabitants of the land, written before the year 1596, Vishensky shows perhaps a more vivid picture than in any other of his writings of the lamentably little attention the people paid to religion, and of a hopelessly low moral

standard to which the people deteriorated in the whole of the territory then under the sovereigntyof Poland. He is horrified at the existing conditions and denounces more forcibly than elsewhere the slighting by the people of Christ's teachings and in breaking His Commandments. He begins thus:

"I say unto you, that the earth whereon you trod and where you were born for this life, and where you live to-day, complains against you lamenting before God; it groans and asks the Maker to send a sickle of death, a sickle of penal destruction, as He had once sent on Sodom, and a flood which would destroy and eradicate you (so that you would stop soiling it with Satan's ungodly infidelity and with your filthy paganized lives), rather than it remain vacant but pure, than be settled by you infidels and be soiled and devastated by your evil deeds, and be deprived of the Grace of God on high, the Maker of Heaven and Earth.."

The author then curses all the feigned Christians and the heretics, and in despair calls upon the clergy and all the people to repent. He hopes that if all do not, at least the Orthodox Christians would lend him their ear and fulfill his admonitions and become saved.

Two other important epistles of Vishensky were one to Prince Ostrozky and all the Orthodox Christians, and another to the Bishops. In the latter he again in his original way takes the Bishops to task. He directly asks them to prove to him that they who professed to be working for harmony amongst the people, themselves fulfilled the six Commandments, namely; to feed those who

hunger, to give water to those who thirst, to shelter thosee who travel, to clothe those who are naked, to minister to those who suffer, and to visit those who are in prison. Having conclusively proven that the Bishops are wholly incompetent to hold offices as dignitaries of the Church and to lead the people, he calls their attention to the fact that if they continue to meddle with religious affairs without first reforming themselves, they would be bringing upon themselves the curse of the Lord. He urgently appeals to them to save their souls, for, the punishment is coming which is so appalling that, "they would all flee naked and without taking time to put their dress on at the sight of it".

According to Franko, the Epistle just considered is from the literary point of view avery important work. He says: "... Never up to that time did the mighty of this world, the secular or the spiritual hear from an ordinary Ukrainian such lofty, resolute and tremendously strong words. Theysavor, though the author himself is not yet conscious of it, that fresh, new spirit of emancipation of the thought of the individual from the fetters of almighty traditions, which one hundred years before burst out in Germany like a thunder in Hutten's battle cry " Ich hab's gewagt", (I have dared to do this)! And here one had to have a great deal of moral courage to thrust straight into the eyes of the mighty prelates and the whole of the Polish ruling system such a fiery Epistle. Be it that from the point of view of theological argumentation, it does not present to us anything new, and that from the point of view of practical politics it is

in places even artless, ---- herein is not its power, it is not herein that its permanent literary and historical importance is contained, but in that lofty elevation of the moral force, with which vibrates every word, in that fervid, cordial blood of the author and of the whole of the Ukrainian nation, which blood coagulated in every line of this work".

Vishensky continued to write epistles with remarkable skill. They were all overflowing with his great personality, his sincerity and his ardent desire for a moral uplift of his people. Besides the epistles he produced other works on religious and educational questions. Some of them were more or less of a polemic mature, as for example his reply to Skarga to his book on the government and the unity of the Church under one shepherd. But, he is not really classed as one of the polemic writers of the period, for he has such strong and unwavering faith in the Word of God, upon which he builds his convictions, that he stands independent and without a rival or opponent. It must be admitted, however, that after his journey through Ukraine, during which he visited Lviv in 1605, his writings appear to be much weaker than those published formerly. One cause of this was probably his age, while the other, a more important one, was the disappointment with which he met in the different parts which he visited. Until this time he knew of the corruption of the clergy and the shortcomings of the people in general in matters of religion. The knowledge of this gave him a fiery zeal to minister unto them and

to reform them. But, when he personally met some of his opponents and became convinced that a great number of his countrymen held divergent views to his, and that there was little hope for a mutual endeavor to fight for the same cause, he became somewhat discouraged. At the same time he was invincible and was far from departing from his inviolable purpose. In one of his later epistles, namely, that to the Stavropegian Fraternity, he gave them paternal admonitions to stay with Orthodoxy, that they should not be lured by the wisdom of the Catholics, and that for the time being, they rather remain in ignorance, holding out with their traditional Faith, which was the only true religion, and which would eventually bring them to light.

One can hardly leave out of consideration a valuable work of Vishensky, entitled "Perestoroha" (a warning). This is a composite work and contains brilliant thoughts in connection with education both secular and spiritual. He urges that schools be built for the purpose of educating the youth, which he hopes will raise the status of the Orthodox Church, and which will sponsor the movement for a renaissance of Ukrainian nationhood. The fact that he saw the value of education for raising Ukraine from its decline is evident in his reference in "Perestoroha" to history and traditions. "Every one of you, Orthodox Christians,!" he says, "ought to know where from Christian religion came into our land; otherwise you will only know that Ukraine accepted the Christian Faith from Greece(about twenty-five years before the Poles got their Roman religion from

the Germans)." He then rehearses the gradual decline in Ukrainian cultural life owing to the selfishness and materialism of the priests, and how this could not be remedied by the common people because of their lack of education. In this respect the author, being cognizant of the past and looking forward to the future, was in a sense an initiator of future progress.

Since Ostrozky was at the time a great national figure, Vishensky held him in very high esteem. He, therefore, gave him a prominent place in his "Perestoroha", Wishing to show how the Christians were being persecuted, he quotes Ostrozky, who says, in part, the following to the Polish King: "And your kingship, seeing the abuses to which we are subjected and the interference with our rights, do not heed your oath, whereby you bound yourself not to violate our rights, but to augment and to extend them." The author continues with severe reproaches of the government, and predicts great confusion in the State unless the king changes his tactics with regard to the treatment of the Orthodox Christians. His prophecy came true, for it was not very many decades before Poland reaped the fruits of its mistakes and lost its status as a sovereign State.

As to the style of Vishensky, it is so rich and beautiful that there is no doubt that in the whole of Ukrainian literature up to Kotliarevsky the only other writer who rivals him in plasticity and individual expression is the author of the "Slovo". As to his characteristics as a writer, we have already seen that he

shows a very strong feeling, a lively imagination and an eager concern for the cause he supports. He is very humane and full of sympathies, but he is at the same time strict. However, if he was ever too severe in his criticisms, he always did it with sincerity. Vishensky is very poetic, which characteristic adds much to the beauty of his writings. He has a strong poetic imagination, and is wont to think in pictures rather than use abstract ideas for reaching the same purpose. He is also artful to a high degree. Besides this, his writings are characterized as containing a great deal of dramatic quality, and his language is lively, energetic and simple. It flows easily and clearly like a quiet rivulet. He selects his words from whatever source he can, so long as they serve his purpose.

As a literary personage, Vishensky has no equal in the Middle Period in Ukrainian literature . He is a distinguished representative of Ukrainian renaissance. He is the great defender of the conservative old Faith amongst the Ukrainians, but his own conservatism savors of new ideas, as his seen from his policy regarding education. Vishensky is whole-heartedly with the oppressed masses. He endeavored to show them the means of liberating themselves here through education, and in the hereafter, through strong faith, in Orthodoxy. This is evident throughout his Epistles and other writings, where he invents many new forms to effect his purpose. And, it is because of this that he is regarded as a master of his art and wonderfully original throughout his works.

Kirilo Trankvilion Stavrovetsky.

This writer becomes known for the first time in 1589, when it was his lot to defend the Stavropegian Fraternity before Patriarch Yeremy. As a punishment for this defence, Bishop Hedeon Balaban ordered that his beard be cut off. Whereupon he was called "the beardless". He continued active in his work, however, and held responsible positions in the Church. About the year 1626, he became a Uniate and remained such until his death in 1646.

One of the most important works of Stavrovetsky was his "Mirror of Theology", which was published at Pochaiv in 1618, and which was then regarded by many as a wise philosophical treatise. The writer was really the author of the first Ukrainian Orthodox dogmatic system, which he divided into three parts: the first, concerining God, the second, concerning the world in its four phases; the invisible or angelic world, the visible, that is, heaven and earth, the latter of which is a human and an angry world of evil where Satan reigns; and finally the world of future life, that is, Paradise and Hell. The writer's theory is that the visible world is made up of four different elements, namely, fire, air, water and earth. Out of these four elements are made all the things in the world; out of fire; the sun, moon, stars and all light; out of air; the breath of all creatures, animals, fowl and man; out of water: fish and fowl; and out of earth: quadrupeds, trees and various seeds. He then reflects on the relative positions of

the different elements in the world system and the scheme of the Creator in arranging them thus. He particularly emphasizes the fact that two elements, namely, water and fire, are in perpetual discord, and that is why the Allwise Creator out them far apart, the former below, and the latter high up, with the air in the middle as a partition and peacemaker between the two. The author, however, betrays his ignorance of astronomy when he states that God put the waters on the top of the heavens, i. e., in the clouds, so as to prevent the heavens from catching fire from the sun and the countless stars shining from below. Then, too, he says that the waters of the sea are salty, because if they were not so, remaining in one place from the beginning of the world would make them stagnant and they would become a source of disease and epidemic which would destroy all human life. The author, in logical sequence, comes to Man, and here he shows some knowledge of pyychology. According to him, the human body is made out of four elements, that is, earth, water, air and fire. In this God implanted an immortal soul. Besides this are the Will, Mind, Virtue, Thought, Reason and Dexterity; Imagination, Deliberation, Joy and Love.

The dogmatics of Stavrovetsky were too far-fetched for the age, and it took little time before he realized it. A great number of the Ukrainian clergy disagreed with him. They thought he went too far, that some of his theories were not Orthodox, and, they went so far in their criticism as to accuse him of heresy. It was

this discouragement that later drove him to join the Roman Catholic Church. When in 1619 he attempted to carry on his work by publishing a collection of 109 sermons for Sundays and various holidays, he was met with severe criticism and contemptt. But he would not give up. Commenting on his persecution he says, "When the devil, who despises what is good, became greatly enraged at me, seeing that I prepared for him a poisoned arrow, he opened against me a fearful war, arraying a gigantic army, so as to wholly destroy the fruits of my work in bloody swaats, and to put out the light of such a bright torch of knowledge of salvation as "The Gospel of Christ", (i. e., his collections of sermons, etc.).

Stavrovetsky had some of the clergy on his side. This, coupled with his firm belief in his theories, helped him to continue with great zeal the work of moral reform. His sermons are original, and he shows no regard for the opinions of others with regard thereto. He interpreted the Word of God as he understood it and appealed to the moral nature of the people to follow it, and thereby to become uplifted morally.

While the writers just considered largely dealt constructively with the questions of Faith, and with the dogmas which they favored, they could hardly avoid incidentally to intermingle their writings with matters which were of a controversial nature. The conditions were such that ample material was available for polemic writing. The Church Union had created a gap between the Orthodox adherents on the one hand, and the Uniates and the

RomanCatholics on the other, which could by no means be filled. Those favoring Eastern culture could not bear their old traditions to be downtrodden by their Western rival, while the Westerners persistently endeavored to thrust upon them Western ideals and to convince them of the idea that the Romish Church was the only true Church, since, according to them, the Pope, who is the head of it, is the direct successor of St. Peter. From the point of view of the Orthodox Ukrainians, therefore, they were opposing Roman Catholicism, firstly, because they revered their traditional religion; secondly, because of the brutal methods used by the Poles in their propaganda to plant the Romish Church principles in the whole country; and, thirdly, because the propagators of the church union were the Poles whom the Ukrainians hated together with their Catholicism, owing to the fact that Ukraine was then in their clutches groaning oppresed nationally, economically and politically. Naturally, therefore, with such state of affairs a compromise was out of question, and there is no wonder, then, that so many men connected with the Church resorted to their pen in the fight. Nor should one wonder that these writers often went into extremes in their methods of argumentation in order to overcome their opponents.

There were many writers who engaged in these polemics, some of whom were more while others less popular. It would be interesting to examine in detail their contentions. But this would be a study in itself. Then, too, this is, in my opinion, a subject of more importance for church history than for literature proper. However, it will prob-

ably not be amiss to touch upon some of the writers, and to examine, more closely, particularly those works which have materially contributed to literature .

We are already familiar with Skarga's name. In 1597 he published a book in Polish in defence of the Church Union. The book was made up of two main arguments, namely, that the union effected at Berest was of an historical character and that the decisions of the Council held at Berest were properly and legally arrived at. At the conclusion of his book Skarga tries to show the Eastern Slavs the moral and material benefits which are bound to accrue as a result of the union. Skarga's book was met by a book entitled "Apokrizis", written by an author who went under the pseudonym of Filalet. The book dealt extensively with the questions raised by Skarga, and contained such effective refutations of all the contentions, that the author of the former book dared not make a reply thereto. Filalet's sound argumentation was due to his high scholarship in Latin, Greek, and to his wide knowledge of church history and familiarity with the works of many famous historians and theologians. This enabled him to cite authorities to support his views, which gave him superiority over his opponents. But Filalet's book was answered by Ipatey Potey, who with Terletsky signed the Union. He wrote his book in 1599 and entitled it "Antirrizis". Potey also interchanged argumentative letters with Klirik Ostrozky. The criticism of "Apokrizis" was, however, not strong enough, for, though Potey was often clever, he was not always logical.

Meletey Smotritsky.

A writer who here deserves some attention is Meletey Smotritsky, son of Herasim Smotritsky. In 1610 he published a book to which he gave the title "Trenos", i. e., the weeping of the Orthodox Church. This book was his masterpiece, and is considered to have marked the height of all the polemics between the Orthodox ,and the Uniate and Catholic Christians. The author, being himself of exceedingly sensitive nature, keenly felt the lamentable situation in which the Orthodox Church was found. Being a patriot as well as a churchman, Smotritsky was greatly moved at this situation, and he shows it throughout the whole of his "Trenos". In it he reviews the state of affairs, complains bitterly, and in accordance with his nervous temperament, vehemently reprimands those who, in his opinion, are to blame. The "Trenos" unconsciously reminds one of the lament of Yaroslavna, wife of Prince Ihor. The Church weeps, as it were a mother, for being altogether deserted by her children, and the effect created is pathetic:

"Woe is me", says the Church, " woe to the unfortunate, ah, robbed, robbed am I of all good on all sides. Woe is me, stripped of my robes and left to be derided by the world. Woe is me, heavy-laden with unbearable burdens. My hands are in fetters, a yoke on my neck, schackles on my feet, a chain on the back, while over my head is a two-edged sword. The water under my feet is deep, inextinguishable fire on either side of me. From one quarter come prayers for relief, from another, fear, and still from another, persecution. There is misery in the cities and the villages, misery

in the prairies and the forests, and misery in the mountains and the depths of the earth. There is not one peaceful spot nor a safe dwelling. The day(is passed) in pains and wounds, the night, in groaning and sighing. Summer is so hot that one faints (from heat),winter freezes one to death: I feel miserable, for I suffer nakedness and I am being persecuted to death. Once wonderful and rich, now ravaged and poor; once a queen, beloved of all the world, now scorned and tortured by all. All who live, all ye people and ye citizens of the earth, come unto me, hearken to my voice, ye will realize what I formerly have been, and ye will wonder. I am now for the world a subject of contempt, while I was once a marvel both for people and for angels. I was beautiful before all, attractive and beloved ...."

Then the Church goes on to explain who were the ones most responsible for her downfall. It accuses her children of this crime:

"I gave birth to my children and raised them, but they renounced me and contribued to my downfall. Why do I now sit as one of the widows who moan, - once a ruler of the East and the West, the South and the Northern lands. I weep during the day and the night, and my tears, as it were, the yearly floods, roll down my face, and there is no one to console me, - All have deserted me, and despised me. My relatives are far from me, my friends became my enemies ...."

The lament is continued and the culprits are being enumerated. The Bishops are severely censured. Among them is the

son of the Church, Potey, who with others deserted her. Her complaint against him is almost tiring, for she so prayerfully reiterates to him how much she had inconvenienced herself and suffered for his sake, and now he would not hear her, that she convinces the reader of the righteousness of her pleading, and he can hardly bear it, knowing that no one answers her prayers.

Considerable part of the book was devoted to criticizing the Pope and the Catholic clergy. The author spared no pains in depicting them in the worst possible light. Smotritsky was not only a lyric poet, but was also a master satirist. He had no difficulty in obtaining sufficient facts to show to the world the scandals of the Romish Church, and the moral perversion of the Pope and his clergy. No wonder, therefore, that the Catholics became fearfully enraged over it as soon as the book was published, and Skarga and Morokhovsky hastened to make a reply thereto.

Among the Orthodox Ukrainians "Trenos" was a great treasure. It was read, studied and quoted. It became a vade mecum for many, and some went as far as to have it placed with them in the grave.

" Trenos" is valuable as a literary work for what it contains and how the author went about it to make it as effective as possible. It is written in rhythmical prose style, shows a profound feeling of the author for his church, and the comparisons and figures make itna poetical work of great value. The author is almost redundant in his words , but he is logical, and his

multiplicity of words is easily overlooked when we take cognizance of the fact that he does it knowingly, though heedless thereof, for it his method of attaining the desired object. And attain it he does, as may be judged from its popularity at the time and its value which permitted it to stand the test of time.

The controversy between the Orthodox and the Romish and Uniate Churches continued, becoming more heated each year. There were various questions at issue. Each side disputed relevant and irrelevant questions to the issue with a strong determination to win. In the middle of the 17th century the controversy was at its height. Zakharey Kopistensky came out with his book entitled "Palinodia", which was a reply to a book written in Polish by Leo Krewza, under the heading of " A Defence of the Church Union". From the nature of the defence and the arguments used therein, there are good grounds to believe that Krewza had been much assisted by Josaphat Kuntsevich, who has since been canonized by the Catholic Church, and who is regarded as one of the heroes thereof. It may be noted that "Palinodia", similarly to many later writings of Orthodox writers, bears marked evidence of the influence of Smotritsky's "Trenos". Here, like in "Trenos", Mother Church speaks to the Uniates, to whom the author tries to prove that the Orthodox Church avoided with justification the challenge which the Uniates made for a formal public debate on the question as to which Church was founded on solid Christian principles. The author of "Palinodia" deals with various questions, with heresy in Ukraine, the harmful books which are used in some of the churches, the persecution of the Orthodox

clergy by the Poles, and other matters.

Kopistensky is enlightening and at the same time interesting. He keeps the subject alive by appropriate narratives and passages. He says, for example, "Look for fire in the water", or, "All that thunders from Rome are not thunderbolts." The author is often satirical and accordingly resorts to gentle humor. His language is literary, but is not the purest Ukrainian, for it contains a large admixture of Polish. His book shows a close study of the Bible, and is, therefore, a work which is suitable not only for the times when it was written, but is also valuable for later theologians and students of religious questions.

The Orthodox Ukrainians kept up this struggle for their ideals with wonderful tenacity. They had their strong belief, the traditions, and the masses behind them, but their opponents, besides using arguments, also used force which they employed and which would listen to no reasoning. The natural outcome of this were the sympathies of the Zaporogian Cossacks, who came to the assistance of the masses. Pogroms on the Orthodox Christians could only be resisted by an armed force. The Cossacks, who then wielded great power as a national organization, betook themselves in defending the rights of their oppressed countrymen. They stood not only for religious but also for national rights and the rights to which they were legally entitled under the Polish rule. With them the Poles had to reckon, for, great leaders like Sahaydachny and Khmelnitzky would not be satisfied until their grievances were righted.

Much of the literature of this Cossack period is embodied in the so-called Cossack Chronicles. The chronicles of this period which have been preserved to our day, number about twenty. From them we get much information about the political and social order of the time. Like the ancient writers, some of the chroniclers commence with the beginning of the world and reiterate the important events up to their own times. The subjects which interested them most and on which they dwelt more than on any other topics were the ward of Khmelnitzky, the great Zaporogian Cossack leader in the middle of the 17th century. Probably the greatest chronicler of the period was Samuel Velichko, who was assistant of the General Secretary of the Cossacks. He ably dealt with the question of the eight years of war between the Ukrainians under Khmelnitzky and the Poles. He carefully gathered all diaries and information from various sources, and used all which he considered to be authenti

A valuable chronicle on the history of the Ukrainians, dealing with the events commencing with the reign of Prince Volodimir, the Great, until the middle of the 18th century. The authorship of this work is debatable. Some critics attribute it to George Konisky, while others to Basil Poletitsia. Another writer of the time was Kasian Sakovich, a man of some ability. Before he was a year old a pig bit off one of his ears, and his opponents in later years often referred to this incident when they wished to jest of him. Sakovich is remembered for his verses dedicated to Hetman Petro Konashevich Sahaydachny, and for his religious writings, which are at times conflicting, since he was

at first an Orthodox and later joined the Uniates.

With the assistance of the Cossacks the Ukrainian Church leaders made alarming headway in regaining the rights which were due them. The Poles themselves saw that the disorder in the country would continue as long as the great number of the inhabitants are dissatisfied. During an interregnum before the ascension of Vladyslav 1V to the Polish throne, a special commission was appointed which passed a special statute granting certain rights to Orthodox Christians and to White Russians. With this the Ukrainians saw a long fought for triumph of Orthodoxy. Several polemic writings appeared in connection with these final negotiations with the special commission. The one most deserving of note is the "Synopsis". The preface to this document deals with the intolerable position in which the Orthodox Church found itself as a result of the persecutions and oppressions. The memorial showed how the different rights which were denied to Orthodox Christians were their birthright, and that no one had or could claim a right to moledt them. In answer to the "Synopsis", Kasper Skupensky prepared a dialogue between two Ukrainians, one an Orthodox, the other a Uniate. The Orthodox claims that had tehy not gained a vistory over the Uniates in the ordinary argumertative way, they would have done it with the help of the Cossacks. The Uniate advances an argument that the blame lies on the Jesuits. However, the Orthodox eventually score a victory, and the two Churches went on developing independently of each other, according

to their own ideals.

Many distinguished personages had taken part in the great controversy between the Churches. The leading educationists of Kiev became in the latter half of the 17th century very much involved in the polemics. The result was that Ukrainian literature for that reason naturally at that time got a mark imprinted on it which was characteristic of the Kievan writers, prominent among whom was Petro Mohyla, who made a reply to Sakovich's "Perspektiva".

It will be remembered that at the beginning of the 17th century Kiev became a centre of a literary movement in Ukraine in the same way as it once formerly served as a political and cultural centre of the Southern Ukrainian territories. About 1650 the Kievan Academy becomes noted as a school from which a great number of learned men are being sent out to all parts of Slavdom. It also becomes an authority on literary form and style, which dominated the character of Ukrainian literature until about the end of the 18th century. As we have already seen, the establishment of the Academy had, undoubtedly, from one point of view, a very beneficial effect on the Ukrainian educational and cultural life as a whole. In fact, it marked the beginning of real educational life in the country. But, like the religious polemics, though in one respect they were somewhat beneficial, since they necessarily brought out the genius of many writers, in another respect they were almost harmful for they submerged the gradually evolving Ukrainian national

literature, the Kievan Academy also had its disadvantages. Drawing on the ready form of knowledge from the West, the directors of the Academy accepted that which the West had already outlived. They adopted the scholasticism of the middle ages, while Europe had already turned its attention to a newer life. In the West there Shakes peare, Milton, Cervantes, Moliere, Galileo, Newton, Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibmitz, and others. The great new movement started by these men did not then reach Ukraine. Instead there was propagated in the Kievan Academy the scholasticism of the middle ages together with its rigid formalism which left no room for individual expression.

The Kievan Academy, being born at the time of the Catholic reaction, and being under the influence of the schools which were part of the reaction, also acquired their character. So that little, if any, room was left therein for the European humanism, freedom of thought, and the realism of Bacon. It must be admitted that though no encouragement was given for real creative work of the human mind, nor for conceiving of new ideas, (for even verse-making was according to a borrowed Latin form), yet the Academy afforded an opportunity for a training of the mind and for accustoming it to abstract thinking. However, this was not the best that could be desired for the development of Ukrainian literature. The tendency of literature was, in fact, dangerous, for, writers were wont to pay strict attention to form at the sacrifice of the context, and thereby considerably retarded the

progress of the Ukrainian cultural life.

Quite naturally even the most prominent educators who were graduates of the Academy were true to its teachings, so that among the Kievan adherents of the subtleties of the academy there were such men as Hizel, Baranovich, Polotsky, Tuptalenko, Haliatovsky, Radivilevsky and others. They were, to a great extent, responsible for keeping alive the scholastic formality which resulted in pseudoclassicism on Ukrainian soil, and the consequent continuous gap between Ukrainian culture as it was being evolved among the learned circles, and that ofthe common people with practically no means of reconciliation between the two.

However, the inner forces behind the national and, therefore, natural literature were at work. Human nature rebels against anything that is unnatural. Scholasticism was not only foreign and unintelligible to the common people, but also repugnant to them. We have seen that from times immemorial the common people have been creating real literature-- something that proceeded directly from their own lives. As evidenced by the ballads and stories, this literature was at first unwritten. Later, much of it was collected by various chroniclers and writers. From then on the two literatures kept evolving, running parallel to each other. Unwritten literature and literature written by the common people remained close to the lives of the people, while that written by the educated class, particularly during the Kievan scholasticism, put on a foreign cloak, and was gradually becoming alienated. The struggle between the two for supremacy was a violent one during

the 17th and the 18th centuries. The dislike to cold scholasticism became more and more pronounced, while at the same time the national literature was gradually gaining ground. The dawn of a new era was approaching. The ever active elements of a, so-to speak, living literature, were becoming more active with time. The people were coming to a realization of their national consciousness and demanded literary productions in pure Ukrainian, in the language of the people. Towards the end of the 18th century the coming revival was piercing the wall of the old order, with productions in drama and verse, history, and moralistic philosophy. The first of these, of course, originated in the Bible long before, and was a later development of the miracle plays. This was then carried into schools which drew great crowds. Various kinds of verse poetry was produced, including the hymn, lyric, satire, panegyrical and historical verse. The historical works reflect on the immediate past, the times of the Cossacks and their futile fight for the independence of Ukraine, while the moralistic philosophy was really the continuance of the influence of the Christian Church.

The revival in Ukrainian literature finally came; the endeavors for the emancipation of thought, the attempts at realism and freedom of national feeling culminated in Kotliarevsky, who is called the father of the new Ukrainian literature, the precursor of which was Skovoroda. With him begins the third and undoubtedly the most active and the most important period in Ukrainian literature

It is to be greatly regretted that owing to lack of time and space, only the most outstanding literary figures and works of this period can be dealt with. However, it is deemed necessary that the writers who are the most prominent be considered spmewhat fully, and that their biographies be taken into account, which particularly in this period in most cases played a very important part in what the writers were to produce.

THE MODERN PERIOD

On the threshold of the new era in Ukrainian literature stands out very prominently Hrehory Skovoroda (1722-1794). He was born in Poltava, Ukraine, and studied in the schools at Kiev and also outside the border in the West. Having acquired considerable knowledge of philosophy, he returned to Ukraine, where he became teacher of a Seminary at Pereyaslav. He later gave up his position and was employed as family tutor by a wealthy Ukrainian named Tamara. About this time he commenced writing his first tales and composing verses. Then he was given a position in a High School at Kharkov, where owing to the radical views which he held and which could not be reconciled with those of the other teachers on the staff, he was forced to resign.

This was a turning point in his career. Sacrificing his personal comforts, he set out wandering over Ukraine, oftentimes suffering from hunger and exposure. His purpose was to give the common people a good education and make them realize that they have had their past history and that a bright future wasbefor them. Having seen the greater part of Poland, Hungary, Germany and Italy, through which countries he travelled on foot, he formed his own ideas about the progress of humanity, and when he returned to Ukraine he denounced the Intelligentsia for keeping the common people in intellectual bondage, "who", he said, "though they are asleep, are not dead yet, and, when they have awakened,

will show the world that they are men of mettle". Skovoroda soon became very popular among the lower classes and was also respected by the higher classes. For his teachings he wascalled the Ukrainian Socrates or "a w alking University". Nor were his efforts in vain. A good proof of this is the fact that a large sum of money was raised by the intelligentsia and the common people which money was used in establishing after his death a University at Kharkov. This was the direct result of the labors of the poor philosopher .

Skovoroda attained his object not only by his ethical teachings, but also by his own life. This young man with a knapsack on his back, a flute under his belt, and a cane in hand, never despised the poorest and never feared the richest. He did not hesitate in imparting knowledge to a crowd of people wherever they would meet, be it in the Churchyard, the fair grounds, or in a poor man's cottage. But his favorite sport was, as he himself says in his verses, out in the fields and in the blue sky and close to nature. The character of his writings which were not published until late after his death, show the influence which natural enviroment had upon him. As nature is humble and free, so was he in the ideas which he propagated. "Let nature take her course", was his motto. He well expresses this in one of his songs when he says,

"Why should I waste time in worrying
Who was in a village born?
Let those who are bent on flying high
Stretch their brains to find it out,

I prefer to spend in silence

The dear life with which I'm blest.

Thus no harm will I encounter

A happy man will I be."

The verse gives us a good idea of Skovoroda's philosophy. There is no doubt but that he is a hedonist. Reading more of his works reveals the fact that he was a close follower of Socrates. His philosophy savors much of epicureanism and pantheism.

But Skovoroda is an important Ukrainian figure, not so much for his philosophy or his literature as for his attitude towards his country and people. His works leave no doubt that he was thoroughly sincere in his efforts to educate the people in order to alleviate their condition and thereby to raise his nation to a higher standard of culture. He loved his land to the extent that when he travelled abroad he was always sad and yearned to come back. But no less than he were his people praying for his return. And they had good reasons to love him as much as they did. His teaching was the kind which they had been waiting for for a long time. At the moment of his appearance in public life the question of the whole nation was," to be or not to be?" When his work bore fruit, the unanimous answer of the people was," to be", and this answer gave them courage to carry on in spite of obstacles placed in their way by foreign oppressors to keep them down and to deprive them of their national rights.

Ivan Kotliarevsky 1769-1838.

Kotliarevsky was born at Poltava, Ukraine, There he spent his boyhood days and acquired his education. His father was a

member of the Town Council. Unlike other people in his position he spoke Ukrainian at home and not Russian. He was a good father and often related to his son stories concerning Ukraine, the Hetmans, the destruction of the "Seech" , slavery, and the inhuman treatment which the common people received at the hands of their overlords.

In the Seminary Ivan was taught in Russian, which he found rather difficult, but by dint of hard work he soon became regarded as one of the best students in the school, while his ability to write verses and stories gained him great popularity among the students. Graduating from the Seminary he was engaged as a private teacher in the homes of the wealthy classes in the villages. Here he had an opportunity to mingle with the peasant folk and to study their life, customs, language and song. When he stopped teaching he became employed in the Court at Poltava. Later he entered the army where he served for ten years with great success, and was in due course given a commission as Captain. At the end of this term he retired on a pension. Then he became principal of an Institute and a Director of a Theatre in Poltava. He was never married, and when he was dying he distributed his property amongst his relatives and friends, while to the two slaves who were in his service he granted their freedom.

Comparing the time of Kotliarevsky with the date in the historical sketch we find that he lived at the time when the Ukrainians became completely deprived of their freedom as an independent nation. In 1764 Catherine II disallowed their Hetmans to rule them; in 1775 she destroyed the "Seech", and in 1782 sanctioned

serfdom in Ukraine. Young Ivan lived through these reforms and changes which impressed him considerably. The discussions of the Ukrainians' final attempt in a struggle for political liberty engaged in on all occasions, and he listened to these with great interests. Then too, he saw how the last act of the Czarina divided the Ukrainian people into two sections, namely, the higher class who disclaimed their nationality and neglected their language, and the class of common people who loved their language and traditions, but who were deprived of the rights to develop these.

When he grew up Kotliarevsky though himself a son of a family belonging to the former class of people did not hesitate in throwing in his lot with the latter. The common people were that material foundation upon which the father of the new Ukrainian literature based his valuable works. He was well versed in foreign literature, but was above all fond of the old Ukrainian works. Realizing full well that all the nations of Europe endeavored to create a literature in their own tongue, he took a rather new and a bold step to write in Ukrainian. There is no doubt that in doing this he was to a great extent prompted by Skovoroda's philosophy in which he strongly expressed that learning was not meant to servethe interests of the rich and the intelligentsia only,"but for everyone who could call himself a man". So that, it will be seen that the spirit of Skovoroda of loving one's fellow-men runs throughout and dominates most of the works of Kotliarevsky. In them the theories of the philosopher became cast into a form of a concrete literary activity in the language of his own people. "When Kotliarevsky appeared,"

says Serhey Yefremov, an authority on Ukrainian literature, "the field of Ukrainian literature was already cleared, but it remained unused waiting for someone to come with a suitable instrument, add his labors to it by breaking it, and sow thereon select seeds for the benefit of his native land. This last work is the result of Kotliarevsky's individual labors. For this reason his works had and still have not only the literary value, but they also became a social factor. They became that kernel whence grow both the Ukrainian literature and the social activities in Ukraine as a definite whole of ideas which leave their mark on all matters of national character. "

Kotliarevsky's first great work of invaluable importance, by which he virtually started the literary revival and the restoration intellectually of the nation which was now enslaved politically was his translation of, or more accurately, his parody on the "Aeneid". The first cantos of this poem appeared in 1798. In this work the poet set up a memorial to his nation by transferring the unhappy state of things in Ukraine to the city of Troy and applying it to the Trojans driven away from their home, which were sympathetic features to the Cossacks who were in a similar way made fugitives from their own home. The Aeneid was written in a popular way, so that it was not difficult to understand it. The Ukrainian and Russian intelligentsia on the first appearance of the book ridiculed it; but when they read further on and came to the point where the poet described the agonies of the lords in Inferno, they began to reflect on the treatment of their slaves. In reprimanding the rich

class he says;

"There they tortured all the Pans,
And scorched them from all sides,
This for giving the poor no peace
And for treating them as beasts. "

Here the author clearly shows his sympathy for the serfs,and the verses are no doubt a sincere expression of his inner feelings. In reply to Aeneas' inquiry as to who is eligible to be admitted to Paradise he replies in part:

"Not the ones whose coffers are filled with gold,
or those whose bellies bulge out,
- -
Not those with book in hand
Not the knights, nor robbers,
- ----- -
But those who are poor, humble - - -
Those styled as fools,
The aged, cripplied, blind
Those who are ever ridiculed - - -."

Kotliarevsky does not therefore, leave us guessing as to his sympathies or antipathies. He takes the two extremes, Heaven and Hell, and around these he centres the whole of his discourse. He is actuated by strong ideals which he determined to put before the public and thereby to effect the reformation of the social system. This was the burning question of the day, and he felt that it was his mission to devote himself to the work and to

endeavor to bring about the changes , the time for which was long overdue. In England the corresponding period was more clearly defined for the work in purely literary pursuits. There Gray and Goldsmith a few decades prior to this date marked the triump of Romanticism over Classicism. And though a little later writers like Burns dealt with the cause of the common people and with the social conditions in their country, yet we see that their not far distant followers like Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, Byrom, Shelley, Keats and others took a great interest and found time to treat in their works not only of matters immediately pertaining to human life, but also of inanimate nature, Kotliarevsky was not as free to do the same.

In his Aeneid the poet is so clear in depicting the characteristics of his Gods, and he makes them such earthly characters that no difficulty is encountered in finding their prototypes on earth. Having shown us the life of the Gods on Mount Olympus, Aneas hastens to the earth below to join the common people of whom he is very fond. He says,

"And now must part I with Heaven,

'Tis time for me to descend to earth (VI,20)".

Here he finds,only on a smaller scale than on Mount Olympus. similar quarrels, drunkenness, oppression, injustice, and disorder.

Two other very important works of Kotliarevsky besides the Aeneid which are in fact a continuation of his advocacy for the emancipation of the common people, are his dramas entitled "Natalka Poltavka" and "The Muscovite Wizard". They were, as it were, another

phase of his attacks and criticism of the higher classes. The former drama even to-day enjoys a great popularity among the Ukrainians, and in travelling through the Canadian West one often comes across a quaint country school-house or a "Reading Room" where a party of amateurs find great joy in acting the play, and their audience, in watching the performance.

Kotliarevsky wrote little, but that which he has written has proven to have been of great consequence. He was consistent in his tendencies,and his outlook on life was indivisible. Having inherited from his predecessors, particularly from Skovoroda, a humanitarian-democratic inheritance,he succeeded in dressing it in a new robe and supplying it with new blood by means of a living language of the people . Once started , he continued to sow the seed of justice and human sympathy. The people were a foundation on which he commenced his work. Former literature and its everlasting traditions supplied him with moral essentials, while his motive from the psychological point of view was a love of his country. The fortunate combination of these circumstances coupled with his education and genius made Kotliarevsky the foremost figure in the revival of Ukraianian Literature and a leading personage, both in theory and in practice, in laying down the foundations of a democratic national movement in Ukraine. Up to the time of Kotliarevsky Ukrainian literature was not in the strictest sense altogether national, for the essential element in which is the language of the people, was generally speaking missing, while in cases where it was employed, it was done so rather sporadically

than continuously, and was often not long adhered to. It is he who marks the commencement of a period wherein native language becomes a condition precedent to the creation of Ukrainian literature and forms a part and parcel of it. He observed the fact that "le ton fait musique" as Yefremov states, and he shaped his works accordingly. In his opinion, and history has proven that he was correct,a reform towards democracy , humanism, and national independence could only be rightly and speedily effected with the aid of the language of the people concerned.

The literary activity of Kotliaredsky and particularly the great popularity of his works awakened the Ukrainian intelligentsia to a life of thinking which a great number of them were secretly, consciously or unconsciously , following. There existed latent powers , but someone had to arouse them to action. Kotliarevsky started the stone rolling and no opposing force has ever since been able to stop it.

Naturally this great Ukrainian revivalist had ready followers. The new ideas propagated by him became a living factor in the new movement. The language, traditions, and the songs of the people were loved and respected, as is seen in the various works of the numerous writers of lesser and greater importance. Among the more talented of his followers were, Artemovsky-Hulak, Hrebinka, Kvitka and Borovikovsky who wereamong the first to meet the advent of a new character of literature which was now making its way into Ukraine from the West, namely, Romanticism.

Petro Artemovsky-Hulak 1790-1866.

Artemovsky-Hulak was the first writer after Kotliarevsky to gain prominence and popularity in Ukraine.

He studied in the High Schools in Kiev and completed his University education in Kharkov in the University which was established in 1805 as a result of the untiring efforts of Skovoroda. Students of various nationalities attended the University, and Artemovsky had an opportunity to learn foreign languages and something of the customs of foreign people. He mastered the Polish language on which he lectured during his undergraduate course. Meanwhile, he was preparing for his examination in history. Having passed this, he became professor of Russian history, which position he filled until 1850. He then retired and lived on a pension in Kharkov, until his death.

Not having yet broken away from the old system, Artemovsky at first wrote in Russian, but when he became familiar with the works of Kotliarevsky, he began to use Ukrainian, and soon became a noted satirist. Like his predecessor, he did not spare the Pan in his satires. This he showed in his story entitled "A Pan and a Dog", which story is responsible for the very common Ukrainian quotation , "Every Pan is a dog". His slogan always was ,

"He is a fool who goes to serve foolish Pans,
A double fool is he who tries to please them."

A protest against serfdom runs through every line of the story, and critics of the time expected nothing but a continuation of the work which he undertook with such boldness. The story was

well written , and the life of the peasants and their subservience to their overlords was clearly depicted. Owing to this he soon brought upon himself the wrath of the Pans, which he did not heed, however, and carried on his work giving promise for a great literary career.

But it was not long before a turning point came in his success, which disappointed his friends. Due to his epicurean philosophical tendencies he became inconsistent, and without any apparent justification verged off from his original purpose. He well expresses his irresponsible spirit in two lines, saying,

"Whether you shall live or die, Parkhom,do not worry,
Care thou but that thou have enough to drink."

It is really difficult to understand Artemovsky, but when reading his poetry it strikes one as if there is in him some curiously cynical trait, a mixture of high idealism with a correspondingly low practicalness, but the inevitable summing up is almost in every case the pessimistic "all is vanity".

So that Artemovsky apparently made no attempt to go back to his earlier tendencies, and died much less popular than at the beginning of his career. At the same time, it must be remembered that his earlier works were timely and therefore affective, and they insure him a place amongst the leading writers of the period.

Hrehory Kvitka (Hrytsko Osnovianenko),1778-1843.

Knitka was born of a wealthy family in Osnova, near Kharkov, Ukraine. He was an invalid from childhood, but life in the open

out in the country where he was raised was very favorable, and he eventually completely recuperated. He acquired his education at home where his father had tutors for him, one of whom was Skovoroda. He proved to be a diligent student, and in addition to what he got from his teachers, he eagerly listened to the stories of his father, who was a great story-teller and never ran out of material for stories on patriotic subjects. At the age of 23, Kvitka joined the monastic order, but in spite of his strong religious proclivities he remained in it for only four years. Then he went back to live among the peasants whose life he studied and he got so fond of them that he pledged thereafter to work in the literary field for the cause of the common people. Leaving his home he went to Kharkov where he came in contact with many educated people. He was appointed Director of a theatre, and later the principal of an Institute for Girls, and, at the same time, an Associate-Editor of a paper entitled "Ukrainsky Vistnyk". He died in Osnova, his home town.

It was during his connection with the "Ukrainsky Vistnyk" that this contemporary of Kotliarevsky commenced his literary career. He began writing novels at first in Russian and later in Ukrainian. He was therefore one of the first to commence novel writing in Ukrainian. In them he embodied the life and customs of the peasant folk, and his success in this field was so great that he was soon proclaimed as a novelist of the first order. He is a didactic writer, for, while in some of his novels he described the people as they were, in others he tried to point out what they ought to be

and how they ought to live. In fact his whole aim seems to have been to put the Ukrainian peasant in as favorable a light as was possible and to show that although he was virtually a slave, he possessed very desirable traits, and was deserving of as much respect and consideration as the Pans and the intelligentsia whom he oftentimes surpassed in his conduct.

Among the more important works of Kvitka are "Marucia" , "Perekotipole" , and "Kozir Divka". These were really amongst the first novels not only in Ukrainian literature but in all literatures dealing with the life of the people and showing a sincere sympathy towards them. His desire was to show that in cases of the most simple there was beating a human heart similar to that of the privileged classes. It may be noted that Kvitka outstripped both the French and the German writers belonging to the same class, for he wrote his novels before George Sands who described the French peasants in his works in 1841, and Auerbach who wrote his "Dorfgeschichten" in 1843. This circumstance could probably be explained in the first place by the fact that Ukrainian literature , being in a sense since the revival a new literature, was less bound by the set form as those which developed without such a serious decline as it did, and in the second place, since the Ukrainian language was now coming into use and prominence as a literary language, it was quite natural that the tendency of the writers be to use it for advocating democratic principles and to treat of subjects which were of greatest concern to the classes which formed the majority of the nation, and which heretofore were sadly neglected.

Kvitka had a thorough knowledge of Russian literature, but it cannot be said that he approved of its generalcharacter. His criticism of it was, that the Russians were soaring to the skies, forgetting that virtue and beauty were more easily to be found amongst the common folk and in the simple things. In this respect he resembles Wordsworth. His "Marusia" shows probably most clearly and effectively his warm sympathy for the people and his sincerity, and it is therefore nothing to be wondered at that the reading of the novel brings tears to one's eyes. He has one of his characters expressed well his predominating principle by having him say, "Everyone is a brother of ours, be he of our own village, or that of another, of a city, a German, a Turk, still he is a man, a creature of God." In his "Perekotipole" (a certain piece of land), Kvitka showed how right triumphed over wrong. This is done with the aid of such a dumb witness as the rushes of the Steppe. Unfortunately, Kvitka was blind to the evil of slavery. The worst evil which he could see was in the moral downfall of a man. For this reason he is quite forgetful of the social phase of human life and centres his moralizing remarks on human morality. He very well saw the disorder and unfairness of the social structure, and criticised it wherever possible. But he regarded the evils more as personal faults and did not seem to realize that they underlie and are responsible for the existing injustice in society. This is probably due to his origin. But we must give him credit for his consistency in unwaveringly adhering to the ideals which he formed and ever endeavoured to spread by means of his novels.

Evhen Hrebinka (1812-1848), and Leonid Hlibiv (1827-1893).

These two writers are considered by critics as the most popular of all the Ukrainian writers of narratives. Hrebinka was born at Poltava, where he spent his boyhood days and attended school. When he became of proper military age, he entered the army where good training and promotion enabled him to get a position as teacher of military schools at St. Petersburg. While there he corresponded with a number of Ukrainian men of letters, and formed a close friendship with Shevchenko. His first volume of stories were edited at St. Petersburg in 1834. But it was rather unfortunate that he wrote mostly in Russian. Influenced by the environment in which he found himself, he slavishly followed Gogol, and found little time left to devote his energies to purely Ukrainian literary pursuits. But what he has written has its value not only because he was, to a certain extent, a pioneer in this field of literature, but also because he impresses a reader with his subtle method of employing animals for the purpose of pointing out the social inequality which was the cause of most disorders in the State.

Hrebinka preferred writing in verse, which will ever remain a gem in Ukrainian literature. But his prose works are also worthy of mention. In some of his prose works he gave us a beautiful view of nature in Ukraine.

Hlibiv was born at Poltava, the birthplace of the former writer, where he studied both in the public school and in the "Gymnasium", in which latter school he was forced to give up his

course for awhile owing to sickness. Having regained his health in the country, he returned to the Gymnasium and graduated therefrom in 1855. Three years later he was appointed to the staff of a Gymnas ium at Chernihov, and there he established a newspaper which was edited both in Ukrainian and in Russian. In 1863 the Russian Government forbade the publication of it, and also, for this defence of the Ukrainian people, dismissed him from his position. Life to him was miserable now, for, after the death of his wife, he remained for a long time in poor health. In 1867 fortune smiled upon him a little, for he was appointed manager of a large printing press in Chernihov in which he worked until his death.

Hlibiv wrote mostly narratives, and besides, he was the innovator of a new poetry which dealt with riddles and jokes. He took great pleasure in writing for the children, and for all young people in general. Like Robert Louis Stevenson, therefore, he has the reputation of thoroughly knowing the psychology of the child. His characters and examples were very true to life, and his style simple, so that his works became very popular. Hlibiv's poems are very fine, lyrical and touching. One of his poems has been arranged to music and which is a great favorite amongst young and old is that entitled " There Stands a Lofty Mountain". Here the poet strikes a sad note in saying " And youth bygone once and for all, 'twill never, never return". He seems to have been a close observer as well of inanimate as of human nature and also of animals.

In all these he finds the essence of good. "Truth, education, virtuous life", these are the guiding principles in all his tales. Henever forgets to give his own opinion as to what he thinks is good, and he uses concrete and striking examples to illustrate his point. For example, after he has related a story about "A Straw Man", he adds:

"Such straw men are also found amongst the people, and they do no one any good;
'Tis time that people stopped to act as straw men would,
We ought now to a greater aim aspire, to seek a living word,
knowledge and truth".

In rare cases Hlibiv to a certain extent used the satire for the purpose of correcting wrongs done in commuhnity life. In one of his tales, for example, he compares a poor man with a lamb and a Pan with a wolf, which , desp ite the weeping and entreating of the mother to spare her child, mercilessly chokes it. This in his view is not only inhuman but also unpatriotic, for it tends not to order but to dis order in the State. It may be noted that the writer is sincerely patriotic and constantly refers to such virtues as goodness and truth, not merely as desirable virtues from ethical considerations, but also because they tend to bring harmony in the community and in the state. Ever keeping this thought in his heart he interweaves all his stories with his moralistic admonitions. His great patriotism almost restricts him in his works to his own country, and he is, therefore, not univeraal in his scope. But the history of the period justifies him in this. Yet

he is always original and has not yet been surpassed by any other Ukrainian writer in the same field.

Amvrosey Metlinsky (1814-1870).

Metlinsky was a son of a poor family who lived in Poltava. He studied in the public schools of Hadiach and later in a Gymnasium, and in the University in Kahrkov. During his undergraduate course he lived with professor Artemovsky-Hulak, who helped him considerably with his study of Slavonic languages. He also became familiar with Slavonic writers who wrote on Ukrainian subjects, and these first opened up to him the beauty of Ukrainian poetry in which he became so interested that he soon began to compose verses and himself became a great poet. Having graduated he became instructor in the University in Kharkov, and later in Kiev. Returning to Kharkov he lived there until the beginning of his mental sickness in 1858. He went to Geneva and later to Crimea for purposes of a cure. But, while in Crimea, he fatally wounded himself in a fit of mental derangement and died a premature death.

Metlinsky dealt extensively with the fortunes and misfortunes of the Cossacks whom he considered to have been great Ukrainian heroes. He wrote mostly lyrics, and as a lyric poet is considered to have been the greatest before Shevchenko. He edited a volume of poetry in 1839. In this volume, besides his own works he also included translations of Bohemian, (Czech),Slovak, Polish, Serbian, German and other writers. A book of his purely Ukrainian songs and poems was edited some fifteen years later.

The political works of Metlinsky are filled with pessimism, which sometimes makes them difficult reading. He seems to be always "crying over spilt milk" and has little, if any, hopes for a better future. He bewails the sad lot which befell his native land, but has not enough courage or initiative to denounce those who are responsible for the existing despotic rule in the country. On the contrary, apparently under the influence of Russian writers like Pushkin and others, he talks well of the Czar and his attempts to keep his enemies under his heel. His purpose may have been in this way to gain the ruler's good will with respect to the Ukrainian people. If so, his efforts were not in that particular crowned with success.

Like Hlibiv, Metlinsky is sincerely patriotic, and he attributes much of his patriotism to his old grandmother, who was the first who taught him Ukrainian songs and the language which he later thought was the most musical language he had ever heard. Remembering his grandmother in his poems he says :

"She ever loved me; in songs she enwrapped me,
With the native word she nurtured me,
The native tongue she taught me".

As later his own, so were his grandmother's songs replete with stories of the old glory of Ukraine. It was, therefore, she who was indirectly responsible for his recasting of such a valuable work of his as "Kozacha Smert", (The Death of a Cossack), although it is true that he got many of his ideas for it from a German poet who had previously written on the subject. He saw the dangers threat-

ening his mother tongue, and on many occasions he seems to show his anxiety for its existence. But about the year 1838, when certain writers reported on their investigations on the Ukrainian language, he became hopeful of its future development. However, in spite of his love for his own language, Metlinsky would not exclude foreign influences. His purpose was to educate his people no matter where the knowledge came from, and this he well expresses in one of his poems in which he says :

"Out into the world, let us seek knowledge!
There's no use sinking with hands raised up!
The brains of others is our assistance,-
Out into the world let us depart."

Mikola Kostomariv (1817-1885).

In a striking contrast to the lyric, pessimistic poet, Metlinsky, stands out the optimistic historian Kostomariv.

Born of a wealthy parentage, Kostomariv was sent to schools to be educated. When he was in his "teens", he lost his father who was killed by his serfs to revenge his mistreatment of them. In his seventeenth year he registered in the University of Kharkov where he became a member of a secret society, and through which act he incurred the displeasure of the Czar. While here he commenced to compose poems, to study Ukrainian and to write articles on the historical value of national poetry.

In 1845 he obtained a position as teacher of a gymnasium at Kiev. Two years later he was arrested for being an active

member of the Society, which had for its object patriotic work amongnthe Ukrainians. He remained in prison at Petropavlovsk until his pardon in 1856 by Czar Alexander 11. After his release he became professor of the University at St. Petersburg from 1859 to 1862. He died in St. Petersburg in 1885.

Kostomariv left behind him a name of a noted Ukrainian historian. He wrote considerably in Russian, but contributed much to Ukrainian literature. He is said to have been the first Ukrainian historian who paid more attention not to the States, as is the custom of many students of history, but to the people, having regard to their life, customs, traditions, songs, stories and beliefs. He was a close student of the various Slavic nationalities, and was, therefore, in a position to defend the historic rights of the Ukrainian people and to show that they were a distinct nationality from the Russians. So that with his death in 1885 it was particularly the Ukrainians who mourned his loss and not so much the Russians, as the informant in the Encyclopedia Britannica would have us believe.

As an historian, with an open mind, Kostomariv does not merely record historical events, but also stops to dwell on the economic and social conditions in the State. He resents tyranny and injustice practised on the helpless classes. Truth and will, fortune and fate, are in his opinion the attributes of Christianity. He stood for Slavdom free and unfettered, and for each nationality to develop according to democratic principles.

Khmelnitsky is, therefore, in his opinion, a real democrat, fully conscious of his national duties. What Kostomariv fails to achieve in his historical treatises, he effects with his dramas where he very skilfully introduces characters to represent the forces struggling in society for supremacy. His strongest wish is expressed in one of his short verses:

"All races will awake,
A legacy eternal will they take,
The foe of a thousand years,
A foe will besiege".

Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861).

Practically every nation has had its beginning away back in the mysterious past, in times which are beyond the memory of man. Then it lives a life of a human individual in many respects, but one on a larger scale. It lives a life of vigor, prosperity, progress, happiness, weakness, poverty, decline, tribulations; all these depending on the internal conditions of the State and the management thereof, on its relations with the neighboring States and on various other considerations. Ordinarily if any changes take place in the life of a nation they appear to be slow in coming. Yet in rare cases a man arises oftentimes out of an insignificant source, becomes a great warrior,

statesman, or writer and is hailed as a leader of men. Ukraine had passed through its golden era, and through its decline, it had leaders great and small, but it was not until the beginning of the 19th century that the greatest of all the distinguished Uktainians arose, a Ukrainian without an equal --- Taras Shevchenko. Out of a country where the national and social conditions were rigidly fixed, there came from the lowest ranks of a morally and economically oppressed people a poet whose whole life was a steadfas and continual protest against all forms of despotism. He was a serf, yet his spirit and genius have placed him in the foremost position in Ukrainian literature, and it is hoped, when he becomes known to the world, he will be accordedthe position which he deserves in the literatures of the world.

Shevchenko was born on the 9th of March 1814 in the village of Morintzy, on the River Dnieper, in Ukraine, a place south of Kiev, the ancient cradle of Ukrainian culture. His father was a serf, and while Taras was still a young lad they were moved by their master Engelhardt to the village of Kirilywka. Here Taras lived for fifteen years of his young life, and of this spot he has vivid reminiscences.

At the age of ten, Taras lost his mother, his father married again, his new wife, a widow, bringing in her children to the family. Two years later his father died. He was now a helpless orphan, and his troubles began, for his stepmother was quite open in her discrimination against the poor boy. And, indeed he

poor and left to shift for himself. In bequeathing his property to the family, his father, Gregory Shevchenko, apportioned so much for each member, but to Taras he gave nothing, saying that he will be no common man. By using his ability he will either become a great man or a rascal, and, therefore, in either case the patrimony would not be of any use to him. He was obliged to mind cattle from Spring until Autumn, while during the winter he continued his studies which he began during the life of his mother, with a local precentor who did not believe in sparing the rod, and particularly in his periods of inebriation, which were rather frequent, as a result of which he often used to run away and conceal himself for several days at a time in the shrubs of his neighbor in the same way as he did to escape the wrath of his stepmother. Lucky was he if before making these retreats he could take along with him his brush and paints wherewith to attend to his hobby, and if his faithful sister, Iryna, could find him and stealthily supply him with food. In one of his poems of early boyhood he recalls the few happy years which he enjoyed during the life of his parents; how happy he was minding sheep on the outskirts of the village, but how the sun had soon set, the sky became overcast; he looked at the lambs, they were not his; he looked towards his home, and it was not his, "and", he says, "heavy, heavy tears streamed down my cheeks".

Tiring of his treatment at home and at school, and seeing that while he remained in his home village, he would have to spend many of his days in hunger, he made up his mind to go out into

the world and to try his luck as itinerant painter of Icons. He thought that fortune was smiling on him when he found a man who required his services as apprenticed painter, but who required Taras to get a written permission from his master to allow him to enter apprenticeship. But when he applied for same to the manager of the master's estate, he noticed the cleverness of the boy and decided to keep him and make him his valet.

Taras' new life now began. His master was very fond of travelling through Russia. He now took the young boy with him on all his journeys. The boy secretly painted whenever opportunity presented itself. His master soon found out that no amount of brutal treatment could prevent him from stealing pencils and paper for his drawing, so he conceived the idea of exploiting the boy's talent for his own benefit. He would apprentice him to a painter and reap good returns therefrom. Accordingly he left him with a painter at Warsaw, where he remained for a year. From Warsaw he was transferred to St. Petersburg where he was apprenticed as painter and decorator. Needless to say, this was just the work he craved to do. However, it cannot be said that he was very happy, for he could not forget the beautiful natural surroundings of his home in Ukraine, and he often longed to go back there. But his freedom as painter was not as much circumscribed as when he served as a valet. He often got out and wandered through the streets, where he studied the pitiable conditions of the poor enslaved people. He contrasted them with the ruling class, and his spirit resented the injustice.

In St. Petersburg he formed acquaintance with his countryman, Soshenko, which acquaintance proved to be of great benefit to him. Soshenko became much interested in his studies and his life, and gave him to read works of various writers. He also introduced him to Hrebinka, the poet, to the noted painter Brulov, and the Russian poet, Zukovsky.

Taras' distinguished company of new friends saw in him a man of unusual intellectual abilities and agreed that he ought to be registered in the Academy of Arts, where he could develop his talent. But, this was not possible without encountering some obstacles-- a serf was absolutely debarred from admission to the Academy. However, the Director of the Academy, Brulov, was determined to have him as his student. He conceived an idea for the lad's emancipation. A portrait of a famous poet was painted, in which work Taras collaborated with Brulov. This was raffled bringing a return of 2500 rubles, which were a sufficient amount to purchase the boy's freedom. For the first time in his life Shevchenko was a free man! This very important event took place on the 4th day of May 1838, when he was 24 years of age.

Now, Shevchenko felt that he was a man in the full sense of the term and that his origin would no more stand in his way, barring , as it did heretofore, access to the educated world. We have proof, however, that since he was now himself free, he fully realized the privilege, and his heart ached more than ever before , for it was now to others that his sympathies went out.

As to the use he made of his own freedom, one can well imagine how he would try to gratify his desire for learning. His friends were very generous to him, with the result that Shevchenko soon read the history of the world and translated works of a number of great poets and writers. His knowledge of foreign literature was in a great measure due to a Pole named Dembinski and a German named Schternberg. Through reading Shevchenko's eyes became opened to the past of his motherland. An ancient Ukrainian history made him realize the place which his country once occupied in the history of the world, its present condition, and what position it should, as of right, hold. Diligent studies and consideration of these questions were, of course, to a certain extent an obstacle in his progress in painting. But as far as we know the director of the Academy was well satisfied with his work. That his personality and genius were appreciated is also apparent in the fact that men like Count Tolstoi and the Governor General, Repnin, were among his intimate friends.

But the reading of literature, his own and foreign, aroused the Ukrainian Muse in Shevchenko. Valuable works of Grecian, Roman, British and other great writers had a considerable effect on him, Of the British writers particularly Shakespeare, Byron and Scott, who were his favorites, and with whom he was very familiar. The condition of his oppressed brethren gave his mind no peace. As he himself admits, oftentimes while he was busy painting in the Academy, there would appear before him a Ukrainian village with a blind "Kobzar" (a wandering minstrel playing

on an instrument which resembles a mandolin) , playing a sad tune on his instrument. Then, too, he would see the"Hetmans" and the "Haidamaki" (highwaymen) . His meditations gave expression to poetry which he began to write with success. Presently he had a small collection of poems . With the financial assistance of his friend, Martos, he edited them under the title of "Kobzar". In the following year he edited his "Haidamaki", an historical poem of the days of trials in Ukraine. The effect of these poems was instantaneous. A concentrated latent force was set free. The whole of Ukraine felt it and proclaimed the poet its indisputable leader. In his poems he spoke on behalf of all of his countrymen, and he spoke in their own tongue, which had hitherto been sneered at as being a rude jargon of the serfs and peasants. He, therefore, lifted it above and placed it in the ranks of the literary languages of the world. Naturally in reclaiming the language he also reclaimed the self-respect of his people. He brought back in his poems the past, described the pitiable condition in which his people were found groaning under a yoke of oppression, and admonished them to open their eyes to see the existing injustice. What he wrote was a plain truth, and the ideas which he expressed, therefore, spread very rapidly. As a free man awakened once more in a serf, so was the spirit of the whole people born again with new hopes for the future.

In the year 1843 Shevchenko visited his own country, now as a man learned not only in the art of painting but also in other branches of knowledge, for he had been occasionally attending

lectures at the University, and besides, read extensively in private. After a short stay in Ukraine he hurried back to St. Petersburg to the Academy from which he was graduated a year later.

To his personal freedom and accomplishments there was now but one thing lacking, and that was to return to his homeland once and for all, and to devote his life to the service of his people This he did soon after his graduation. As was to be expected he was hailed by his countrymen as a great hero, and both the rich and the poor arranged banquets and receptions in his honor, and, i t is said that a lady of high rank and great wealth kissed his hand as a mark of respect for him. Happy was he too, to once more reunite with his relatives and friends, and to listen to the Great Dnieper, which he fairly idolized , to view the wide Steppes over which the Cossacks once roamed fighting for freedom, and to admire beautiful Kiev, the mother of Ukrainian cities. Here Shevchenko was engaged in a very agreeable work. By an arrangement with an Archaelogical Commission he was sent out through the Province of Poltava, Chernihov and others to make drawings of the historic Ukrainian buildings and places. This work was a God-send to him. He could not have enjoyed anything better. These travels were an aid to him to learn still more of the past history of his people , and thereby to gather material for his poems. His work was pleasant , for, because of his genial personality and generous spirit he was quick in forming acquaintances. Like Goldsmith he was always poor, not because he was not earning enough, but because what he made, he either gave away to the needy or sent it to

his relatives who he hoped to eventually emanicipate from bondage.

But probably Shevchenko was happiest at Kiev where Ukrainian culture both old and new was concentrated. Here there had been reviving for some years past an intellectual life in which he was much interested. Shevchenko and a number of other intellectual leaders in various fields, including University professors, formed a society called the "Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood", the aim of which was the federation and freedom of the Slavic races. And, while the poet was an active member of the society, his friends planned for his further studies in painting. The wife of the most intimate of his friends Kulish was willing to sell her family jewels for that purpose, and he was to be sent to Italy to continue his art studies there. A probability of a future Ukrainian Mazziri would at this stage of the poet's career not have been too presumptuous to conjecture. Then too arrangements had also been made to establish for him a chair as professor of art in the University at Kiev.

Unfortunately, his dreams and the dreams of his friends could not be realized. In 1847 the Russian Secret Service discovered the "Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood" , and ordered the arrest and banishment to Siberia of a number of the prominent members thereof. Among these was Shevchenko, who in addition to his connection with the conspiracy ,brought upon himself, particularly through his poem, "Caucasus", the wrath of the autocratic Ruler Czar Nicholas I . To illustrate the point I wish to cite a few verses of the poem

so ably translated into English by Dr. A.J.Hunter of Teulon, Manitoba:

"Beyond the hills are mightier hills,
Cloud mountains o'er them rise,
Red, red have flowed their streams and rulls,
They're sown with human woes and sighs.
There long ago in days of old
Olympus' Czar, the angry Jove,
His wrath did pour on a hero bold,
On brave Prometheus, he who strove
The fire of heaven to seize for men.

- -

Look at us in tender heartedness,
All in hunger dire and nakedness,
Forging freedom in unhappiness,
Toilingever without blessedness.

- -

In faith, there's widows' tears, I think,
To all the Czars to give to drink.
Then there's tears of many a maiden
Falling so soft in the lonely night,
Hot tears of mothers, sorrow-laden,
Dry tears of fathers, in grievous plight.
Not rivers, but a sea has flowed,
A burning sea.
Al all the Czars who in triumph rode,
With their hounds and gamekeepers,

Their dogs and their besters,

May glory be !

To you be glory, hills of blue,

All clad in montrous chains of frost,

Glory to you, ye heroes true,

With God your labors are not lost.

Fear not to fight, you'll win at length,

For you, God's ruth,

For you is freedom, for you is strength,

And Holy Truth."

For such and other bold denunciations of the Muscovite Ruler and for refusing to retract in spite of the fact that the Government offered to be lenient if he would do so, he was sent to the fortress of Petropavlovsk from whence he was exiled to far Orenburg. Later he was transferred to Orsk amidst the Kirkhiz Steppes,"that God-forsaken place", as he says. His guards were specifically instructed by the Czar that he should be given no books to read nor be allowed to write verses or to paint. One can easily imagine the sorrow and revolt in the soul of the freedom loving young man against such abominable restrictions on his liberty. He could not live without writing and painting, and he hated army life which was thrust upon him. Some of the officers realizing his abilities and being impressed by his personality, permitted him to occasionally stealthily do some painting and writing. And, it is during these spasmodic efforts that he wrote his best works in spite of scarcity of the necessary material. Two of his letters written to his friends

at home in which he prays for immediate necessities, move one to tears. A few sentences of a letter written to one, Lisohub, read :

"I have asked W.N. that she send me some books, and now I am asking you for them also, for, outside the Bible I have not another letter. If you succeed in finding Shakespeare in Odessa, or a translation of Ketcher or the Odyssey translated by Zukovski, then in the name of the one who was crucified for us, send same to me, or else, My God, I shall go insane from tediousness! I would much like to send you some money for these, but God knows -- it has all been lost, to the last coin. But if the Lord sends me some, I shall some day repay you.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Fare thee well, do not forget your faithful and unfortunate friend".

In another letter to one, Lazarevski he says:

"I am not certain that a little hungry child on the appearance of its mother would gladden as much as I did yesterday on receipt of your gift, my only comrade. I rejoiced so much that I am not yet fully recovered from the ecstacy. I stayed awake all night long- I examined, admired, turned it over and over again in my hands, thrice kissing all the little paints; and how can I refrain from kssing them, not having seen them for a whole year. My God! What a tedious, long year! But in spite of all, with God's help, it passed by at last".

An occasional message or a gift from home were a great consolation to the poet.

In 1848 while on a march, the commanders showed a particularly humane attitude towards him, and in fact, permitted him to dress in

civilian clothes. Then also at this time one Captain Butakov, who was out on a scientific expedition observed that the artist was talented and took him along to sketch the banks of the Sea of Aral. Here in his spare moments Shevchenko wrote poetry. The relaxation of the rigid rules of the prison did not continue indefinitely, however. In 1915 the authorities at St. Petersburg on learning from one of the officers of Shevchenko's persistence in writing, searched his cell and discovered that he had in his possession a Bible, copies of Shakespeare, and Bushkin, writing and painting material. It was then that he was transferred to the desert wastes, where he could see no flower, nor a tree but the sullen skies.

From thence until 1857 little is heard of Shevchenko . For seven years he wrote not a line of poetry. He was dead to the world. His closest friends had forgotten him. Only Count Tolstoi and Countess Repnin who did not fear the government, kept petitioning it on his behalf. But this was of no avail. At the trial of the arrested members of the Brotherhood, Shevchenko was indicted and convicted of writing "abominable verses dangerous to the safety of the Czar and the State", so that no leniency could be shown him.

It was not until after the Crimean War that the Czar found it a wise policy to change his tactics with respect to the subjected classes. Czar Alexander II madeseveral reforms, amongst which was an amnesty to political prisoners sentenced during the reign of Nicholas I. Shevchenko was, however, not so fortunate as to be included in the list of those pardoned. He was considered to be

too dangerous to the State to be at large. However, Shevchenko's friends were persistent in their petitions to the Czar for the liberation of him. Finally an amnesty was obtained for him chiefly through the efforts of Countess Tolstoi, and in the second list given out in May 1857 Shevchenko's name was also found. But it was not until April of 1858 that he came to St.Petersburg. Ten years before he left the city a 33 year old healthy young man, and strong of body and soul. He returned an old, baldheaded, physical wreck with only his will still ruling supreme. This is quite evident from the fact that when on his way from exile, he was already writing verses similar tothose of previous years.

After his return he spent considerable time in St.Petersburg where he was still under the surveillance of the government officials. Here he was engaged in painting in the Academy where many learned men including Turgenev came to see the celebrated poet-marytr.

In 1859 Shevchenkoreturned to Ukraine, and succeeded in purchasing freedom for his relatives. His next desire was to get married and to settle on the Dnieper from whence he could view the whole of Ukraine. He had even purchased a parcel of land whereon to build a cottage but his dreams did not come true. He remained a batchelor for the rest of his life . He returned to St. Petersburg for a short time where he suddenly took sick. Still he would not give up his work, he wrote letters, painted, and sometimes composed poetry. Gradually he was getting worse. He knew that the end was coming, for in his last verses he says, "I'll have to get my waggons ready for a long journey, to the next world, to God."

On the 9th of March he suffered extreme pains , but let out not a groan. On the following day at 5 o'clock in the morning one of the greatest Ukrainian martyrs breathed his last. He had one consolation when dying, and that was to know that a manifesto for the abolition of slavery was already signed and only awaited the proclamation which was made a week after his death.

Thus out of the 47 years of his life Shevchenko was a serf for 24 years, in exile 10 years, for 3½ years under police surveillance, and enjoyed 9 years of freedom. Such a tragic biography has no other poet, and it is therefore hoped that for this reason the rather detailed and lengthy treatment of the poet's life will here be pardoned.

The remains of Shevchenko were temporarily kept in St. Petersburg until Spring, when, according to his dying wish as expressed in his poem entitled, "My Testament", or, "My Bequest", they were carried , with a great procession following, and others joining on the way to his beloved spot in Ukraine where he once wished to build himself a home, and where pilgrims to this day visit his resting place on the Mound at Kanev on the Dnieper to pay tribute to the great martyr. Shevchenko's "My Testament" follows:

"When I die, remember, lay me
Lowly in the silent tomb,
Where the prairie stretches free,
Sweet Ukraine, my cherished home.
There,'mid meadows' grassy sward,
Dnieper's waters pouring

May be seen and mat be heard,

Mighty in their roaring.

When from Ukraine waters bear

Rolling to the sea so far

Foeman's blood, no longer there

Stay I where my ashes are.

Grass and Hills I'll leave and fly.

Unto throne of God I'll go,

There in heaven to pray on high,

But, till then, no God I know.

Standing then about my grave,

Make ye haste, your fetters tear!

Sprinkled with the foeman's blood

Then shall rise your freedom fair.

Then shall spring a kinship great,

This a family new and free.

Sometimes in your glorious state,

Gently, kindly, speak of me. "

(Translation of Dr.A.J.Hunter)

As a poet of Ukraine Shevchenko is great not only because of the quality of his productions, and the ideas therein, but also because he has demonstrated with his own life his belief in the principles which he propagated. His whole life was symbolic of his suffering nation, and the trials he went through were essentially the trials of the rest of his countrymen. However, he himself had great hopes for his people even when he saw little

chance of getting rid of his own chains , for he says to them,

"Study my brethren!

Think and read,

Learn ye from foreigners

But scorn not thine own."

Here he shows both his optimism for a better future through industry, and,at the same time , that he is always with them in their endeavors to rise intellectually. He is a genius high above an ordinary man, yet he calls men his brethren and thereby proved his humble spirit. It is this spirit that makes him one of the greatest lyric poets dead or living . As a result of his labors Ukrainian literature became really a national literature, and, at the same time, social,with strong indications that the rest of the civilized world will in the near future recognize him as one of the literary geniuses of the world,as has already been done by some noted writers , amongst whom is Dr. Alfred Enzen of Sweden, who a few years ago wrote a valuable and exhaustive thesis on the poet and his works.

Shevchenko did not at any time lose contact with his people, that is, he never ceased thinking about their welfare, and in this respect he stands ethically higher than for example some of the Russian poets like Koltzov. As a freed serf he always remembered that he was born in bondage, and that his relatives and his nation were still suffering under social and moral humiliation. It is for that reason that his lyrics are so truly national. His expression was the expression of a sentiment which any friend of men

would give vent to if his sympathies for the people could rise to such a degree of perfection as to enable him to pour out from his heart that which is found therein. He spoke out in the language of the people and expressed on their behalf all that they inwardly felt. He collected and concentrated the sad tunes of all the "Kobzars" (wandering minstrels), of Ukraine and sang them in his poetry for his people, and they immediately acclaimed him their prophet and liberator.

True, Shevchenko is very sad in places, as every lyric poet is, and he chooses suitable characters to bring out this inclination effectively. In many of his poems, for example, in his "Kateryna" he pictures a person solitary and complaining against fate. This is undoubtedly partly a reflection of his own unhappy state. But, at the same time he never completely loses his innate optimism which he uses to encourage his compatriots to hope and work towards a happier state of things. One exception to this general rule is known to the writer, and this is found in one of his poems written in 1848, where he says, "O, wherefore have ye become so black, ye green fields?" To this the fields answer, "We have blackened from blood shed in fight for freedom." Further on in the same poem, the fields say that they will once more become green, but that the descendants of Zaporogian Cossacks, who fell here and covered them, will never again regain their freedom but will plough the fields complaining of their fate. The poet's spirit of hope is well brought out in his "Haidamaki" (Knights of Vengeance), he

says,

"My sons, Haidamaki!

Behold the wide world, freedom, -

Go and wander far and wide

And find your happy lot."

His optimism, however, did not go as far as to cause him to be fully complacent even in his moment of liberty. He was too altruistic for this, and he would far rather share the unhappiness of his neighbor and help him carry the banner of struggle than seclude himself in his good fortune. He always has in mind his native land. When, however, he does reflect on his own unhappy lot, since no man alone in the wilderness could altogether forget himself when his freedom-loving spirit is bound in fetters, he almost apologizes for it by fully explaining his position. This is quite apparent in his poem entitled,"Thoughts from a Prison", which poem Mrs. Florence Randal Livesay translated into English, and as in most of her other translations, succeeded in conveying the real spirit and intent of the poet. The poem reads:

"The sun sets; mountains fade

Into the darkness; the bird's note is stilled.

The fields grow silent, for the peasant now

Rejoicing, dreams of rest.

And I look with desire,

Longing desire- to an orchard dark,

The Orchard of Ukraine.

And I pour forth my thoughts
As though my heart were resting.

Fields, forest, mountains, darkening still-
And in the shadowy blue appears a star ...
O Star! My Star! ... And the tears fall ...
Hast thou then also risen in Ukraine?

Not for the people and not for the praise
These verses now are written. Nay, I write
But for myself, my brothers, for heart's ease.
Lo, from beyond the Dnieper, as from far away
The words flow in and spread the paper o'er;
Laughing and crying as the children do
They gladden my poor soul, uncomforted,
Raw, inconsolable- I joy in them,
With them would always stay. They are my own.
As a rich father loves his little ones,
So am I glad and merry with my own.
Yea, I rejoice; and the Good God I praise,
That He lets not my children fall asleep
In this so far-off land, but says, "Run home,
And tell the others in the dear Ukraine
How bitter 'twas to live in such a world! "

In the marshy Kirghiz Steppes he is deprived of the beautiful natural surroundings in which he was born and raised. He, therefore, recreates in his imagination the places where he roamed as

a boy. Like Wordsworth he personifies inaminate nature and speaks to it, or makes it speak, and thereby express most effectively what he intends to say. Personifying nature was of course always characteristic of him, for even before his exile he says in one of his poems," Thou calm world, beloved country, my Ukraina! Wherefore, hast thou been thus plundered, wherefore diest thou, my mother? Didst thou not at sunrise offer thy prayers to God? " --- But while he speaks to inanimate objects showing his grievances against the cruel fate, he quickly reverts to his countrymen to spur them on to action, for he well realizes that only through their own efforts can they free themselves. And, two years after writing the above words he wrote his ,"Poslanis" (an epistle), which is probably the best expression of his love for his Motherland, and which was written to awaken the conscience of the young educated Ukrainians, and to make them realize the responsibility which they owe to their country. He entitled his "Poslanie", "To the Dead, and the Living, in Ukraine and those out of it, my Epistle of Friendship."

In this poem he both reprimands his countrymen for the neglect of their duty to their country, and also strongly counsels them "to awake, open their eyes, to see the truth and to break the chains by which they are bound."

As a national epic poet, Shevchenko not only equals but even surpasses Kotliarevsky. We have seen in the historical sketch of Ukraine that this country was under the most democratic government while the Cossacks ruled it. Their management of the affairs

of the State was nearer to the ideal than that of any of their predecessors. They won glory for their country through their encounters with the enemy, both on land and on sea . It is, therefore, on the Cossacks and the Cossackian period that most of the Ukrainian epic is founded, of which Shevchenko is a master. His Kobzar sings of the times of glory and defeat. He converses with the elements ; the wind, the sea, the wide steppes and the sky all speak to him, rejoice and mourn with him and supply to him the tune suitable to the occasion. The poet is an artist in bringing in these elements to show the feeling which the Kobzar wishes to express. So that, in spite of his very simple versification, in which he employs very little variety of form, he does by frequent resort to alliteration and onomatopoeia bring out the desired effect. Now he describes the wind as softly breathing, the sun shining, the waves of the sea gently splashing; but a moment later the wind becomes violent, it brings the clouds, shutting away the sun, the billows roll rapidly, and the sea foams and roars.

In numerous cases the poet actually addresses the natural objects or has his characters do so. In an historical romance entitled "Hamaleya",after the name of an Ukrainian Hetman who headed a company of Cossacks against Skutari, a Turkish city on the Bosphorus, imprisoned Cossacks in Skutari beseech the wind to blow from Ukraine and bring them tidings of their home. "Dry our tears",they say, "chase away our woe". And the Bosphorus which had never before heard the wailing of the Cossacks, groaned

like a bull and hurled the complaints of the Cossacks into Dnieper, which in turn woke up brother Forest and the sister River. Thereupon the Zaporogian Cossacks set sail with Hamaleya as their leader. The poet relies on nature to such extent that he brings it into very many of his poems, and particularly in the opening lines.

This ability to draw on the resources of nature was developed by Shevchenko not because of his poetic genius alone. As a painter of natural scenery, he was akeen observer, no doubt more so than if he had not studiedthis Art. This combination was very advantageous to him in his poetic work.

While reading Shevchenko's poems in connection with political reform , for example, his poem entitled "A Dream", it strikes one on first reflection that he is somewhat harsh in his satire, but when other of his works are considered, it will be found that he does this with no ill intent. He was an apostle of freedom, and therefore could not write without hurting the feelings of those who would retard the acquisition of that freedom. He is essentially a Christian, and that is seen in his frequent references to the Bible. He believed in the maxim that love is stronger than revenge, and he practised the former, showing it in his charity, forgiveness, and great respect for women. He had for his friends people of various nationalities. He considered all the people as his fellowmen. Even some of the Poles, who as we know, did much towards the downfall of Ukraine, liked him , and he had several of their writers for his intimate friends.

He had little to do with the Western world, and, therefore, does not say much concerning the Western nations. But as to Slavs he shows in his poem "The Heretic", or "Ivan Huss", his desire for a harmony amongst them. In concluding the poem he prays to the Lord, " that all the Slavs would become worthy brethren of the Sun of truth, and be heretics as was the great heretic of Constance".

The work of Shevchenko as a poet considered from various points of view places him indisputably firstly, as the greatest poet of Ukraine, and secondly, and assures him a permanent place in the literatures of the world.

Panteleymon Kulish.(1819-1899).

Kulish was born in Chernihov and was a descendant of the old Cossackian family. After completing his studies in the Gymnasium he registered in 1837 at the University of Kiev. Later he taught in the Gymnasiums, and on certain occasions travelled around Kiev for educational purposes. He tried to meet as many Kobzars as possible, and from them collected material for his ballads. In Kiev he got acquainted with Kostomariv, Shevchenko and other intellectuals, and enrolled as a member of the Cyryl-Methodius Brotherhood. At this time, he was offered a position in the University of St. Petersburg, but he preferred to go abroad for the purpose of post-graduate work in Slavonic languages. When he came to Warsaw he was arrested, taken back to St.

Petersburg, and then to Tul.

In Tul he spent three years. His sentence was not as heavy as that of Shevchenko, and he was therefore able to write narratives and at the same time to study foreign languages. In 1850 he was pardoned by the Czar, and was allowed to return to St. Petersburg. From there he went to live in Poltava, and when in 1856 he obtained permission to publish his works, he returned to St. Petersburg where he established a printing press. While engaged in this work he often travelled abroad, and particularly in Galicia, in connection with educational matters. He later lived in Warsaw, being in the service of the Russian Government, but in 1868, owing to his refusal to give up his Ukrainian patriotic ideals, he was forced to resign his post. Then he worked on the translation of the Bible and wrote a history of Russia and Ukraine. The latter production made him very unpopular among the Ukrainians, for, in it he shows marked inconsistency with regard to his former policy towards Ukraine, and strong leanings in favor of the Russians. Shortly afterwards, however, he reverted to his former convictions, and through his writings at Lviv tried to bring about a compromise between the Ukrainians and the Poles. But, being unable to regain the confidence of the people, he was unsuccessful in his attempts. He returned to his home in Ukraine where he wrote quietly until his death in 1897.

Kulish was of a changing disposition, but he is nevertheless no small contributor to Ukrainian literature. He was a successful writer both in prose and poetry. With Shevchenko and Kostomariv

he stands in the middle of the 19th century at the head of the Ukrainian intellectual movement, so that many writers not as accomplished as he looked up to him as an authority in literary matters.

Kulish's field is epic and lyric poetry, and novels. But he is also known as a dramatist, historian, publicist and a literary critic. He also made translations from foreign literatures. Out of the English writers he chose Shakespeare and Byron as his favorites, and in beautiful language translated some of their works.

In his poetical works Kulish often reminds one of Shevchenko. His ballads are based on the chants which he copied from the village Kobzars. They are, therefore, simple but effective. In them he expresses the grievances of the common people against their oppressors, and intimates that it is time they got equal rights , which he firmly believes must some day be obtained . In one of his poems he says :

"Kobza, thou who art our only joy
Before our sleeping country wakes,
Before its Spring shall come-
Ring, thou, in our poor homes.
Silently ring thou., that the hearts of our brethren,
Beat fast in accord
As strings of a mandolin do harmonize."

Some of Kulish's novels are very valuable works. His historical romance founded on the events which happened in 1663 and

entitled "Chorna Rada " (The Black Council), is a bold attempt to produce a romance. In Chorna Rada he came out successful,and having obtained the desired effect, the Work will continue to hold an honorable position in Ukrainian literature, and particularly since some of his characters in group scenes are depicted with great artistic ability and skill.

Kulish though ordinarily quite simple in expression, is often difficult to understand owing to his contradictions in logic, which he appears to make knowingly. Yet in spite of this defect his many works including lyrics, epics, novels, idyls, ballads, legends and fables are in general so well executed that he will always be regarded as one of the leading Ukrainian writers of the 19th century.

Maria Markovichevna,("Marko Vovchok"), (1834-1907).

The sixties witnessed several Ukrainian writers worthy of note. Oleksa Storozenko (1805-1874) is remembered for his legends and anecdotes, which are never very deep, but are good reading, for their gentle humor and elegant language. Yakiv Shchoholiv (1824-1898), a writer for approximately 50 years, is known for his beautiful nature poetry in which he depicts natural scenery in Ukraine and the lowly life of the people, for his historical poems , his lyrics and his poems on the community life of the people . Due in all probability to the rather extended time of his literary activity, one may find in his poetry romantic strains from his youthful years and realistic characteristics of later years. But the best remembered writer of

these years is Maria Markovicheva, known under the pen-name of Marko Vovchok. She was born and raised in the town of Orel in Russia, and studied in Kharkiv, Ukraine, until her fifteenth year, by which time she mastered the French language. Returning home she became acquainted with one Opanas Markovich, whom she married in 1851.

Her husband was a well educated man, and was editor of a paper at Chernihiv, andlater a teacher in a Gymnasium at Nemirov. From him she learned the Ukrainian language, in which she was deficient before her marriage. Also when she started to write she had him revise her work. In 1858 Kulish published her first collection of novels in St. Petersburg.

When her husband died in 1867, Marko Vovchok wrote no more for over thirty years. She remarried in 1871. In 1902 she published her new novel on the life of Ukrainian peasants. The first novels which appeared in 1858 attracted considerable attention in the Ukrainian literary world, and gave the authoress promise for a brilliant literary career. Her first book of novels placed her in the centre of the literary movement, and Shevchenko himself welcomed her as his close second. The noted Russian writer Turgenev , too, realized and appreciated her genius and set to work to translate some of her works, while another Russian , Dobrolubov, dedicated to her one of his chief writings.

When one considers t he character of her works there is little wonder that they became so popular in a very short time.

In her novels there were to be found artistic form, elegant language, a force of a real feeling and a deep and serious thought. She could touch the most sensitive strings of the reader and exhibited her thorough understanding of the problems of humankind. Her narratives in which she dwells on the unhappy plight of the serfs and the poor people are a great revelation of her sympathies for her fellowmen. They are remarkable for their touch of sincere sorrow, for the unfortunate, and a humane feeling towards all to whom consideration is due. She is a master in bringing out the deepest human feelings by making her characters converse freely amongst themselves. And so, her characters who are serfs speak from the depth of their hearts, and show their just indignation against the unjust laws which allow such a horrible practice as enslaving a human being.

Of course, serfdom was on the point of being abolished at the time Vovchok commenced writing. When the change was made, she still continued to write in that same sad mood, describing the lives of the people who were not exactly serfs but who were forced to live a similar life, that is, servants. One of the best of her works dealing with their lot is "Sestra", (A Sister).

It is to be regretted that the poetess wrote as little as she did, and thereby did not come up to the expectations of the literary critics and her friends. But she wrote enough to show her genius and to impress her style upon some of her followers. As a writer of belles-lettres she stood on a very high level, and traces of her style and literary form may be found in the first of

such eminent writers as Fedkovich, Franko and others. Immediately her works became known there appeared a number of writers who closely imitated her and contributed some valuable Ukrainian belles-lettres. Among them is Oleksandra Kulisheva, who was born in 1828, and wenr under the pen-name of Hanna Barvinok.

Stepan Rudansky (1830-1873).

There are four other Ukrainian writers of this century in Greater Ukraine, who deserve special mention, namely, Rudansky, Anatol Swidnitsky (1834-1871), Danilo Mordovetz (1830-1905), and Alexander Konisky (1836-1900). However, the most important and interesting writer of the group for our purposes is the first one named. Of the others suffice it to say that Swidnitsky gave us a clear picture of the old form of national life in Southern Ukraine during the transition period. Mordovetz, who particularly in his early narratives belomgs to the school of Marko Vovchok, stands high in the estimation of critics as an historical novelist, while Konisky, who extended his literary activities for about forty years, is remembered for his strong patriotism and his varied works in poetry and prose, for his critical works and for his articles as a publicist. He was in his time a leader of the old ideals of freedom and brotherhood. His native country and the people, these are his heroes. A good example of this is found in the following verse of his "Ratay":

"Harnessed in a yoke of want, and shackles
A weary life he drags
Having subdued his pains in the heart

And not complaining against fate,

He ploughs the soil - not his."

Konisky was one of the leading men who with others figured in connection with "Osnnova", a paper which was during its publication a great educational factor. Then also, like Kulish, he was greatly interested in the future of the Ukrainians in Galicia, and we have to credit him with taking a hand in the beginnings of the literary progress in that part of Ukraine.

Rudansky deserves a special mention, for he is regarded by most Ukrainians as their Mark Twain. And, he is in fact the greatest humorist that they have had. Yet in spite of what he wrote, when we look closely into his life, we have reason to doubt the popular opinion concerning him. One thing we must remember about him, and that is, that during the whole of his life he labored under adverse circumstances. And, such being the case, he could hardly at all times be happy. In a letter to his brother he writes :

"They forbid me using my native language - my father forbids me. My father listens not to my language, - but then perchance after my death fourteen million of my compatriots will listen to me ... Probably my father does not like his language for the reason that the "Muzhiky" (common people), speak it. But do not the "Mushiky" of Muscovy not speak Russian? And besides, in what respect are we better than the "Muzhik"? - We are all equal both in the face of God and nature."

Rudansky's pessimism is in many of his poems very strong. And this, coupled with his ability as a maker of verse, for a time indicated that he would probably in time reach the reputation of Shevchenko as a lyricpoet. Similarly to Cowper, he constantly find himself isolated from relatives and friends, and he spills out his grief in his poems. But throughout his works, though he is very pessimistic, he uses his power of will as an antidote. In his "Ode to an Oak", he says : "Let the willow bend, but you, oak tree, keep up your spirits and stay erect". In his historical poems through which runs a lyrical note, he is aware of the almost hopeless condition in which his people are found. He bewails it. But, on hte other hand, he is determined to encourage them which he does through his wit, satire and humor. His intimate knowledge of the common folk was the best qualification he had for this kind of work. He could write on any subject however insignificant, and make it acceptable to the crowd. But he was also familiar with other classes of people, and particualrly those who lived as parasites on the work of the poor. It is in ridiculing these overlords, Polish Pans, and Jewish traders, that he made himself so popular with the Ukrainian peasantry and became known among them as a great humorist

Physically Rudansky was a weakling, and he was battling against sickness all his life. Here one is reminded of Robert Louis Stevenson, who was similarly disposed and at the same time kept on composing some of the best verses, especially those about children, that we have in the English language. Rudsnsky knew that he could not live very long, and in mentioning this fact he ex-

presses a hope that though he die prematurely, his poems will live on long after his death. This wish has been fulfilled. They live on and it is hoped that it will be possible someday to translate some of them into English.

PROMINENT WRITERS OF GALICIA AND BUKOVINA

Markian Shashkevich (1811-1843).

While in Greater Ukraine national and cultural life was undergoing rapid changes, Galicia and Bukovina were not left behind. Influences from Ukraine not only acted as a stimulus to a national revival in these provinces and in Galicia in particular, but also enabled them to foster literature and make progress therein. When persecutions of Ukrainian intellectuals by the Russian Government made it impossible to make any headway in Ukrainian social or cultural life, Galicia felt the natural bond with Ukraine, and this bond became a dynamic force which caused it to continue the work begun by the latter country. At the head of this revival movement stands above all in the beginning of the 19th century Markian Shashkevich.

For many years prior to Shashkevich Galicia was practically speaking dead intellectually. We know that the territories which were later taken over by Austria were very backward 150 years ago.

And, the greatest curse on the civilization of that country was, of course, serfdom. There were few schools and not even the wealthy people were educated. With the cession of Galicia to Austria, at least a partial relief came. In 1781 serfdom was abolished and the poeple were then only obliged to work for their overlord so many days a week. Some schools were then built in Vienna, Lviv and other places, and the people began gradually to take advantage of the opportunity offered for intellectual improvement. There was only one drawback, however, and that is that owing to lack of teachers, most of the instruction was given in the old Church language. But eventually between the years 1816 and 1820 there appeared in Galicia several educated Ukrainians who were eager to spread the knowledge of Ukrainian among their people. Some of the notables in this were Metropolitan Mikhaylo Levitsky, Ivan Mohilnitsky, Joseph Levitsky and Joseph Lozinsky. The most active worker in this educational field, however, was Markian Shashkevich.

Shashkevich was born in Pidlise, Berezany in Galicia. His father was a priest and wished his son to enter the same field of work. Young Shashkevich was educated in the High School at Berezany and then registered for a course in philosophy as a preparation for theology. He became very studious and grasped a good knowledge of German, Polish and other languages. He also came across some Ukrainian works. He longed for these long before, and when he read them, his latent desire to spread the knowledge of Ukrainian history and literature among his Galician countrymen grew more intense. The problem was not an easy one. By force

of circumstances the Ukrainians in positions and power were Polonized. It was only the peasantry who spoke Ukrainian, and the work had to be commenced with them. Shashkevich and two other men who had similar inclinations namely, Holovatsky and Vahilevich, were the ones who commenced this work and who were known as "The Ukrainian Triumvirate".

After completing his course in philosophy Shashkevich registered in the Theological Seminary, but he was expelled therefrom owing to his coming in late to lectures after his walks. Four years later, i.e.,in 1833 he was re-admitted to the Seminary and continued his patriotic work among the students. His labors were fruitful,,for in 1835 his "Voice of a Galician" and other works though strictly censored were greatly welcomed by the people and were effective. Then later in 1837 with the co-operation of his fellow students he published (in Budapest to escape censorship) another book in pure Ukrainian which he entitled "Rusalka Dniestrova" (A Naiad of the Dniester). These few books which were published was the first positive step in putting into use in literature the language of the Ukrainian people of Galicia. With Shashkevich therefore begins a new period of Ukrainian literature in Galicia in the same way as it began in Greater Ukraine with Kotliarevsky.

"Rusalka Dniestrova" was in great demand,although it must be admitted that some people turned a cold shoulder to it for this was something new and strange to them, but the authorities at Lviv soon confiscated all the copies they could find. This action of the authorities was a severe blow to the author of the book,

but he would not be disheartened , and kept on with his work.

When he completed his course in theology he got married. Then he was ordained and preached to the people of the villages. As a priest he was greatly loved by the people both for his sermons and for his patriotism. He read widely Ukrainian literature received from Ukraine, and wrote beautiful poetry for which he was highly respected. But this work was more than his frail body could bear. His lungs which became affected during the four years that he was absent from college and when he was forced to lead a very hard life, were gradually weakening,and he died in his thirty-second year. The poems of Shashkevich are essentially sad. He was really a Shevchenko in spirit. He was a patriot sympathising with and desirous of helping his nation to extricate itself from the clutches of foreign rulers and oppressors. The first step for his people in that direction was to lead them to realize who they were. In one of his poems his plea to the people is, literally:

"An Ukrainian mother gave us birth,
An Ukrainian mother nursed us,
And she's the one who always loved us,-
Wherefore then should her language not be dear to us?
Wherefore then should we disown it
And love one that is foreign? ".

Shashkevich did not live even as long as did Rudansky and therefore did not contribute as much as did the latter to Ukrainian literature. But judging from what he wrote he gave promise

of a brilliant literary career. He left us a few of his thoughts, but these are sincere. They are sad as was the life of the poet, and his poetry is full of sorrow. He left us a few of his prose works. i.e., his tales and some translations. Two important characteristics stand out clearly in all these works, and that is sincerity of feeling and simplicity of expression. But nowhere is this as evident as in his lyric compositions, and that is why Bohdan Lepky thinks that had the poet not died so early in his literary career he would have become a great lyric poet.

However, we seldom think of the amount Shashkevich wrote and of the quality of his works. He is to the Ukrainian people of Galicia a father of the new literary and national movement for a recognition of the Ukrainians as a separate and distinct nationality . As a mark of appreciation of his services there now stands at Lviv, Galicia, a monument erected in his honor.

The movement started by Shashkevich and his colleagues gradually gained approval of the Ukrainian people. It awakened national consciousness in them, and they began to realize that the language which they spoke and which the Russians, the Poles, and the Austrian Germans considered only as a jargon or dialect, was as good a language as the rest , and since it was proved that it was fit for literary purposes, there was no reason why they should feel that it was inferior to other languages. But the Austrian rulers did not welcome this movement. They saw what was behind it, and therefore censored every book and article which appeared in "that dead language which the Ukrainians want to

bring back to life", as they put it. For a time therefore the group of followers of Shashkevich were subject to severe criticism on the part of the government officials. Nothing was allowed to be printed in Ukrainian, not even the translation of the Austrian National Anthem, "for", they said,"how could such a common language be used in praise of so worthy a person as the Emperor".

However, this state of affairs was not to continue indefinitely. In 1846 the Revolution came. Two years later the Scoage system was abolished in Galicia, and the censorship regulations were lifted. This news was, of course, welcomed by the Ukrainians. The government now appeared to assume an entirely different attitude towards them . It recognized the Ukrainians as a nationality and procured them to help quash the Polish revolt. Taking advantage of the relief given, the Ukrainian Intellectuals immediately formed in Liviv the "Central Ukrainian Council", which issued a manifesto to the people in which they were reminded that they belonged to a nation which was once organized in a powerful state, that it had its history, traditions, language and literature. In the manifesto they were called upon to unite in common in the great work of spreading education in the country. The work was commenced by the establishment of newspapers and the teaching of Ukrainian in the Gymnasiums and i n the University at Lviv.

The revival movement was well begun, but, unfortunately it was not carried on as successfully as was to be desired. There were at least three main factors which counteracted it. Firstly,

the number of Ukrainian intellectuals available for the work was not sufficient for the big task; secondly, the leaders did not always agree as to the policy they were to follow; and thirdly, the Poles did all they could to create discord among them and thereby to weaken their forces. In consequence the Ukrainian literary movement was making a much slower progress than it would have under different circumstances. For a time no writer of note appeared, and what was written was of little value. Generally speaking, there was no one purpose in the literary field. Everything was in a chaotic state. It was not until after the unsuccessful war with Italy that Austria again returned to its constitution, which had in fact been put out of existence during the reaction. With this change the social life of the people once more began to gain a momentum. Then too the literary progress in Ukraine had its effect on its Western borders. Works of Shevchenko, Vovchok, Kulish, and others, became to be in great demand in Galicia. They were read and studied. A number of writers soon appeared including Klimkovich, Vorobkevich, Zharsky and others. Among them was also found the highly talented Fedkovich. But though this last mentioned writer may be considered to have started his work as a result of his connections with the Galician revival, he was not a Galician writer but a Bukovinian, and we shall treat him as such.

Osyp Yurey Fedkovich (1834-1888).

In the Province of Bukovina from the time of its annexation to Austria in 1775 until the year 1860, the Ukrainians though they

were the most numerous nationality, they were practically dormant politically and intellectually. The Government considered them as Roumanians, so that if there were any schools, only Roumanian was taught in them. But education even in Roumanian was for a long time sadly neglected, with the result that Bukovina was one of the most backward provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. With Fedkovich, however, began the new period of Ukrainian intellectual life in Bukovina. He therefore fulfilled a similar mission in Bukovina that Kotliarevsky did in Ukraine and Shashkevich in Galicia.

Fedkovich was born in Storonka-Pultova in Bukovina. His parents were well-to-do farmers. While at home his eldest sister, Maria, had a great influence over him. She often told him interesting tales and sang folk-songs to him which he always enjoyed.

Fedkovich commenced his studies at Chernovitz, but six years after, during the time of unrest he went to Moldavia where he studied privately and at the same time wrote poetry in German . In 1852 he was conscripted to the army, and remained there for a few years. In 1859 during the march against Italy he wrote his first poem in Ukrainian.

Returning from the war Fedkovich spent considerable time ib writing, and 1862 published his first collection of poems. These were well received, and the fame of the author soon spread,not only through Bukovina, but also through Galicia and Ukraine. Obtaining a complete discharge from the army owing to ill-health he settled at home on the farm. In 1867 he was appointed inspector of

schools . He later resigned his position and went to Lviv,in Galicia, and there engaged in literary work,specialising in particular in the translation of dramatic works. But he did not long remain away from his home. The following year he returned to Chernovitz,where through his own efforts and those of his fellow workers, a newspaper was established, and a University and a library were opened.

Fedkovich's first attempts at writing were influenced by the poetry and the folk songs which he learned. In these early poems he described army life and its horrors, and, at the same time, always expressed a longing to be back home in his own country. In one of his poems, namely, "The Flute" a poem which was translated by Mrs F.R.Livesay and published in "The Book of Sorrow" by Andrew Macphail, are expressed his reflections on war. The poem reads in part:

"The midnight fire flickers,
The embers slowly dying;
The father sits at the table,
Heavily, sadly thinking.
The mother,too, sits quiet,
Sending swift prayers to Heaven.
Her heart is filled with grief,
But she knows not words to tell it.
The sisters finish their sewing
By the light of the "Kahanetz".(a little lamp).

The brother has sought a corner

To pipe sad tunes on a flute.

He plays on the flute of Ivan,

Ivan who the Emperor serves.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

And on the hot sands of Italy,

On the green grass lies a soldier,

Shot, awaiting death, alone, alone,

As a leaf in desert lands.

Only the moon is shining-

Above him proud"Cheremshina "(birdcherry)

Her buds fling outward.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

And on the hot sands of Italy,

Under the boughs of Cheremshina,

What does he dream,Ivan?

Does he dream of the bay,

Or of Kateryna?. "

The works of Shevchenko and of other writers had a considerable effect on Fedkovich's later writings. A great number of his novels deal with the fate of his people overburdened with a foreign yoke, and express hopes that some day they would be freed. One cannot say of him, however, that he tried very hard to pick out and show us in minute details the characters of individuals, as many novelists do . He would rather take and treat a society

or a community as a whole. But though in his description he omits a closer analysis of the everyday life of the people, which is often very desirable in novels, he very effectively brings out the morality of the crowd, because of his knowledge of its psychology. In this respect he differs from Marko Vovchok, who scrutinized and depicted the characters in every important particular.

Besides poems and novels Fedkovich also wrote and translated dramas, in which work he was very successful. His best dramatic work is probably "Dowbush". Oleksa Dowbush, the hero of the tragedy was a notorious highland robber, who had a number of associates. The members of his company under his able direction did much clever work. Many songs and takes are still recited among the Ukrainian people, of the heroic deeds of this mighty robber who took from the rich in order to help the poor.

As a writer and educator Fedkovich is not only a leader of the Renaissance in Bukovina, but also as a leading figure in Ukrainian literature in the sixties. His contemporaries Sydyr Vorobkevich (1836-1903), who is known under the pen-name of Danilo Mlaka, and Hrihory Vorobkevich (1838-1884), a priest and a brother of the former Vorobkevich, were his great helpers, and two of the other important contributors to Ukrainian thought in that province. The former is noted as a dramatist and the latter as a poet.

Mikhaylo Drahomaniv (1841-1895)

Heretofore Ukrainian writers in Greater Ukraine, Galicia

and Bukovina , confined their literary activities more or less to their respective territories and many of their worksconvey to us an impression that they were meant for the local people. But, beginning with the sixties, there is a fast departure from this characteristic. It has already been mentioned that when in Russia censorship was more severe than that of Austria., Ukrainian writers often migrated to the latter country for literary purposes. This , coupled with a closer relationship of Ukraine and Galicia, had a unifying effect on the writers of both countries, and the tendencies of the writers of Ukraine, Galicia and Bukovina were thence forward more in comman. Marking this change more than any other man is Mikhaylo Drahomaniv.

With Drahomaniv the protest of Ukrainian men of letters not only continued against the political, social, economical and national oppression, but it was now done with a united front. The people, work for their benefit, study of their lives and service in their interests, all these henceforward rang louder than ever before throughout Ukrainian literature.

Drahomaniv is a unique writer of his time. His specialty was history. But, as he himself says, he would just as soon create history as record historical events. He was essentially a reformer and worked hard against the old order. His motto was , "Destruam et aedificabo", which he later qualified, saying, "at aedificabatis" , so as to appease the people who were opposed to his radical views. And, he did work hard to destroy all that he thought was inimical to public good. When this was done , only

then could constructive work be carried on successfully. He stood up for unity, and he says, "I give no preference to either social, cultural, political, or economical interests; I place them all on the same level". Yet in spite of his radicalism Drahomaniv is not a revolutionist, and though his attitude to matters which in his opinion, are not for the public benefit, is always negative, he is a believer in a positive constructive work.

Drahomaniv knew the conditions in Galicia and Ukraine thoroughly. Standing by a conviction that national independence without education will give neither liberalism nor democracy, he desired proper education for the people, education which would raise all to the same level. However, his work was not confined to Galicia alone. Through his influence the Russian Ukrainians came into a closer relationship with those of Austria. As a result of his efforts a library was established at Vienna, amd at Czernovitz, Bukovina, and also Ukrainian books were for the first time introduced amangst the Ukrainians in Hungary. Then too, he established connections with foreign press, and articles concerning Ukraine appeared in English, Italian, French, Spanish, Serbian and Polish journals.

Unlike some other Ukrainian writers, Drahomaniv , while being a worthy Ukrainian, did not forget the fact that proper progress was only possible when people of every nationality in the State became educated. He was a federalist for he treated the various Ukrainian territories as a unity, and he advised that people of all classes and nationality work in harmony, and with a proper

relationship with foreign States and thereby reach their goal.

Several other eminent writers, contemporaries of Drahomaniv, greatly enhanced Ukrainian culture. Amongst them figure Mikhaylo Staritsky (1840-1904), the poet; Marko Kropivnitsky (1841-19100, and Ivan Tobilevich (1845-1907) both dramatists of the first order; Ivan Levitsky-Nechuy (1838--), the novelist, Petro Nishchinsky (1832-1896) translator of classic works, Ostap Terletsky (1850-1902), publicist and critic, Mikhaylo Pavlik (1853-1914), novelist, and Olha Kosareva "Olena Pchilka", (1853--) dramatist and publicist. But s pace permits me to treat rather fully of only one writer, greatest of them all, a man who in many respects stands on the par with Shevchenko, this is Dr. Ivan Frank.

Ivan Franko (1856-1916).

Franko was born on the 15th of August, 1856, in the District of Drohonich, Galicia. His father, Jacob, was a peasant of moderate means, and had knowledge of the blacksmith's trade. He appreciated the value of education, and wished to give his boy, Ivam, all the possible opportunities for obtaining it. And, since in his own village the public school was located too far away from his home, he sent him to a neighboring village where he stayed with his uncle. In two years' time he learned, besides other subjects, something of Ukrainian, Polish and German languages. He was then sent to the normal school in the city of Drohobich. At the end of the school term he was awarded first prize for his efficiency. While receiving his scholarship at a convocation he heard someone in the crowd sobbing. Turning around he noticed

that it was his father who was so overjoyed that he could not keep back his tears. Two months later this good father died, and young Ivan, with other children, was left an orphan. His mother soon married again, however, and his stepfather seeing that the boy was progressing well at school willingly supported him.

In 1868 Ivan was admitted to the Gymnasium, where he was again acclaimed one of the cleverest students in his class. But being a son of a peasant he was often ridiculed and abused by the sons of the rich, who formed the great majority of the enrollment. Ivan plodded on patiently, however, realizing that through persistent efforts he would eventually attain his object in spite of obstacles. Besides his regular studies he devoted considerable time to the study of Ukrainian literature. So that during his course in the Gymnasium he thoroughly familiarized himself with the works of Shevchenko, Rudansky and others. He also took great interest in French, English and German literatures. While still in the college Franko was already writing verses, and in 1873 gave us two of his valuable poems, " Kotliarevsky" and" The National Songs" Before he completed his course in the Gymnasium he lost his mother. Then he went home to help manage domestic affairs. After some time he travelled considerably for the purpose of broadening his outlook on life. Returning to the Gymnasium he matriculated therefrom with distinction in 1875.

His next step was to register in the faculty of Philosophy at the University of Lviv. Here he became one of the most active members of the "Academic Circle" and a contributor of poems and

novels to the paper "Druh" (A Friend). An influential man who also had connections with the "Circle" and the paper was the writer, Professor Drahomaniv. Franko took great liking to Drahomaniv's attitude towards the common people, and like the latter he sympathized with the folk from which he himself sprang. This sympathy is well manifest in one of his great poems, entitled, "Naymit"(A Servant), which poem by its spirit reminds us of that masterpiece, "Gray's Elegy", and by its style, of Wordsworth's "Michael." It reads in part:

"On his lips a mournful tune, in his hands the handles of a plough,

Thus I behold him;

Poverty, toil and worry.

Have ploughed his wrinkled brow.

In his soul he is a child, though his head is bent

As 'twere an aged man,

For, from cradle days he spent all his life in misery

And in adversity.

That servant - our people from whose brow streams of sweat trickle down,

Upon a foreign soil.

Ever a youth in heart, in thought ever sublime,

Though trodden down by fate.

He's waited for his destiny centuries long

And still he waits in vain:

He has endured the ruin, the Tartar cruelty

And the heavy yoke of Socage.

But howe'er be the heart oppressed

Yet hope lives on."

In 1877 while Franko was in his second year in the University he was suddenly interrupted in his progress. Without in the least suspecting it he was put under arrest and indicted for being a member of a secret society, which as a matter of fact, never existed in the Galician Ukraine, and also for his acquaintance with Drahomaniv who was regarded by the Austrian rulers as dangerous to the State. Some little guilt was established against Franko and he was sentenced to six weeks imprisonment for it, but before his case came up for trial he was kept in custody for eight months.

Upn his release from prison Franko was forbidden to re-enter the University. Nor could he now expect to get a position as a professor as it formerly appeared that he would. He was now an undesirable and abandoned even by his own people, who were afraid that any friendly relationship with him might bring upon them the disfavor of the government.

Franko could not remain inactive, however, and, cooperating with Pavlik he commenced to edit a paper entitled, "Hromadsky Druh" (A Friend of the Community), therein he published so many new ideas that many issues of it were confiscated.

The articles were of a political and narrative character. In one of his narratives, "Boa Constrictor", he depicts the horrible abuse of the labor class by their employers.

But the authorities watched his every move. In 1880 while on a visit to a friend in Kolomeya he was arrested for an alleged agitation amongst the peasantry. After three months of investigations he was released and taken back under a guard to his place of birth. This escort was a very tortuous one, and his temporary imprisonments at Kolomeya, Stanislaviv, Striy and Drohobich belong to his greatest hardships in life. He was often ill and in hunger. While being escorted by an officer from Drohovich to Nahuyevichy, his home town, and, while he was feverish they were caught in a rain and drenched to the skin. After a week's stay at home he went to Kolomeya where he soon found himself without means for livelihood, and one day lived on three cents which he had found. Finally he shut himself in his room and there in fever and hunger awaited death to come. A friend of his found him and saved his life.

Franko was arrested for the third time in 1889 and was kept under arrest for two and a half months without knowing what for. It was during this time that he wrote his highly prized "Prison Sonnets", and his narrative, "To the Light".

After an unsuccessful campaign as candidate to the Austrian Parliament, Franko studied in Vienna, and a degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred on him. In 1895 the Senate of the University decided to offer him professorship of Ukrainian literature in the University of Lviv. But the government refused its assent to this proposition.

In 1898 the Ukrainians celebrated the 25th Jubilee of Franko's literary career. Many literary men and women came to honor the writer on the occasion. Among the speakers was also Natalia Korbiska who welcomed him as a defender of the rights of women, which he very well proved himself to be in his drama "Ukradene Shchastie" (A Stolen Happiness), and in other works. The poet in a trembling voice replied to the speaker and stated that he was raised on hard bread of a peasant and he felt in duty bound to devote his life to the service of this peasant. He would serve his people, he said, to the utmost of his abilities by his work as writer and by bringing in the culture of other nations in order to enrich his own. It may be noted that as to this latter statement he well lived up to it. He was probably the best educated of all former Ukrainian writers and he made translations of the works of Byron, Heine, Goethe, Sophocles and others, and his translation of "Don Quixote of Cervantes" is always a welcome book in an Ukrainian home.

Thenceforward we see Franko as active as before in his literary work, and particularly in connection with a literary journal of which he was associate-editor. To this journal he contributed many of his poems and novels.

The Great War found Franko a nervous wreck. He had undergone too much hardship during his life and at the same time was always a hard worker. The death in 1914 of his bosom friend Pavlik also had its effect on him. During the Russian invasion of Galicia Franko was forced to stay in Lviv. Then little could be heard of him until May 29th, 1916, when the sad news was spread that the poet was dead. Condolatory telegrams were sent from many parts of Europe sympathizing with the relatives of one of the greatest Ukrainian poets.

Franko is an author of a great number of works. His historical novel "Zakhar Berkut", "Semper Tiro", "Dream of Prince Sviatoslav", "A Servant" and "Kameniary" (Masons), will, it seems to me, never grow old, and his "Moysey", which is his masterpiece written in 1905, certainly will not. In this lengthy poem he places himself in the position of Moses, who, like himself, tried to lead his people to a better life. He commences it with,

"O people of mine, tormented, disunited,
As 'twere a paralytic at the crossroads..."

The further addressing God he says,

"Forty years I've worked, taught,

All immersed in Thee

That out of serfs I create a nation

According to Thy likeness".

It would require a separate study, and a wide study at that to closely examine at least the most important works of Franko, and it is to be hoped that some future student will undertake to do this. One can here only mention in a general manner that he is a great contributor to Ukrainian literature. His sympathy for the people, his broad education and his genius well qualified him for the position of a leader of Ukrainian thought, which he was for some years. His literary anx social activities were such as to place him in a unique position as a literary figure. He had exceptional ability in clearly expressing his convictions, and he wrote so much in his time as if he were pouring his works out of a Cornucopia. Franko, a poet, writer of valuable works for children, youth, translator o foreign works, a critic and historian of literature, writer of folk-lore, dramatist, novelist, publicist, student of social and economical conditions, disseminator of various branches of knowledge, a popular, well-loved agitator of new thought among the youth an d an editor of efficiency, he well deserves the esteem which is accorded him. Always industrious, a humanist, moralist, hopeful of success, he gave am

example by his life that if people keep on toiling for the elevation of their condition, they will finally succeed.

As to his own life he could have made it easy. Because of his ability he could have easily obtained some official position and make a comfortable living therefrom. But he felt that he had a mission to fulfill. He chose the thorny path of life which was even more aggravated by the fact that even many of his own compatriots were his opponents. He realized, however, that such fate had also befallen some of his predecessors who sacrificed the whole of their lives to the service of the people. He was often discouraged, but he would not cease spreading his ideas. He brought about a period of storm and stress in the intellectual life of his nation. Most of his works, which eked out an existence until the end of the 19th century foster radicalism and free-thought. This versatile activity of his bore fruit, and his many followers, creating the so-called "Franko's School of Young Ukraine", have carried on the work begun by him. Franko strengthened the focus of intellectual life of Ukraine in Galicia, being the guiding spirit of it for a long period. And to him is due much credit for the present desire and endeavors of the Ukrainians to rise socially, politically and intellectually. They have obeyed his teachings and exhortations as he has put them in one of his patriotic poems "Ne Pora" (meaning that the Ukrainians are no more bound to serve foreign rulers), which poem is

now being sung by the Ukrainians as their second National Anthem, and in which he says ,

"We will die that freedom, and glory, renown,
Native Land, we may win for thee".

A number of other Ukrainians have become famous in the literary field since 1880. Probably those most worthy of mention are Boris Hrinchenko, Trokhim Zinkivsky, Natalia Kobrinska, Volodimir Samiylenko, Pavlo Hrabovsky, Lesia Ukrainka, of whom the Russian publicist, Paul Tuchapsky, said, "If Lesia Ukrainka wrote her verses in one of the leading languages, she would be famous world wide," Ahafanhel Krimsky, Mikhaylo Kotsubinsky, Mikola Cherniavsky, Liubov Yanovska, Modest Levitsky, Vasil Stefanik, Prof. Mikhaylo Hrushevsky, Olha Kobilianska, Volodimir Vinnichenko and Petro Karmansky. The last four mentioned, who are still living, are among the indefatigable workers for the advancement of education and culture. And, Prof. Hrushevsky's name will go down as oneof the greatest Ukrainian historians.

CONCLUSION.

Since the time of Shevchenko, and even more so with the beginning of the literary career of Franko, Ukrainian literature has undergone a hurried change. We have seen that in the first period Ukrainian language merely penetrates the foreign language, but is not yet used much in literature; in the second, it comes to the fore with more self-confidence; while in the third, it becomes the fundamental language and a sine qua non of Ukrainian literature. In the second half of the third period the scope of Ukrainian literature broadens. There is more variety of writing, works of foreign writers are being translated and imitated, and culture of the West is readily absorbed. Ukrainian literature here goes beyond itself and grows at a remarkable pace.

During all these periods Ukrainian literature met obstacles which at times seemed insurmountable. Many a time its existence was endangered at the same time that the life of the people was in jeopardy. But in spite of it men of vision by self-sacrifice carried the work on. They embodied the spirit of the people in their works; they sympathized with them in their defeat, suffering and grief, and they gave us the drama and the sad lyrics; they rejoiced with then in their victory, happiness and mirth, and they gave us humorous tales and poems. Various valuable works from time to time were, and still are, being produced, with result that Ukrainian literature can now contribute to, and in the near future will take its place among the literatures of the world.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

Istoria Ukraini (A History of Ukraine) -
Mikhaylo Hrushevsky.

Ukraintsy Yak Narod (Ukrainians as a Nation)-
V. Pachovsky.

Ukrainska Revolutsia (Ukrainian Revolution)-
1917-1920, Vols. I and II. -
Pavlo Kirstiuk.

Ilustrovane Ukrainske Pismenstvo v Zhytiepisakh,
(Illustrated Ukrainian Literature with Biographies)-
Dr. M. Pachovsky.

Korotky Ohliad Ukrainskoho Pismenstva, A.D.1100-180
(A Brief Sketch of Ukrainian Literature)-
O. Makarushka.

Istoria Ukrainskoye Literaturi (A History of
Ukrainian Literature) Vols. I and II.
M. Vozniak.

Istoria Ukrainskoye Literaturi (A History of
Ukrainian Literature) -
Serhey Yefremov.

Literaturny Kharakteristiki Ukrainskikh Pismennikiv
I. Ivan Franko (Poezia)- (Literary Characteristics
of Ukrainian Writers I Ivan Franko (Poetry)
A. Krushelnitsky.

Literaturny Kharakteristiki Ukrainskikh Pismennikiv
II Markian Shadhkevich, z ilustratsiami, (Literary
Characteristics of Ukrainian Writers, II , Markian
Shashkevich, illustrated-
Bohdan Lepky.

Nacherk Istoriyi Ukrainskoye Literaturi (An Outlin
of the History of Ukrainian Literature) Vols.I and
Bohdan Lepky.

Taras Shevchenko, Yeho Zhytia i Tvori (Taras Shevchenko His Life and Works)
Dr. A. Enzen.

Ivan Franko Biografichno- literaturny Naris (Ivan Franko Biographical-literary Sketch.

Vibyr z Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Pismenstva (Selections out of Ukrainian National Literature) Vols 1 and II-
Antin Krushelnitsky

Ukraine- The Land and its People -
Prof. Stephen Rudnitsky.

The Kobzar of the Ukraine-
A. J. Hunter.

Songs of Ukraina-
Mrs F. Randal Livesay.

The Ukraine-
Bedwin Sands.

Memorandum of the Ukrainian Question in its National Aspect-
Yaroslav Fedortchouk.

The New Europe, 23rd August 1917.
" " " 20th December 1917.

Current History, February 1918.

Munsey's Magazine, October 1918-
"The Ukraine, A New Nation."-
Prof. Frederic Austin Ogg (Wis.)
and

Works of Various Writers dealt with in the Essay.

++++++++++