

Stephan Jarmus

**Pamphil D. Yurkevych
and
His Philosophic Legacy**



1979

Winnipeg

Canada

PAMPHIL D. YURKEVYCH
and
HIS PHILOSOPHIC LEGACY

Stephan Jarmus

**Pamphil D. Yurkevych
and
His Philosophic Legacy**

Published by St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg

W i n n i p e g

1 9 7 9

C a n a d a

*To my parents,
the late Onysym and Euphrosynia,
and to my wife Constance and
our son, Andrew.*

CONTENTS

Preface	9
I. INTRODUCTION	11
(a) Origin of the Awakening to a Neglected Philosopher	11
(b) Biographical notes	15
(c) Chronological notes	16
II. YURKEVYCH — A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHER	20
(a) Yurkevych on the Scene of 19th Century Europe	21
(b) Yurkevych and the Western Thinkers	22
(c) Plato and Kant in Yurkevych's Philosophy	25
(d) The Biblical Elements in Yurkevych's Thinking	28
(e) Yurkevych in the Philosophic Tradition of Ukraine	29
(f) Yurkevych's Anthropology and His Philosophy of the Heart	31
(g) Some Characteristic Features in Yurkevych's Philosophy	38
III. DEBATE WITH MATERIALISM	44
(a) The Kievan Period	44
(b) Yurkevych in Moscow	46
(c) Yurkevych and Chernyshevsky	48
IV. THE FATE OF YURKEVYCH'S PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT	54
(a) Solovyov and His Master's Philosophy	54
(b) The Fate of Yurkevych's Philosophic Legacy	55
(c) Yurkevych and the Emergence of Philosophic Thought in Russia	56

V. YURKEVYCH IN THE SECOND PART OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY	63
(a) The Increase of Interest in the Neglected Philosopher	63
(b) The Materialistic Critique of Yurkevych	64
(c) Yurkevych in the Evaluation of Christian Idealism	66
(d) The Similarity to Yurkevych's Thought in Western Thinkers	67
VI. CONCLUSION	70
(a) Yurkevych and the Search for an Acceptable Philosophy Today	70
(b) The Challenge to Revive a Forgotten Legacy	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	77

PREFACE

This publication, *Pamphil D. Yurkevych and His Philosophic Legacy*, is an introductory treatise to the Collection of the philosopher's Works published by St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg.

The Collection of Yurkevych's texts, in their Russian originals, was published in a very limited edition with the intention of making it available (for the first time) to specialized circles, such as philosophers, theologians, researchers and the like. It is our hope that these works will be published in English translation and thus become available to a larger number of readers. It is a need that should be fulfilled in the near future, for Yurkevych and his philosophic thought deserve the attention, not only of Ukrainians, but also of other peoples. Yurkevych is a unique thinker; being the founder of concrete Christian idealism he has a lot to offer to the universal man in general, and to the frustrated man of our time, in particular.

But, before the Works of the philosopher become available in English translation, we are releasing this publication in order to acquaint the general public with Yurkevych, with his philosophy, and with his contribution to the enrichment of our culture; and it is hoped that it fulfils this initial function.

Furthermore, it must be admitted that it is time for us, Ukrainians, to arrive at a more realistic orientation, and go beyond the preoccupation with the emotional and aesthetic aspect of our culture, such as Ukrainian national dress, dancing, our sentimentally powerful songs, and so forth. All these expressions of the Ukrainian spirit are charged with a tremendous emotional power, and they possess a very significant nurturing substance for the development and preservation of the Ukrainian entity, particularly in our situation of dispersion throughout the world. This emotional aspect of our culture nurtures and charms

our community and, to some extent, affects our fellow citizens. But it is time for us to recognize and to show to our questioning children (and to the world) not only our culturally emotional values, but also our philosophic and scientific achievements, and thus offer them for the spiritual enrichment of man as a whole. Yurkevych's philosophy can make a significant contribution to these efforts. This is why we are bringing him to the attention of the general public.

March, 1979

S. J

PAMPHIL D. YURKEVYCH
(1826—1874)
And His Philosophic Legacy

I. INTRODUCTION

**(a) ORIGIN OF THE AWAKENING TO A NEGLECTED
PHILOSOPHER**

From the very beginning of my interest in Pamphil Danylovych Yurkevych in 1974, which happened to be the centenary of his death, when I for the first time acquainted myself with this philosopher and with some titles of his works, and later when I initiated the search for and completed the collection of his written legacy, and finally, when I began my research on this neglected Ukrainian philosopher, — all this preoccupation was accompanied by a feeling of excitement, some anxiety, some doubt, and even fear of being unfit for this task. P. D. Yurkevych was a philosopher, and, philosophy is not a field in which I feel very comfortable. Nevertheless, I feel privileged to bring this Ukrainian philosopher to public attention. Thus I am pleased that, at last, although one hundred years after his death, Pamphil Yurkevych is being brought out of oblivion and to the attention of the outside world, where the name of this Ukrainian philosopher is literally unknown. Even among Ukrainians, there are few who know anything about this philosopher, except that some have perhaps seen his name in rare publications. Yurkevych's name does appear in encyclopedias where he is described as a philosopher, but his works are known only by the titles of some of his treatises. Only since 1974, after searching the libraries in London, the Vatican, and Moscow, has the author of this study succeeded in collecting Yurkevych's philosophic works. His two books on the theory of education (pedagogics) are absent from this collection. Now, steps are being undertaken to publish this collection, be-

sides its original Russian, in Ukrainian and English translations. My collection consists of about 750 printed pages, and it includes ten of Yurkevych's philosophic treatises that are known to have been published.

The initial success with this collection is what made my efforts exciting. Yet, having little training in philosophy, I am fully aware of the difficult task of doing anything in the way of an analysis or a critique. But I do feel obliged to risk at least some evaluative approach to the philosophy concerned.

Very little is written on P. D. Yurkevych. The first evaluation of his philosophy was carried out by Yurkevych's student, the Russian philosopher, V. Solovyov (1853-1900) on the occasion of his master's death. His second review was written twenty-five years later. One article was written on Yurkevych in 1890, and two in 1914. A short study of Yurkevych was made by Professor Dmytro Chyzhevsky (1894-1977), and it was included in his *Narysy z Istorii Filosofii na Ukraini*. However, his promised monography on Yurkevych was left unpublished.¹ Another contribution, a short essay on Yurkevych, on the occasion of the 120th anniversary of the philosopher's birth, was written by the Ukrainian writer, Yuriy Lavrynenko. In 1974, on the centenary of the philosopher's death, the author of this paper published two articles, and Dr. S. Fostun published another article in the weekly, *Ukrainian Thought*, No. 51, 1974, London, England. And then, as a final contribution, the article of D. Sviatohirsky (V. Rev. D. Burko) was printed in *Ridna Tserkva*, No. 111-112, 1977, in West Germany. However, almost everything written on Yurkevych to the pre-

¹ See his autobiography; "Lebenslauf," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* vol. I, No. 3, 1977. Prof. D. Chyzhevsky was interested in Yurkevych under the influence of his teacher, Prof. V. V. Zenkovsky. Other works on P. D. Yurkevych are:

V. Solovyov, "O Filosofskikh Trudakh P. D. Yurkevycha," *Collection of Works*, volume 1, pp. 162-187; "Tri Kharakteristiki," *ibid*, volume VIII, pp. 424-429.

Kolubovsky, "Sources for the History of Russian Philosophy," *Voprosy Filosofii i Psichologii*, V, 1890.

H. H. Shpet, "Philosophskoe nasledie P. D. Yurkevicha," *Ibid*, 1914.

Fr. O. Khodzitski, "Professor P. D. Yurkevych," *Vera i Rozum*, 1914 (18. 20, 22, 24).

D. Chyzhevsky, *Narysy z Istorii Filosofii na Ukraini*. "Pamhil Yurkevych," pp. 136-155, Prague, 1931.

Y. Dyvnych, (Yuriy Lavrynenko), "Viaduk u Maybutne," *Litavry*, No. 1, April, 1947, Salzburg, pp. 57-67.



The Thinker by D. Farcavec'

sent is fragmental, biographic, or of publicistic nature. While virtually no one had access to the whole written legacy of this philosopher, nobody could attempt to analyze the whole work or to propose any critical synthesis. Thus, besides the above mentioned essays and articles, the greatest Ukrainian philosopher, in my opinion, Pamphil D. Yurkevych, remained a forgotten man and his philosophic legacy — neglected. Perhaps now, the readers will appreciate my motives in bringing this philosopher to their attention, for in my opinion, Yurkevych and his philosophy, can answer the needs and quests of many today, and deserve to be made known to our contemporaries. The value of Pamphil Yurkevych's thought can be deduced even from the Marxist attitude to his philosophy. The Marxists do not waste time on anything insignificant; but when they feel any ideological threat, they react vigorously. For instance, there are few Western thinkers who represent a real danger to the Marxist philosophy; but when Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's works began to appear in print, enjoying various translations, the Soviet Marxists reacted by producing a lengthy critique of "Teilhardism,"² as they call it (even though it was printed in 1,000 copies only, obviously for the use of trusted people). In the USSR, Yurkevych's philosophy is also attacked in all convenient publications: encyclopedias, histories of philosophy, and more specialized works.³ This adds to the rising interest in Yurkevych's philosophy on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

(b) BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Pamphil Danylovych Yurkevych, the son of a Ukrainian Orthodox priest, was born February 16, 1826 in the district of Poltava in central Ukraine. He completed his studies in the Seminary of Poltava (six years of learning in humanities and theology) and then he studied in the Kievan Theological Academy (1847-1851). In 1851, he was appointed to the chair of philosophy in the Academy and the next year he received his master's degree. At that time he was the best qualified teacher of philosophy in Imperial Russia. For his achievements in this area he was recognized

² E. M. Babosov, *Teilhardism* — Popytka Syntheza Nauki i Christianstva, Minsk, 1970, pp. 264.

³ V. L. Hubenko, "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini," *Borotba mizh Materializmom ta Idealizmom na Ukraini v XIX st.*, Kyiv, 1964, pp. 107-120.

as the "Bachelor of the Academy," and in 1853 was honoured by a special "Grammota" of the Holy Synod. In 1854, he was appointed as the assistant to the inspector of the Academy, but two years later, he resigned this position taking up, in 1857, the teaching of philosophy and the German language. In 1861, he was promoted to the rank of ordinary professor, and in that same year, the Ministry of Education invited him to teach philosophy at the University of Moscow. There, he also taught pedagogy in the Teacher's Seminary and gave public lectures on materialism. In 1869, he was appointed Dean of the Historico-Philological Faculty, a post that he retained until his untimely death on October 4, 1874, at the age of 48. This was, as well, one year after the death of his wife, whom he had married in 1856 in Kiev, and who, after a long illness, died in the Crimea in 1873.

(c) CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES

The most productive years in Yurkevych's life were his earlier years, while he was living and working in his native surroundings in Kiev. He wrote and published two books on education, in addition to ten treatises on philosophic topics that were published in various periodicals. One very important manuscript, *Metaphysics*, was left unpublished as were also some other works. Their fate is unknown. My collection of Yurkevych's works consists of the following treatises:

1. "Ideia" (The Idea), published in the *Journal of the Ministry of National Education*, 1859, X, XI.
2. "Materializm i Zadachi Filosofii" (Materialism and the Duties of Philosophy), *ibid.*, 1860, III.
3. "Serditse i yeho Znachenie v Dukhovnoi Zhizni Cheloveka, po Ucheniu Slova Bozhia" (The Heart and Its Meaning in the Spiritual Life of Man according to the Word of God), *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, 1860, I.
4. "Mir s Blizhnimi kak Uslovie Christianskaho Obschizhitia" (Peace with Fellow Men as the Condition of Christian Community (or Fellowship), *ibid.*, 1861, III.
5. "Iz Nauki o Chelovecheskom Dukhe" (From the Teaching on the Spirit of Man), *ibid.*, III.
6. "Po Povodu Statey Bohoslovskaho Soderzhania, Pomeschenykh v Filosofskom Lexikone" (On Account



Pamphil D. Yurkevych

of the Articles of Theological Contents, published in the Lexicon of Philosophy), *ibid.*, 1861, I, II.

7. "Dokazatelstva Bytia Bozhia" (Proofs of the Existence of God), *ibid.*, 1861, III, IV, V.
8. "Yazyk Phiziologov i Psihologov" (The Language of the Physiologists and the Psychologists), *Russkiy Vestnik*, 1862, IV, V, VI, VIII.
9. "Razum po Ucheniu Platona i Opyt po Ucheniu Kanta" (Reason according to the Teaching of Plato and Experience according to the Teaching of Kant), *Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*, 1865/6, V.
10. "Ihra Podspudnykh Sil" (The Play of the Hidden Forces), *Russkiy Vestnik*, 1870, IV.

The two books on education were the following:

1. *Chtenia o Vospitanii* (Readings on Education), Moscow, 1865, pp. 272.
2. *Kurs Obschey Pedagogiki* (The Course of General Pedagogy), Moscow, 1869, pp. 404.

These two books are absent from my collection, but the second of these could be found in the British Museum Library in London. Now, one more remark before going any further. All the works of Yurkevych were written in Russian, even though his native language was Ukrainian. But since all of his works were published in the official magazines, they had to be written in Russian, otherwise they would not be released for publication.⁴ Therefore, Yurkevych wrote in Russian and his works, as those of many of his contemporaries, are still waiting a Ukrainian translation.

⁴ In Yurkevych's time, the Imperial Order "Valuevsky Ukaz" (1863) was proclaimed, which banned all Ukrainian publications (except some private literary works, subject to censorship) and declared that "There never was any Ukrainian language, there isn't any now, nor can there ever be one."

II. YURKEVYCH — A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHER

Marxist criticism of Yurkevych is based on seeing in him a mere theologian who, because of his vested interest, had taken a stand against materialism. One finds this stand even in Chernyshevsky's polemics with Yurkevych. In the *History of Russian Philosophy*⁵ he is labeled as a "philosophizing theologian." Other critics deal with Yurkevych as a religious philosopher.⁶ No doubt that his philosophy, especially anthropology, is based on the Bible to a great extent (and thus can make a contribution to theology). Yet, Yurkevych was a philosopher of strong idealistic conviction, and an ardent opponent of emerging materialistic philosophy. Until now, Yurkevych is nowhere credited with any contribution to theology, but he is regarded as a founder of a family of Christian philosophers such as V. Solovyov, the Trubetskoi brothers, N. Berdyaev, and others. Solovyov openly professed himself to be a follower of Yurkevych. Besides the recognition of being idealistic, Yurkevych's philosophy was not identified with any specific school of thought. His philosophy now may be labeled as *concrete idealism*. To this it may be added that Yurkevych, with a particular interest in Plato and Neoplatonism, in Leibnitz, Boehme, and Swedenborg, reflects personalism and existentialism in his outlook.

The late nineteenth century, and the twentieth century Russian religious and existential thinking is based on Yurkevych's insistence on the value of *concrete knowledge* in opposition to extreme abstract thinking. "Concrete knowledge" is not knowledge as a result of mere reasoning but, rather, it is primarily the knowledge of the heart. Yurkevych states that the best philosophers and great poets were always aware of the fact that their deep ideas were born not in their brain but, rather in their hearts; brain and

⁵ *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*, Moscow, 1961, p. 307.

⁶ *Philosophskaya Encyclopedia*, Moscow, 1970, p. 602; *Borotba mizh Materialismom ta Idealismom na Ukraini v XIX st.*, Kiev, 1964, p. 107. etc.

reasoning only helped to shape the ideas born in the mysterious depth of the heart.⁷ We shall have the opportunity to speak of this later. Now let us try to place Yurkevych on the stage of the second half of the nineteenth century.

(a) YURKEVYCH ON THE SCENE OF 19TH CENTURY EUROPE

The philosophic concern and strivings of Pamphil Yurkevych will be better understood when one takes a look at what was going on in the area of studies of the mind and the heart in the middle and second half of the nineteenth century. The mind and the heart were typically Yurkevych's field of concern, but he was affected by other interest and forces. The philosopher was born, grew up, and was working within the totalitarian state of Imperial Russia which was reaching its final stages of growth as far as its integrity, pride, and national identity was concerned. At that time some Russians came to the conclusion that Russia had had enough reliance on the West and hence the school of slavophiles emerged. Others were breathing the air of progress, of the materialistic and rational philosophies coming from the West. Most were attracted to the scientific development in Western Europe. Almost all of the educated classes in Imperial Russia were opposed to the repulsive system of serfdom that prevailed until 1861. Among the politically enslaved, namely the Ukrainians, the Poles, and the Caucasian peoples, there was an ongoing ferment for national freedom from Russian oppression, at the same time as the neighbouring Balkan peoples had been gaining theirs from the Turks. Thus, if not all, at least some of these trends concerned Yurkevych.

The psychological effects of Feuerbach's ideas expressed in his *Essence of Christianity* (1841) and other works, and Charles Darwin's *The Origins of the Species* (1859) were beginning to reach people in Imperial Russia, and with this came an admiration for natural science, and the glorification of reason. Yurkevych was well aware of what was taking place in the West, especially in Germany, and what was taking shape in some minds in Russia. He does not appear to have been openly concerned with the events in the

⁷ P. Yurkevych, "The Heart and its Meaning for the Spiritual Life of Man According to the Word of God," *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, 1860, I., p. 85. From here on this source is going to be abbreviated only to *Trudy*...

fields of politics, social order, and economy; but philosophy as expressed in nihilism, utilitarianism, and materialism became Yurkevych's concern of the outmost importance. A glance at the titles of his works: "The Idea," "Materialism and the Duty of Philosophy," "From the Teaching on the Spirit of Man," "The Language of the Physiologists and the Psychologists," "Reason according to the Teaching of Plato and Experience according to the Teaching of Kant," etc., speak very explicitly about the philosopher's major preoccupation. In this Yurkevych's concerns remained true to the prevalent spiritual tradition in the Ukraine, beginning from C. T. Stavrovetsky (XVII c.), H. Skovoroda (XVIII c.), M. Hohol (Gogol), M. Kostomarov (XIX c.) and stressing the predominance of the emotional (horizontal) over the rational (vertical) elements not only in every day life but also in philosophy.⁸ But this does not mean that Yurkevych was limited to the philosophic tradition of his native Ukraine. He was well oriented in other philosophies as well. In fact, it was Yurkevych who said that the science of philosophy does not belong to any individual; it belongs to the whole of mankind, and this is how it was viewed and valued.

(b) YURKEVYCH AND THE WESTERN THINKERS

In our time it is presumed that if one undertakes the task of studying any thinker or writer it is expected of him to look for influences or models that a given thinker is supposed to have followed. It seems difficult to assume that one can be original in his thought. Although I feel that this approach would be erroneous in the undertaken task, I will try to identify those who are credited with having influenced Yurkevych's development of his philosophy and to measure the extent of this influence.

It is an established fact that Yurkevych was a man of wide erudition as far as other philosophies are concerned, and science in general. He offhandedly speaks about the thoughts of "practical Englishmen" and the "theoretical Germans";⁹ he knows Spinoza, Descartes, Hume, Newton, Leibnitz, Hegel, Shopenhauer, Steintal; in some cases, he

⁸ *Ukraine — A Concise Encyclopedia*, University of Toronto Press, 1963, p. 954.

⁹ "Iz Nauki o Chelovecheskom Dukhe," *Trudy...*, 1860, III., p. 461.

successfully criticizes Kant, in others admires him; but he praised Jacob Boehme, and Emanuel Swedenborg, and recognized them as real philosophers. It is they who are assumed to have had a considerable influence on Yurkevych. Although Yurkevych was very fond of idealistic philosophy, he disagreed with many of its expressions in Kant and Hegel, subjecting the former's philosophy to extensive criticism and saying of the latter: "Hegel possessed an incurable mania for greatness."¹⁰

Besides Greek and Latin, Yurkevych had a practical knowledge of the German language and he even taught it in the Kievan Academy. Thus, he had a direct access to German literature (and this seems to have been expected of such a man as Yurkevych). In one of his early works he says that, "anything that attracts the interest of German thinkers very easily finds its sympathizers among our scientists."¹¹ Yurkevych studied the German philosophers but he did not rely on them. He openly criticized Hegel and Kant, giving them credit for some thoughts but fully sympathized with those philosophers who were closer to his concepts.

Most of Yurkevych's thought was directed against materialism that, as a philosophy, was developing in the West, and during his time was spreading to Russia. He took a stand against it on philosophic grounds, and in this, he was eminently successful. Yurkevych entered into a literary struggle with materialism in its formulation by the Russian ideologist Nicolas Chernyshevsky (1828-1889). Neither Feuerbach (1804-1872) nor K. Marx (1818-1883) were the objects of Yurkevych's attention. It is not known whether Yurkevych was even acquainted with either the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848) or the main work of Marx, *Das Kapital* (1867). By the time the latter work came out in print Yurkevych's zeal and spirit seem to have been exhausted by the prevalent atmosphere in Moscow, and there seems to be no evidence that he knew either of these publications.

Speaking about Yurkevych and the Western thinking, we should note that there is a striking similarity in Yurkevych's thinking on the role of the heart to Soren Kierke-

¹⁰ *Encyclopedicheskiy Slovar* (Efron & Brokhaus), vol. 81, p. 420.

¹¹ "Iz Nauki o Chelovecheskom Dukhe," *Trudy...*, 1860, III, p. 374.

gaard's (1813-1855) teaching that religious and ethical truth for every individual can be found in subjectivity, in his inwardness.¹² Yurkevych, likewise, insists on the meaning of "concrete knowledge" explained as the subjective knowledge of the heart.¹³ Here is a short quotation of Kierkegaard on this matter:

"One may have willed a thing many times and attempted it, and yet it is only by the deep inward movements, only by the indescribable emotions of the heart, that for the first time you are convinced that what you have known belongs to you, that no power can take it from you; for only the truth that edifies is truth for you."¹⁴

Now let us quote Yurkevych where he states:

"Everything that enters the soul from the outside, with the help of the organs of feeling and the brain of the head, is reworked, changed and receives its final and lasting quality by the particular, particularly determined, and hearty intention of the soul. And to the contrary, no action, no emotion, that came from the outside world, are able to arouse in the soul assumptions or feelings if the latter are not compatible with the hearty disposition of man. In man's heart rests the basis on which his assumptions, feelings, and doings are finding their particularity which is the expression of his own and no other soul; or on the basis of which they are receiving such personal and determined direction that on their force they become the expressions not of the *general* spiritual being, but of a *distinct*, alive, and *truly existing* individual."¹⁵

The similarity in the thoughts of these two thinkers is remarkable and yet it is very unlikely that there were any explicit connections between them. In any case, there is no evidence of a direct influence of Kierkegaard on Yurkevych. The Dane published his *Either/Or* in 1843 and he died in 1855; Yurkevych's *Philosophy on the heart* was published in 1860, but at that time no one seems to have heard anything of Kierkegaard in Imperial Russia, or for

¹² Paul L. Holmer, Introduction to *Edifying Discourses*, p. XIX.

¹³ P. Yurkevych, "The Heart . . .," *Trudy* . . . , 1860, I, p. 85.

¹⁴ Soren Kierkegaard, *Either/Or*, vol. II., Princeton University Press, 1944, p. 294.

¹⁵ P. Yurkevych, "The Heart . . .," *Trudy* . . . 1860, I, p. 83.

that matter in much of Western Europe. Yurkevych does not mention the Dane anywhere.

There is no study to show to what extent Yurkevych was influenced by the acclaimed German philosophers Jacob Boehme (1575-1624), and Gottfried Leibnitz (1646-1716), or the Swedish thinker Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772). For our purpose, one can make the assumption that Yurkevych could have been interested in Boehme's mystical experiences, in Leibnitz's theory of knowledge, and Swedenborg's neoplatonism and spiritism. It should be noted that Yurkevych was very much interested in spiritism and that he seems to have had many expectations from it, but in his usual cautiousness he wrote nothing on this matter. This detail on Yurkevych is noted by A. Aksakov in his article "Mediumism and philosophy. Memoir of a professor of the University of Moscow Y.,"¹⁶ and it is also spoken of by Solovyov.¹⁷

Space and time compel the writer of this essay to conclude his discussion of the relationship of Yurkevych to the thinkers of Western Europe. From here on, we shall refer to this matter only occasionally.

(c) PLATO AND KANT IN YURKEVYCH'S PHILOSOPHY

When we spoke about Yurkevych's interest in Boehme and Swedenborg we spoke about the philosopher's sympathies with these thinkers. Neither of these two is credited with making any conclusive influence on the shaping of Yurkevych's thought. But when we come to Plato and Kant, the story is different. These two founders of separate epochs in the history of philosophy played considerable roles in the determination of Yurkevych's thought. In his analysis of Plato's teaching on reason and his critique of Kant's teaching on experience, Yurkevych developed a particular philosophic identity. He deals with these philosophers in his first work, "Idea," published in 1859. Seven years later, in his essay "Reason According to the Teaching of Plato and Experience According to the Teaching of Kant," Yurkevych subjected these two philosophers to a thorough critical study wherein Plato is looked

¹⁶ Efron and Brokhaus, *Encyclopedicheskiy Slovar*, vol. XLI, p. 420.

¹⁷ V. Solovyov. "O Filosofskikh Trudakh P. D. Yurkevycha," *Sobraniye Sochineniy*, I, p. 196.

on favorably but Kant is accused of bringing confusion into the science of philosophy.

Yurkevych begins his analysis with the assertion that the human spirit does have access to the basic convictions as far as its recognition and acceptance of various phenomena is concerned. According to Plato, the spirit is endowed with principles enabling man to know the truth in itself; according to Kant, the spirit of man, being subject to the whole system of his bodily organization, has access only to the general notion. Outside of these two basic convictions is the area of scepticism.¹⁸ Yurkevych is not satisfied with the second view. He says that philosophy, as every other area of science, depends on the condition of true knowledge, and if it cannot back its claims for true knowledge by the positive sciences, it is not a true philosophy. "Truth is the property of pure reason, or of the comprehension of the very nature of things."¹⁹ This is a direct refutation of Kant's critique of reason.

Speaking of the two epochs in the direction and development of science, Yurkevych says that Plato's teaching on reason was accepted as valid throughout thousands of years. All attempts at change, from Aristotle to Christian theology, failed to undermine its simple essence, which stands on the conviction that there is a formal, ontological truth of the pure reason, and that every science is a science only to the extent that it satisfies the requirements included in pure reason.²⁰ Leibnitz, in his recognition of the eternal truths of being, spoke to the same effect. Kant changed this situation. And since the publication of his *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), philosophy changed its attitude to this faculty of man. Yurkevych illustrates this difference in the following opposing theses and at the head of each he places its founder, Plato and Kant. Here are the notable opposites in Yurkevych's words:

PLATO

KANT

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Only the invisible and the
suprasensible entity of thing
is knowable. | Only the visible and sensible phe-
nomenon is knowable. |
|--|--|

¹⁸ *Razum ... Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*, 1866, p. 322.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 351.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 353.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>2. The field of experience is the area of shadows and of dreams; only the striving of reason to the world of the suprasensible is the striving to the light of knowledge.</p> <p>3. We have true knowledge when we move by thought from ideas, through ideas, to ideas.</p> <p>4. To know the being of the spirit of man, its immortality and the ultimate destiny, by priority — deserves the very name of science; it is the <i>king-science</i>.</p> <p>5. It is possible for the pure reason to know the truth.</p> | <p>To strive by reason to the suprasensible world, means to strive to the field of shadows and dreams; but activity in the region of experience is the striving to the light of knowledge.</p> <p>We have the true knowledge when we move by thought from convictions, through convictions, to convictions.</p> <p>It is no science, but a formal discipline which warns of the fruitless endeavours to determine anything about the essence of man's soul.</p> <p>To know the truth is possible neither for pure reason, nor for reason enriched by experiences. It is true that in the last instance knowledge is possible; but it will be knowledge not of the truth, but only general knowledge.²¹</p> |
|--|---|

These five opposite theses form the basis upon which Yurkevych develops his critique of Kant which, in spite of overemphasis on some of Kant's mistakes, is, according to D. Chyzhevsky, unparalleled in its criticism of the German philosopher.²²

As far as Plato's theses are concerned, Yurkevych says that they became the very spirit of our science and culture,²³ whereas Kant's theories became the basis for scepticism.

My consideration of Yurkevych's critique of Plato and Kant serves to illustrate the originality of Yurkevych's thought and the wide-ranging grasp that he had of the field of philosophy.

It should be noted here that Yurkevych is known best as a critic of materialism; but there are areas where he criticizes idealism also, and sees some positive values in

²¹ *Razum... Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*. 1866, pp. 356-357.

²² *Narysy z Istorii Filosofiï na Ukraini*, p. 142.

²³ *Razum... Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*, 1866, p. 357.

materialism. For example, he values Feuerbach for his recognition of the role of the individual in the concrete course of his being, but he criticizes the lofty "abstractness" of idealism with its disregard of the concrete and the individual.²⁴ Furthermore, mysticism with its attempts to penetrate the depth of the heart, to negate the light of reason and knowledge and thus to bypass the necessary conditions of spiritual development also calls for Yurkevych's criticism. To bypass all the life conditions and to strive to achieve one's spiritual goals immediately, in Yurkevych's judgment, is the pathological feature of mysticism.²⁵ Thus, the critical, objective and independent thought of Yurkevych must be recognized as being noteworthy in itself and should be instrumental in helping to restore the image of this far too long neglected and ignored philosopher. It is easy to see that Yurkevych owes much to Plato; but there are cases where he stresses his admiration for Kant and thus, speaking of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Yurkevych admiringly calls it the work of a real genius.²⁶

(d) THE BIBLICAL ELEMENTS IN YURKEVYCH'S THINKING

Yurkevych was a religious philosopher and in some of his deliberations he sought for guidance in the Bible. In his treatise on the meaning of the heart he begins his work by citing over 120 concrete statements on this matter by the writers of both the Old and the New Testaments. The very title of this work states that it is based on the teaching of the word of God: "The Heart and its Meaning in the Spiritual Life of Man according to the Teaching of the Word of God." This work contains Yurkevych's anthropology; chronologically, it is the second, but in reality it is probably the most important philosophic contribution to the philosophic thought of the 19th, and also of the 20th, centuries. Yurkevych was aware that in his time, to base a philosophy on the Bible, meant to open oneself to being

²⁴ D. Chyzhevsky, *Narysy z Istorii Filosofiï na Ukraini*, p. 140. See also:

"Materialism i Zadachi Filosofiï" *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnaho Prosveschenia*, 1860, pp. 51, 52.
pp. 96-97.

²⁵ "The Heart," *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, 1860, I,

²⁶ "Reason According to the Teaching of Plato and Experience According to the Teaching of Kant," *Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*, 1866, p. 356.

branded with the abusive label "mrakobiessiye,"²⁷ meaning an enemy of progress and one enchanted with the demonic darkness. Nevertheless, he begins his thinking on this matter with the following opening paragraph:

"One who reads the Word of God with due attention can easily notice that in all the Sacred Books and in every divinely inspired writer the human heart is looked upon as the centre of all bodily and spiritual life of man, as the most essential organ and the nearest location of all the forces, departures, movements, desires, feelings, and thoughts of man with all their directions and colorings. Here, first of all, we shall select some places from the Sacred Writings, which will demonstrate that this view of the sacred writers on the essence and meaning of the human heart in all the areas of man's life is marked by precision, clarity, by all the signs of conscious conviction and after that we shall put this biblical teaching side by side with those views on this subject, which are prevailing in contemporary science."²⁸

Yurkevych, indeed, formulates his stand well, bringing to his support conclusions of science, particularly physiology and psychology. At the end of his study he expresses the conviction, that if someone cared to undertake a similar study with the problem of education in mind, then "we would have the whole cycle of practical elements, which would bring closer the area of faith to the area of science."²⁹

There is no need to look for further evidence for the biblical elements in Yurkevych's philosophy; his own declaration on this matter is sufficient, and, as far as the biblical spirit is concerned, it is present throughout his writings.

(e) YURKEVYCH IN THE PHILOSOPHIC TRADITION OF UKRAINE

Pamphil Yurkevych was born and grew up in central Ukraine, retaining typically Ukrainian features in his philosophic thinking. It was the Russian philosopher, Vladimir Solovyov (a student of Yurkevych), who spoke of the peculiar Ukrainian character of his master and his philosophic

²⁷ Yuriy Dyvnych, "Viaduk u Maybutnie," *Litavry*, I, Salzburg,

²⁸ "The Heart . . .," *Trudy* . . ., 1860, I, p. 63.
1947. p. 63.

²⁹ "The Heart . . .," *Trudy* . . ., 1860, I, p. 118.

world view. Speaking of this "conscious enemy of all hasty generalizations, groundless constructions, and biased philosophic systems," Solovyov says:

"Yurkevych was . . . Ukrainian and the clear features of his origin forever retained in his character and language . . . The individual character of Yurkevych, without doubt, was shaped on the general basis of Ukrainian nature. On this was based his thoughtfulness, his deep insight into himself, his sensitivity more intensive than extensive . . . his stubbornness and closeness in himself that could go to cunningness . . . Yurkevych was inclined to speechless contemplation and to quiet exchange of thoughts with a small number of friends . . . To these features must be added another, also Ukrainian (feature) — a typical kind of condensed humor — he used to have me consumed by laughter, himself smiling only slightly."³⁰

We should not overlook here Yurkevych's unusual cautiousness (a Ukrainian feature) which prevented him from constructing precise systems.

The clearly Ukrainian feature in Yurkevych's thought is his stressing of the value of emotion. Here we find traces of neoplatonism (the element of the idea) and of patristics (the element of the heart).³¹ But both of these elements, as an existential force, can be found in medieval Ukrainian thought and ethics, particularly in the documents and literary works from the 11th to the 13th centuries. The element of the heart, as a precise philosophic object, is presented in the thought of the 17th century Ukrainian thinker, Cyril Tranquilion Stavrovetsky. The 18th century philosopher Hryhoriy Savych Skovoroda gave the concept of the heart a more definite philosophic expression. Skovoroda places man's heart above and beyond his soul and spirit and sees it as the centre of man's life, a faculty of ultimate spiritual importance.³²

Thus, the concept of the heart, a typically Ukrainian object of contemplation, born in the medieval ideas of ethics, went through the more definite thoughts of Stavrovetsky (17th c.), Skovoroda (18th c.), Kulish, Hohol, Shevchenko

³⁰ Quotation taken from Chyzhevsky, *Narysy z Istorii Filosofiï na Ukraini*, (Prague, 1931), p. 154.

³¹ Ibid.

³² H. S. Skovoroda, *Tvory* (in two volumes), Kiev, 1961, vol. I, p. 47.

(19th c.). However, this concept, as a predominant guiding force, was expressed in morals, in social customs, in folklore, and in the hospitality of the Ukrainian people from pre-Christian times.³³ Finally, it found its systematic scientific formulation in the thought of Pamphil Yurkevych. As a literary emotionalism, and later philosophic existentialism,³⁴ it was carried through to the 20th century, to our own time. In the field of philosophy this tradition was brought to its epitome in the thoughts of Russian exiles, especially of the Paris group with Nicolas Berdyaev as its best known representative. In the Ukrainian sector, this tradition was quenched by the now prevailing official Marxism; it was branded as being "mrakobiessye" and thus died out, even as a characteristic feature in Ukrainian literature. In our time, in the diaspora, Yurkevych was brought back to public attention by the articles of D. Chyzhevsky, Yuriy Lavrynenko and by a few notes in the press on the occasion of the centenary of his death. This is the first time that Yurkevych has been brought to the attention of the public in North America.

(f) YURKEVYCH'S ANTHROPOLOGY AND HIS PHILOSOPHY
OF THE HEART

Yurkevych was a Christian thinker, and quite naturally he devoted most of his attention to the mystery of man. He seems to have worked with two objectives in mind: one, to search and know better the inner mystery of man, and two, to prove the groundlessness of the materialistic theory of man. Most of Yurkevych's works contain his thinking on man, but in his essays on the heart, on the teaching on the spirit of man, on reason and experience, on the ideas of peace with fellow men, on materialism and the obligations of philosophy, Yurkevych is expounding his concept and teaching on man as a free, concrete, individual, and responsible being. Thus the problem of man is in the very centre of his philosophy, as it was with other Ukrainian thinkers: Skovoroda, Hohol, Shevchenko, and others. Yurkevych's thinking on man is best formulated in his

³³ Consult the sociological study of N. Hryhoriyiv, *Ukrainska Natsionalna Vdacha*, (Ukrainian Publishing Co. of Canada, Winnipeg, 1941).

³⁴ According to N. Berdyaev (*Samosoznanie — Opit Filosofskoi Avtobiographii*, Paris 1949, p. 110) our philosophic thought always was inclined to the existential type of contemplation.

treatise "The Heart and Its Meaning for the Spiritual Life of Man according to the Word of God." Here Yurkevych undertakes to expound and prove that:

1. The heart is the guardian and the carrier of all the physical powers of man;
2. The heart is the centre of life for man's soul and spirit;
3. The heart is the citadel of all the activities of knowledge;
4. The heart is the centre of the manifold spiritual feelings, disturbances, and passions; and finally
5. Man's heart is the centre of his moral life.

In the final analysis, the heart is the very man, the whole man.

Yurkevych bases his theses on the Bible and then proves their validity through the views of contemporary science. His teaching caused an uproar in the circle of Russian materialists but Yurkevych had no difficulty in proving his point from the data of science, and this is obvious from his works. The first spontaneous philosophic products of Yurkevych were the treatises: "Idea" (1859); the second "The Heart..." (1860); and later works he produced as a response to challenges by the materialists, especially by the radical Nicolas Chernyshevsky. It was V. Solovyov who pointed out the obvious utility of Yurkevych's works against the opponents of his philosophy.³⁵

Now let us look at some points in Yurkevych's anthropology. This teaching begins with the decisive refutation of the then prevalent view that it is reason that is the basis of the spiritual life of man. Here is a quotation from his work on the meaning of the heart. Yurkevych writes:

"On the basis of doubtless physiological facts... psychology teaches that the head or the brain, with the nerves leading to it, serves as the indispensable and the direct physical organ of the soul for the formation of images and thoughts out of the impressions from the outside world; that is, that only this organ (the head) is the immediate conductor and carrier of the activities of the soul. With this true teaching on the organ of the

³⁵ V. Solovyov, "O Filosofskikh Trudakh P. D. Yurkevycha," *Izbraniye Sochineniy*, vol. I, p. 187.

spiritual phenomena, no doubt, in psychology for a long time was connected the peculiar view on the very being of man's soul — a point of view which to some known extent could have had an independent development. If the nerves coming to the central point in the head are moved by the images and impressions of the outside world, then the immediate and the nearest consequence of that movement is the occurring in the soul of impressions, conceptions or knowledge about the outside world. Hence, it was easy to come to the presumption that the essential faculty of a man's soul is in fact this ability to bring forth or to form the impressions about the world on the account of the movement of nerves, aroused by an outside object. Thus, that which takes place in the nerves, as a movement uncovers itself, appears and exists in the soul as an impression. On account of this, in philosophy prevailed for a long time, and to some extent still persists, a view that man's soul, first of all is the impression forming entity, that thinking is the very essence of the soul, that is, that thinking composes the whole spiritual man. The will and the feelings of the heart were understood as a phenomena, variants and accidental states of thinking. In the true development of man's spiritual life, these two dependent abilities of the soul should occurringly fit with thinking, disappear in it and thus lose all the appearance of self-being and reality. In such determinations the being of the soul becomes discovered and easily observable as those forms of thinking which in the midst of other appearances in the life of the soul are distinguished by the particular transparency and clarity. With these determinations, the thought that in the very soul there is something as beyond-soul, some deep entity which can never be exhausted by any form of thinking, (such thought) would be absolutely inconceivable. This is how for the first time we see here, to some lesser extent, the inclination to that explanation of the phenomena in which the essence of the great and meaningful contents in comparison with their appearances is not given; and if one, to the contrary, thinks that in man's soul, or in any other creation of God, are sides unapproachable for the limited means of our knowledge than he beforehand can see the great significance of the biblical teaching on the depth of the heart the mysteries of which the Divine Mind alone knows."³⁶

It should be clear from this lengthy quotation that studying man, Yurkevych deals with his most important centres — the head and the heart — and that in his philosophic deliberations he subjects the role of the head to

³⁶ P. D. Yurkevych. "The Heart," *Trudy* . . . , 1860, pp. 74-75.

the heart and thus speaks of the primacy of the latter over the former. But it would be wrong to see in this conclusion the Kantian negation of reason; opposing the prevailing tendency in philosophy to emphasize the autonomy of reason, Yurkevych speaks about the harmonious coordination between these two factors, and thus he challenges the individual man with the responsibility for this coordination. In his words, if the light of knowledge must become the warmth and the life of the spirit, it must penetrate the heart where it can enter into the whole disposition of the spirit. So, when truth falls down onto our heart, then it becomes our own goodness, our inner treasure. It is this treasure and not some removed thought for which man can begin his struggle with circumstances and with people; only the heart is capable of undertaking hardship and self-denying endeavours" insists Yurkevych.³⁷

Yurkevych does not simply negate reason in favour of the heart; he recognizes a sort of "delay" in its action while the "thought of the heart" grasps the truth immediately. Yurkevych illustrates his point by the Emmaus experience of the two disciples who were highly aroused emotionally, conversing with their resurrected, but unrecognized, Master.

Thus Yurkevych's anthropology is based on the recognition of the two essential forces of man's spirit: the head (reason) and the heart (emotions) and on the balance of these two forces he soon comes to the following conclusion:

1. The heart can discover, express, and understand in its own particular way such spiritual conditions which, owing to their gentleness, exclusive spirituality, and liveliness escape the removed knowledge of the reason.

2. Conception and the precise knowledge of reason, inasmuch as it is realized by our spiritual state but is not the result of the removed images of outside objects, discloses itself or makes itself felt and noticed, not in the head, but in the heart; it must penetrate this depth if it is to become the operating power and the factor of our spiritual life.³⁸

Hence, Yurkevych's further conclusion that man is valued not by the amount of truth he knows, not by his

³⁷ Ibid., p. 89.

³⁸ P. D. Yurkevych, "The Heart," *Trudy* . . . , 1860, pp. 89-90.

knowledge, but by the fact of what the truth means to him, how it affects him, and what he is doing with his knowledge of the truth. To evaluate a man we should know where his spiritual interest is, what arouses his sympathy, what brings him joy, what grieves him, or what is the treasure of his heart. (Luke 6:45).³⁹

The size of this study limits our discussion of Yurkevych's anthropology to some principal thoughts, that is, to his distinction and explanation of the two essential forces: man's reason (his head) and emotions (his heart). Now something must be said about his view on man as an individual in the community of other individuals. This is important for the illustration of Yurkevych's ideas that later became very influential for the philosophy of the existential school. It is his insistence on the value of the concrete, the individual, the unique, and distinct human being as opposed to the family and society which caused Yurkevych to hail some materialist philosophers, as for example, Feuerbach, for similar views.

Dissatisfied with the prevailing (in psychology) limited view on man's spirit that spoke about its determination by the family and the community, Yurkevych decided to take a closer look at the individual. He found that man and his spirit in such activities as conceptions, presumptions, feelings, desires, etc., does answer the forms as they are expressed in the family and the community; but he also asks us to take a step further and to take a better look at the particular ways of each individual in the process of developing his uniqueness. We see here the phenomenon of personality which in no way can be determined by any outside force. We also see that every individual soul has its particular destiny here on earth and in eternity... This is why man can never be the expression or the organ of the communal or family life-soul. Our words, thoughts, and actions are born not out of the communal or family substance of the human soul, but from our own particularly developed, specifically personified spiritual life; only on account of this do they stand as our personal guilt or reward, which cannot be shared with anyone.⁴⁰

This concreteness and uniqueness of the individual's spirit implies also his moral freedom. Man's spirit and its

³⁹ Ibid., p. 90.

⁴⁰ P. D. Yurkevych, "The Heart," *Trudy* . . . , 1860, p. 94.

nature is similar to God's Spirit. God is love; God loves man from the beginning (I John 4:16; 19), hence man is to act in likeness to God in His action. God is love, so he made man's spirit free not in growing strong in his physical development, but in striving for truth and for love, and for victory over passions and self-love. On this stands the last precondition of the moral freedom of man. To this statement Yurkevych adds that man performs moral acts only because he is free; there is no moral value in acts carried out in obedience to the law. These latter acts have judicial significance; acts of truth and good performed out of a free heart and out of love, are acts of great moral value.⁴¹

According to Yurkevych, man is unique in his spirit; he is unique in himself and in his freedom; he is unique in his responsibility for the harmony between his head and heart (reason and emotions); and also, man is unique in his moral value. Faith and science can accept these theses and thus the debate between them concerning the nature and the mystery of man could be eliminated. This is why Yurkevych himself was searching for the truth about the mystery of man,⁴² and this is how he developed his philosophy of the heart.

In concluding this chapter let us take a look at Lavrynenko's attempt to demonstrate Yurkevych's views on the functions of the heart and the head. He illustrates this in his table of the following antitheses:

<i>The Head (Reason):</i>	<i>The Heart (Emotions):</i>
1. The upper structure of psychic life.	The basis of psychic life.
2. Cognition in the form of inanimate but orderly schemes.	Perception of the world as it is: diverse, live, beautiful.
3. Governs and regulates. It is the upper side of spiritual life.	Originates; it is the root, the seed of spiritual life.
4. Abstraction and generalization. It is common to all people.	Concrete and individual. The heart signifies the individuality of man.
5. Judgment.	Intuition.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 107.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 117-118.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 6. Theoretical element of the spirit, the basis of judgment. | Practical and moral element of the spirit. The basis of will, affects and intuition. |
| 7. Rightfulness, correctness, complexity open to analysis. | Simplicity, elementary entity, without component parts, escapes analysis. |
| 8. The consequence of development from lower to higher forms. It is movable. | Initially has its own particular content, similar to other primitive forms of psychics, but is completely different, of its own quality (entity). |
| 9. Can be enriched by gains of outside influences (progress). | Grows in self-fulfilment of its own inexhaustible resources. |
| 10. It governs the conception. | It grasps (comprehends) the idea, can even reveal it in itself. |
| 11. The lighter, and the light. | The domain of the dark, the unreachable (impenetrable), the basis where the lighter can appear, and enlighten itself and which, sporadically, can come out to the lighter and enlighten it by some of its qualities. |
| 12. It is located on the surface, it is approachable, conscious. | It is hidden in the depths; subconscious but in some measure it is also conscious. |
| 13. Man in light of reason is only a serial number of his kind (family), its simple representative. | Man is a never reoccurring unicum; one in his kind in the universe. |
| 14. Ethics is "formal," "abstract." Morality is based on expediency, profit, agreement, or on egotism. Utilitarian attitude to the world. | Morality is based on the inborn feeling of humaneness, on the ability to recognize the law of things, on the inexpedient interest in them. It is the ethico-aesthetic attitude to the world. |
| 15. It has the tendency to exhaustion and to vanish. | The continual source of new life, new strivings, movements which can reach the final forms of spiritual life and make it ready for eternity. ⁴³ |

⁴³ Yuriy Dyvnych, (Yuriy Lavrynenko), "Viaduk u Maybutne," *Litavry*, No. 1, Salzburg, 1947, pp. 61-62.

This is how Yurkevych confronts us with his view on man in the antitheses of the head and the heart, reason and emotions. Here he postulates the need to bring these two antitheses to a harmonious agreement. What Yurkevych was aiming at was to warn his fellow men about the growing nihilistic and materialistic philosophies. On the other hand, in his teaching on man Yurkevych took a strong stand against the oversimplistic Christian mysticism which thinks that man can reach his ultimate goal through one wink of his eye. Thus, it overlooks the important fact of great moral value — that man reaches his ultimate spiritual goal by constant struggles, by continual steps of perfection and that is done throughout his lifetime.⁴⁴

It should be pointed out that just as Yurkevych worked out his concept of man on the basis of his keen insight into the depth of the heart, F. Dostoyevsky (1821-1881), the great Russian writer of Ukrainian descent, would do the same thing a few years later. When Yurkevych was pointing out the need of life-long moral efforts on the path of man's perfection, Dostoyevsky, on the basis of hard personal experience, was taking a closer look into the same mystery; he took an optimistic look into the rawness of fallen man's heart to point out that it is possible for the seed of spiritual resurrection to take its roots right there. Dostoyevsky, too, made a great contribution to the study of man.

We have to move on with our topic, but we should not leave this chapter without the observation that Yurkevych's thinking on man, formulated over one century ago, is valid in its postulates even for our own time; it can help answer many questions asked of the scientists, the psychologists, and of theologians. These questions are asked by the searching young, by those led astray by nihilism and neomarxism, by the secularized, and by many others.

(g) SOME CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES IN YURKEVYCH'S PHILOSOPHY

From what has been said about Yurkevych's philosophy up to this point, one can be left with the impression that Yurkevych was inclined to negate everything, beginning from science, materialism, rationalism, empiricism, to idealism and Christian mysticism. And it is true that

⁴⁴ See "The Heart . . .," *Trudy* . . ., 1860, I, pp. 95-98.

Yurkevych was not in complete agreement with most of these schools of thought, but he disagreed only with their extremes. To quote E. Radlov, Yurkevych stood on the basis of the "broad, but free from all random or pre-supposedly limited empiricism which included in itself everything truly rational and everything truly overly rational, as both of them before all exist empirically in the universal experience of mankind with no less right for recognition than everything visible and sensible."⁴⁵ Hence his insistence on harmony and agreement between faith and science,⁴⁶ and all other areas of man's spiritual concerns.

In the area of cognition he taught that the Absolute is inaccessible to man; but knowledge about the Absolute is possible. Man can achieve it through,

1. Heartfelt religious feelings;
2. Sincere and conscious philosophic meditation; and
3. Sincere and conscious mystical insight.

It was Solovyov who pointed out these three characteristics as the most important distinctions in Yurkevych's gnosiology.

Philosophic meditation and conscious mystical insight imply thinking; but Yurkevych is quick to remind that the essence of man is not in his thinking⁴⁷ because "the tree of knowledge is not the tree of life,"⁴⁸ but, rather, it is in the root of spiritual life, in man's heart. Thus, the Homo sapiens would not be the complete man for Yurkevych. The complete individual is the individual fully developed in his world of emotions, in the sphere of the heart.

Yurkevych devoted much of his attention to the studies of Plato and Kant; there is nothing unusual in that since both of these thinkers made their contribution to the idealistic trends in philosophy. Plato was the founder of metaphysical idealism; Kant made his contribution to transcendental idealism. Yurkevych, also an idealistic philosopher, was satisfied neither with Plato, nor with Kant, al-

⁴⁵ E. Radlov, "Yurkevych (Pamphil Danylovych)," *Encyclopedicheskiy Slovar*, 1903, vol. 81, p. 420.

⁴⁶ "The Heart . . .," *Trudy . . .*, 1860, pp. 117-118.

⁴⁷ "The Heart," p. 77.

⁴⁸ "The Heart," p. 87.

thought he was more of a follower of platonism. Yet, his particular thinking was developed in the spirit of *concrete idealism*, which later became the basis for the existential philosophy of V. Solovyov, S. Trubetskoi and other thinkers, including N. Berdyaev. For Yurkevych the acceptance of the world of ideas is not satisfactory for it does not explain the transference of the ideally existing into the concrete being. Revelation given in ideas does not lead us into the mystery of individual being and still less into the mystery of the Highest Being. In the field of natural science just as well as in philosophy, basic facts cannot be constructed, but must be discovered through research and evidence that they are facts for the very reason that in their content there is something which cannot be changed into ideas of reason, (transcendent). If the systems of ideas were completely perceivable for our reason then all the less individual existence of the living and rational beings would appear to us to be an incomprehensible fate and revelation which is included in the ideas about the *what* is, would leave us in complete ignorance about the *who* is. Only the immediate and immovably present in the spirit's notion of the good, — the idea of the good, the most simple and the best comprehended, that is present in the spirit from the very beginning, sheds unexpected light upon this side of world perception that can be revealed by means of induction. Thus,

*that which can be (idea)
becomes that which is (reality)
by means of that which ought to be.*"⁴⁹

Hence, thanks only to the idea of good present in our spirit, we can perceive other reality.

This is the point at which Yurkevych shows the incompleteness of both Plato's reason and Kant's experience. According to Chyzhevsky's interpretation, the idea takes roots in the experience but it remains there as an unascertained proposition; the experience only grasps the possibility of the emerging concept. The truth given in a concept can be known only by reason. But reason has its limits also. Its limits begin at the point where we find the concrete and the individual.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ "Razum po Ucheniu Platona i Opyt po Ucheniu Kanta," *Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*, No. 5, 1865/6, p. 348.

⁵⁰ D. Chyzhevsky, *Narysy z Istorii Filosofii na Ukraini*, Prague, 1931, p. 144.

What is an idea? An idea, answers Yurkevych, is something in itself; it exists in the thinking point. Being true to Plato, he says that an idea is one for each kind, it is the eternal truth. All the acts of a living subject are determined by ideas. Hence, the idea is the determining force while man is the obedient executor. God, too, creates the world through ideas; but Yurkevych does not say whether God is the executor of the determining force of the eternal ideas. The "truth (or ideas) cannot be created, nor invented; it exists eternally. Man's thinking is his attempt only to perceive the idea."⁵¹ In all other cases, ideas appear to be of legislative power, while man and causes carry the ideas into their empirical effects.

Yurkevych expressed himself also in the area of ethics; he said that the great mistake in most prevailing schools of ethics is their presumption that man can be wise without conviction (primacy of reason over the heart) or that he can be moral without being heroic (ready to face and deal with all the forces standing in the way of his spiritual, and moral development).⁵² Morality is based on the deep emotional nature which guards man from egotistic interests and no man's effort can ever change it.

The deep emotional nature of man, for Yurkevych, is that which later in Freud's thinking became the area of the subconscious. But while Yurkevych saw the subconscious as the sphere of the higher, above the conscious, Freud reversed it, and limited it to the subconscious function of the libido.

Yurkevych's concern with the *harmonious order* of people and nations is also worth our attention. To him, the step to general social truth begins with the individual. Its source again is in the depth of man's nature. But its path and its free and independent development reciprocally must be guaranteed by the existing social order. Thus, even these efforts will have hopes for success only when they will originate not from "above," but from "within", from the depths of the individual and "not from the crowd."⁵³ This note suggests that Yurkevych was not indifferent to the plight of the ordinary man, something of

⁵¹ "Razum po Ucheniu Platona i Opyt po Ucheniu Kanta," p. 334.

⁵² "The Heart . . .," *Trudy*, 1860, I, p. 96.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 93-95. This is the conclusion of the whole philosophy of P. Yurkevych.

what he was accused by the radicals but, on the contrary he had a sound philosophy for its resolution.

Now, here are just a few notes on man in his relationship to other individuals, taken from Yurkevych's essay "Peace with Fellow Men, as the Condition of Christian Community":

To say that it is natural for man to live in enmity is to be guided by observation of the life of the animal world. In the past, when men practised sincere openness, they always greeted one another by saying: "Peace be with you." Man feels an everlasting need to fulfil himself with other people not only in the physical sense, but much more in the spiritual. His spiritual abilities are so strong that the irrational nature cannot fulfil them with its impressions; man feels a strong need to express his spiritual state of being to the outside world . . . nature can only submit itself to him; it cannot comprehend nor unite with him. Man needs to express himself, to be understood, to be spiritually supported and nurtured, to be able to share with another, and to accept the thoughts, the wishes, the joys, the sufferings of other people. This gives him the sense of humanness (of being human). Here is the basis for mutual strivings, for common well-being. This is impossible without being at peace with oneself, without love . . . no one can at the same time serve God and mammon . . .⁵⁴

Man must have faith in Christ. But this faith must move from the area of simple thought into the living contents of the spirit, from the head to the heart; then, in every other individual one will see his neighbour and brother. In this moral content man overcomes all limitations and distinction; thus, he sees human worth and dignity in everyone; he becomes capable of sacrifice, forgiveness, and love in Christ's name. He can be filled with moral values of great influence; all this can only be experienced and felt, but in no way described. It was said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," because for this obvious and simple devotion, a strenuous struggle is required, a struggle against self-love, victory over passions, a free obedience to conscience, and above all an active love for Christ and total submission to His will.

⁵⁴ P. Yurkevych, "Mir s Blizhnimy . . .," *Trudy* . . . III, 1861, pp. 316-326.

Here we have the same concerns that we find in Kierkegaard. Yurkevych is not satisfied with the speculative truth of Christianity; he wants the truth of Christ to become the motivating and the moving force of man's existence. Thus, Yurkevych, like Kierkegaard, moves away from the speculative philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel, the skeptical philosophy of Kant and speaks positively about man's concrete existence.

III. DEBATE WITH MATERIALISM

Pamphil Yurkevych lived and worked in such a period that he was bound to take a stand against the philosophies of the rationalistic, skeptical, or the nihilistic schools. And indeed, his idealistic thinking drew him into a lifelong struggle with the various representatives of the materialistic convictions. This debate is important to the students of Yurkevych for in it we see this thinker not only as a philosopher of an independent thought but also as a down-to-earth man. It should be noted even at this point, that Yurkevych's ideological rivals were not his equals, neither in the sphere of thought, nor in the plane of human ethics. Contemporary Russian idealists recall the treatment of Yurkevych by their countrymen with open regrets.

(a) THE KIEVAN PERIOD

Pamphil Yurkevych was born in central Ukraine, in the district of Poltava; he began his studies at the Kievian Theological Academy in 1847, at the age of 21. After four years of studies he completed his education and in 1851 he was deemed fit for the chair of philosophy in the same Academy. After the academic study of philosophy in Imperial Russia had been banned for twenty-five years, the young scholar was recognized as the best qualified to open this chair in the renowned Kievian Academy. Six years later (1857), he accepted the proposition to teach German. It appears that he was a very successful young educator; he gained fame among the students and recognition from the authorities.

In the Kievian Academy, Yurkevych was at the peak of his success; he wrote most of his works there and he was a very popular teacher. One of his students, the famous novelist Nechuy-Levytsky in his book *Khmary*, calling Yurkevych by the name Dashkovych, writes:

"The young students, who came here from all over Russia, already heard about him, they waited for something extraordinary. In the old Academy's building,

with its dark windows and black benches, his auditorium was filled with students, who were sitting and standing all over, up to the door — they came here from other classes. Dashkovych entered the auditorium, sat down in his academic chair, not looking at anybody; his eyes seemed to hide somewhere, wander somewhere into depth where the thoughts were stirring. The audience could see only the clear wide forehead. His high forehead was replacing his eyes for the audience; so very many thoughts were appearing there. Every light and thin wrinkle between the eyebrows seemed to be the very place where the thought originated and was shining from. From time to time, he would raise his arm and point his finger to an abstract thought. All the rows of heads, as if by an electric current, would lean forward to listen more intently. They remained in this position throughout the lecture, no one moved. Only the pencils were racing over the paper. And his thought would flow clearly as crystal; there was not a single word that would not fit the matter. Philosophic systems of any philosopher would flow from his lips, as if from the mind of the very philosopher. It was always clear, and complete... Dashkovych was not long in the Academy. His reputation had spread so widely that he was asked to transfer to the Moscow University."⁵⁵

Another student, Kluchevsky, wrote that many students were copying Yurkevych's lecture notes and sending them to their friends.

Teaching philosophy must have been a very gratifying occupation for Yurkevych; it gave him the rare opportunity of gaining a wider knowledge of world philosophy, where he began to move with obvious ease and to speak authoritatively. He soon saw the weak points in such systems as Plato's and Kant's; he questioned many of the great philosophers and spoke of the points of truth in the less famous.

As a philosopher in his own right Yurkevych revealed himself in his first (as far as we know) work, "The Idea" which was published in 1859. It seems to have been the result of his free initiative, called out to being by no outside cause but by his own creative impulse. Then in 1860 he published his most important work, "The Heart and Its Meaning in the Spiritual Development of Man according to the Word of God." This work alone would be sufficient

⁵⁵ Ivan Nechuy-Levytsky, *Khmary* (Trident Press, Winnipeg, 1952), pp. 60-61.

to secure for this thinker philosophic recognition, and place him in the history of world philosophy. In both of these published works, we have new insights on man, a new and systematic anthropology worked out in the spirit of concrete Christian idealism.

The following two works published in 1860, "From the Teaching on the Spirit of Man," and "Materialism and the Duty of Philosophy," were written in response to the then emerging materialistic literature published by the Russian radicals. The most important of them was Nicolas Chernyshevsky's essay "The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy," published in the journal *Sovremennik*, in 1860. Yurkevych's teaching on the spirit of man was a direct response to Chernyshevsky. Here he appeared as an unexpected but very powerful opponent of the materialistic thought as it was formulated by the Russian radical. Published in Kiev and in a specialized magazine, Yurkevych's treatise was read only by a limited number of people. But when it was reprinted in Russia and made available for a much wider circle of people, it caused a "whole crusade" against the Ukrainian philosopher.

In 1861, Yurkevych published three works: "On Account of Articles of Theological Content Published in the Philosophic Lexicon," "The Proofs of the Existence of God," and "Peace with Fellow Men as the Precondition of the Christian Community." With these works Yurkevych ended his Kievan period. By this time he became widely known as a distinguished thinker. Working in his native atmosphere, Yurkevych was a very productive educator and philosopher. But, in 1861, he was promoted to the rank of an ordinary professor and at the end of that year the Ministry of Education transferred him to the University of Moscow.

(b) YURKEVYCH IN MOSCOW

Yurkevych was a Ukrainian. He was called to Moscow and placed in the esteemed (and also trusted) position of professor of philosophy; soon, he was appointed dean of the Historico-philological faculty. Such swift moves of foreigners to high and responsible positions are seldom accepted with kindness by the natives. Yurkevych in Moscow could not expect any exceptions, moreover, since he came to Moscow as an acknowledged foe of the spread-

ing radicalism, political or philosophic. Besides that, leaving behind the nurturing atmosphere of ancient Kiev must have meant to Yurkevych the same as exile from Rome to Pontus meant to Cicero. Out of their natural surroundings, their creative genius died out.

While in Moscow, Yurkevych, in 1862, published his large treatise, "The Language of the Physiologists and the Psychologists" (this work could have been prepared in Kiev). Then, in 1866 he published his renowned critique, "Reason according to the Teaching of Plato and Experience according to the Teaching of Kant." This was the last philosophic treatise Yurkevych wrote in Moscow. In 1870, he published his polemical essay "The Play of the Hidden Forces" and here again the central issue is materialism. This time Yurkevych came out in defence of professor Struve who it was claimed by the radicals, revealed materialistic convictions in his doctoral dissertation. This is all that we have from his philosophic legacy. Yurkevych completed his work on metaphysics but he left it unpublished and there is no means by which to ascertain when or where this work was completed, or whether it still exists.

In Moscow, Yurkevych seems to have turned his attention to the field of education. There he produced two books: *Readings on Education*, Moscow, 1865, pp. IV + 272; and *Course of General Pedagogics*, Moscow, 1869, pp. XV + 404, but it is obvious that in the north, his creative genius was hampered and finally almost completely extinguished. This fact is recognized by such a Russian authority as the late professor of philosophy, N. O. Lossky in his work: *History of Russian Philosophy*. The editors of the *Philosophic Encyclopedia*, published in Moscow in 1970, referring presumably to that fact made this statement:

"Yurkevych's stand against materialism in his publications and in public lectures provoked the Russian community to protest, as it already was captured by the ideas of natural science and materialism."⁵⁶ But contemporary Russians, not of the radical following, recall this treatment of Yurkevych with regretful feelings. We can only repeat that Yurkevych's life in Moscow was not pleasant. His philosophic genius died there very early; his young wife died

⁵⁶ *Philosophskaia Encyclopedia*, Moscow, 1970, p. 603.

there in 1873; and Yurkevych himself physically and emotionally exhausted, followed her, dying in 1874, at the age of 48.

(c) YURKEVYCH AND CHERNYSHEVSKY

The unexpected but forceful criticism of materialism seems to have caught the radicals by surprise. The Russian materialists, better known then as revolutionary democrats, felt that they were the best prepared to carry out the long overdue social and political reform in Imperial Russia. But their materialistic convictions, and especially their attack on Christian idealism, aroused concern. As soon as their leading representative, Nicolai Chernyshevsky (1828-1889), published, in 1860, his work "The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy," Yurkevych felt himself called to respond. The issue was ideological and philosophic; Chernyshevsky committed a whole series of mistakes, and came to some groundless conclusions. Yurkevych caught him on that and with no time lost came out with his treatise „From the Teaching on the Spirit of Man," and published it in *The Works of the Kievan Theological Academy*, No. III, 1860. This treatise was devoted to the refutation of materialism and the correction of the errors made in the "Anthropological Principle of Philosophy." As the author of these theses was then unknown, Yurkevych refers to him as "the composer" ("sochinitel") who in fact was Nicolai Havrylovich Chernyshevsky.

Chernyshevsky, two years younger than Yurkevych, the son of a priest, was born on May 12, 1828, in Saratov. Like Yurkevych, he had a seminary education and later continued his studies in the University of Saint Petersburg (1846-1850). There, under the influences of the revolutionary spirit coming from Western Europe, this brilliant young man, in the words of one of his teachers, "became a fallen angel."⁵⁷ His new outlook was formulated under the influence of L. Feuerbach and the two Russian revolutionaries, the democrats W. H. Bielinsky and A. I. Herzen. In 1853 and 1854, Chernyshevsky began his work with the journals *Otchestvennyye Zapiski* and *Sovremennik*, with the latter soon coming under his complete control. In 1855, Chernyshevsky defended his master's dissertation

⁵⁷ *Encyclopedicheskiy Slovar*, 1903, vol. XXVIII, p. 672.

but the degree was not granted to him. Working as a journalist, he became a widely known literary critic; the first author to become the object of his criticism was another Ukrainian, the famous writer M. Hohol (N. Gogol) (1809-1852), who was attacked for his influence on the trend of Russian literature (Hohol was also under heavy attacks from Chernyshevsky's ideological predecessor, Bielinsky). In July 1862, Chernyshevsky was arrested and accused of organizing the peasants' revolt and this led to his imprisonment and finally to exile. In 1889, he was allowed to return home, to his native Saratov where he died on October 29, that same year, at the age of 61.

Chernyshevsky was a prominent figure and he is highly esteemed by all Russian circles.⁵⁸ This can be seen even from such an obvious fact as the pre-revolutionary publication of the Efron-Brokhhaus *Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1903), where it devotes to Chernyshevsky twelve full pages, while Yurkevych is dealt with only on three-quarters of a page.

There is much to be admired in Chernyshevsky's passion for the plight of the Russian peasant chained to serfdom for centuries; but in his unwarranted attitude to the scholarly critique by Yurkevych of his theses on anthropology, and his expressed arrogance and abusive slander on the Ukrainian philosopher cannot be justified on any account. The sad thing is that the unwarranted and slanderous attack on Yurkevych retained its force and almost entirely removed him not only from the notice of the public, but also from the consideration of other philosophers. This is the tragedy of Pamphil Yurkevych, unfortunately made possible in the north-eastern corner of civilized and enlightened Europe.

What precisely happened?

Yurkevych was working on his philosophy in Kiev, while Chernyshevsky was formulating his in Saint Petersburg. When these two young enthusiasts in their own right (Yurkevych in his 34th year, Chernyshevsky in his 32nd) took each other's convictions to task, neither of them really knew who the other was. Yurkevych knew Chernyshevsky only as the "sochinitel", Chernyshevsky treated his opponent as some "seminarian." When Yurkevych's critique of

⁵⁸ Chernyshevsky as a writer is known by his work *Scho Robyty?* (What Can Be Done?), Kiev, 1950, pp. 365.

the "Anthropological Principle in Philosophy" was printed in the *Russkiy Vestnik*, and gained wider attention and positive appraisal, Chernyshevsky seems to have been shocked by the incredible arrogance of some Ukrainian "seminarian." He even refused to deal with his critic, but instead, writing in his *Sovremennik*, he directly attacked the editor of *Russkiy Vestnik*, Dudyshkin, for making the mistake of publishing Yurkevych's theses for, otherwise, they would have been left in oblivion.

Chernyshevsky's response and critique of the unread work of Yurkevych is now available in the collection of his works, published in Moscow in 1950. The critique was titled "Krasoty, Sobranye iz Russkago Vestnika" (Beauties Collected from the Russkoi Vestnik). This work is written in such a manner that it really is not worth the attention of an intelligent reader and can be read only with difficulty. Of course, the author of this paper is aware that this statement must be documented, otherwise, he might be suspected of being too biased against the renowned Russian. But the very title of Chernyshevsky's response "The Beauties," suggests the whole tenor of that work. Here are some citations where Chernyshevsky, for instance, writes:

Russkiy Vestnik in its book No. IV printed the first part of (Yurkevych's — S. J.) refutation... The refutation is prefaced by *Russkiy Vestnik*: I read the preface and felt satisfied. The whole issue became clear from the very preface... Yurkevych — professor of the Academy (Kiev Theological Academy — S. J.). I have seen people in his situation. Therefore, it would be difficult for me to ridicule him; it would mean to ridicule the inability to have in one's hands some worthy books, or to ridicule the helplessness over one's own development... I don't know how old Mr. Yurkevych is; if he is not young anymore, it is too late to bother about him. If he is still young, then I, with great pleasure, will recommend to him that small resource of books that are available to me... All of us, the seminarians, were writing exactly what Yurkevych wrote... I am sure that in Yurkevych's article exactly the same is written, even though I did not read it, and I am not going to read it... I'll read only a short extract of that refutation which I intend to include in my article. I know beforehand everything what I would read in it, everything to the last word... If Yurkevych will ever change his stand, he will feel very badly about his article... I have no right to re-

print more than one third of that article... it has 27 pages. I am reprinting only 9... as it happens, the last page does not include a full period and at the end of the last line stands only a half of a word... What can I do? I have no right to take the rest of the word from the next page..."⁵⁹

Now we shall turn to the second part. Addressing himself to Dudyskin of the *Russkiy Vestnik*, Chernyshevsky writes:

"So to you it seems unbelievable that I was not interested enough to read Mr. Yurkevych's article... Shall I have to prove it to you? Please... I feel myself so much higher above the thinkers of Yurkevych's school that I am completely disinterested in knowing what they think of me..."

A paragraph lower he writes that his attitude to Yurkevych's article is similar and this is why he did not bother even to read it. And close to the end of his article Chernyshevsky tells Dudyskin this:

"If you could imagine... (that Chernyshevsky finds anything in Yurkevych's article that would undermine his position — S. J.), this simple fact would show you how weak must be those presumptions which can be thought out against me by a philosopher of Yurkevych's conviction."⁶⁰

It appears that Chernyshevsky took neither Yurkevych, nor his philosophy, seriously and that he, a journalist and economist, felt secure enough to place himself over Yurkevych even without checking what the philosopher had to say. Chernyshevsky admits that he is taking his stand not on the basis of a specialist but, only on the basis of being a journalist, who has read a lot, and who has the right to "popularize conclusions made by the specialists."⁶¹

This was the acknowledged basis for Chernyshevsky's stand against Yurkevych and his philosophy; and this is the core of Yurkevych's tragedy. His wide philosophic erudition, his obvious orientation in the field of scientific achievements, his originality and typical scientific caution were denied any consideration. And thus, Yurkevych having

⁵⁹ These citations are taken from the first part of Chernyshevsky's article printed in the *Complete Collection of Works*, Moscow, 1950, pp. 725-726.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 772-774.

⁶¹ *Complete Collection of Works*, (Moscow, 1950), pp. 764-765.

said what he had to say, was silenced by disengaging himself from the undignified polemics. But Chernyshevsky's unscholarly treatment of his opponent receives, till this day, positive evaluation in almost all Soviet scholarly publications. Only the *History of Russian Philosophy*⁶² admits that Chernyshevsky's anthropology does contain some weak points. It also seems to concede that Chernyshevsky was not victorious over Yurkevych's idealism.⁶³ The means that Chernyshevsky used against his ideological foe were ridicule and slander. "The debate was carried by unequal means," writes H. H. Shpet. "On the side of Yurkevych was knowledge, keen understanding, independent thought, and he was struggling for the truth that does not vanish but stands over time."⁶⁴ Shpet made this observation three years before the Great Russian Revolution. He might have lived long enough to see what the real forces were that Yurkevych was opposing.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Imperial Russia, where Yurkevych was destined to live and work, was not interested in philosophy, and much less in the everyday concrete Christian idealism that was proposed by this lone philosopher. The most popular preoccupation of that time was progress — progress in all spheres of man's life. And materialism was one of the popular whims, more from practical rather than from philosophic motives. The progressive society was on the mind of most people and the materialists were most outspoken about progress and reform, especially in the area of economics. Yurkevych, to be true, saw this need, too, but he wanted to found it on the change of heart. The radicals, the revolutionary democrats and the rest of the progressivists worked for this end and saw it possible only on the basis of a change of power. Yurkevych was left unheard; the emerging new social and political forces were more appealing. Yurkevych was left alone, probably unaware of the fact that not all ears were deaf to his warnings; he was probably unaware that his philosophy had to be thrown a little further ahead, some fifty years ahead into the twentieth century, when

⁶² *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*, (Moscow, 1961), p. 309.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ H. H. Shpet, "The Philosophic Legacy of P. D. Yurkevych," *Voprosy Filosofii i Psichologii*, 1914, V.

it would be picked up and reformulated into the concrete, or the existential idealism of our time. It began in the formulations of Solovyov, of the Trubetskoi brothers and of other Eastern European thinkers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Even the Marxists of our time acknowledge Yurkevych as the founder of the new idealistic philosophy.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ *Philosophskaya Encyclopedia*, (Moscow, 1970), p. 603.

Se also: W. W. Zenkovsky, *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*. (Paris, n. d.), vol. I, p. 321.

IV. THE FATE OF YURKEVYCH'S PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT

(a) SOLOVYOV AND HIS MASTER'S PHILOSOPHY

It would be misleading to assert that Yurkevych had no followers. They were not very numerous, but he had some who accepted his philosophy, elaborated it or gave it more precise expression. One of the first was Vladimir Solovyov (a blood relative of the 18th century Ukrainian philosopher, Hryhoriy Skovoroda, on his mother's side), who was Yurkevych's student in Moscow University, and later became a great philosopher of modern time. It appears that he was very close to Yurkevych⁶⁶ and after Yurkevych's death, the young philosopher had this to say about his master:

"If it is the height and freedom of thought, the inner tone of views and not the amount or scope of written books by which the meaning of true thinkers is characterized, then without doubt the prominent place among them must belong to Pamphil Danylovych Yurkevych. In his intellectual character, by a wondrous way, independence was united with broadness of outlook and a sincere recognition of tradition, deep heartfelt sympathy with all the essential interest of life, with keen penetrativeness of critical thought."⁶⁷

This was expressed on the event of Yurkevych's death while Solovyov was still a young man. He wrote about his master again, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the philosopher's death, when Solovyov himself was near the end of his life. He still looked upon himself as Yurkevych's follower and upholder of his thoughts, particularly in the area of man's knowledge about the Absolute.⁶⁸ No

⁶⁶ See D. Chyzhevsky, *Narysy z Istorii Filosofii na Ukraini*. (Prague, 1931), p. 254.

⁶⁷ V. Solovyov, "O Filosofskikh Trudakh P. D. Yurkevycha," *Sobraniye Sochineniy*, vol. I, p. 171.

⁶⁸ B. I. Hubenko, "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini," *Borotba mizh Materialismom ta Idealismom na Ukraini v XIX st.*, (Kiev, 1964), p. 119.

doubt, Solovyov, who learnt at his master's feet, later had outgrown Yurkevych in the scope of his philosophic quests and in the depth of his thought; but he still looked back to his teacher with admiration and regrets. Before his own death, Solovyov wrote to characterize his master:

Yurkevych was a deep thinker, an excellent master of the history of philosophy, particularly, the ancient; he was a very good professor who gave specialists unusually interesting and penetrating lectures. But owing to some strange causes he did not enjoy popularity and the students did not benefit from his lectures as much as they could have benefited."⁶⁹

But Solovyov, too, did not go any further beyond his admiration for Yurkevych and regrets over his fate. The philosopher's various works were left uncollected, unpublished, scattered over different journals in Ukraine and in Russia.

(b) THE FATE OF YURKEVYCH'S PHILOSOPHIC LEGACY

We already spoke of Solovyov's interest in Yurkevych. At the end of the nineteenth century Kolubovsky made a note on Yurkevych's philosophy in his article "Sources for the History of Philosophy in Russia";⁷⁰ H. H. Shpet printed his short study of Yurkevych in 1914,⁷¹ and the same year a biographic essay on the philosopher was printed by Fr. O. Khodzitsky.⁷² There were others who wrote about Yurkevych. Taking all this into consideration we can see that before the Russian Revolution, Yurkevych's idealistic philosophy was recalled and his works indeed were read in some circles. But, even at that time, nothing was done to initiate the collection and publication of his works. Later, in Soviet Russia, this project could not even be thought of. In the late twenties, a study of Yurkevych's philosophy was carried out by the late professor Dmytro Chyzhevsky,⁷³

⁶⁹ V. Solovyov. "Tri Kharakteristiki," *Sobranie Sochineniy*, vol. VIII. pp. 424-428.

⁷⁰ *Voprosy Filosofii i Psichologii*, book V, 1890.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 1914, book V.

⁷² Fr. O. Khodzitsky, "Professor P. D. Yurkevych," *Vera i Razum*, 1914, 18, 20, 22, 24.

⁷³ See his work *Narysy Istorii Filosofii na Ukraini*, (Prague, 1931), pp. 136-156. He also promised to produce a special study of Yurkevych but this manuscript, as we know, remained unpublished.

but for him, an emigré working in Prague with no resources, the task of publishing the philosopher's legacy was close to impossible. But Chyzhevsky's pioneering endeavour performed the task of reintroducing Yurkevych back to the attention of his native posterity, the Ukrainians. Yuriy Lavrynenko, another Ukrainian scholar, devoted to Yurkevych an article in 1947, but, in general, the unique philosopher was still left in negligence. Only since 1974, as was stated before, on the centenary of Yurkevych's death, has the author of this study started a search for the philosopher's legacy, and, by 1976 the most important philosophic works of Yurkevych were collected, and steps were taken for their publication first, in the original Russian, and then in Ukrainian and English translations. Thus, for the first time, 104 years after the great man's death, the collection of his works will be available for the interested Russian, Ukrainian and English readers.

It is unfortunate that Yurkevych for such a long time was unknown to those for whom his message would be of great value. Yet, he was in a tragic oblivion — first forced into it by, in Solovyov's words, the "underdeveloped minds, overpowered by the theories of materialism," by „charlatanism and deceit”⁷⁴ and by sheer negligence. But on the fresh and daring originality of Yurkevych's thought the whole school of modern Russian philosophy was built, and the power of his thought was not forgotten even in the reigning Marxist circles in Soviet Russia. The way this philosopher is treated in Marxist literature today has not changed from Chernyshevsky's methods. Solovyov today would probably characterize the modern Marxist's attitude to Yurkevych in his own old words: deceit, slander, and charlatanism. We shall have the opportunity to get acquainted with some of these methods later, but now we will deal with a subject of a more pertinent nature.

(c) YURKEVYCH AND THE EMERGENCE OF PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT IN RUSSIA

It would be incorrect to say that there was no philosophic thought in Russia before Yurkevych. In the first part of the nineteenth century and in Yurkevych's time, philosophy in Russian was pursued and advanced by such

⁷⁴ "O Filosofskikh Trudakh P. D. Yurkevicha," *Sobraniye Sochineniy* v. I, p. 187 and 196.

Schools as the Slavophiles, the Westernizers, the Positivists, the Materialists and the Nihilists. All of these Schools included prominent personages. But, except for the materialists who later embraced the Western Marxist formulations, none of the other Schools have left any significant following. It was the loner, Yurkevych, who was destined to plant the seeds for the Russian idealistic thought that was to effect the philosophic development in Russia (and in the West) in the first half of the twentieth century. The Ukrainians were in no position to do more than, from time to time, claim Yurkevych as their own and thus allow him to enrich the treasures of their culture. This seems to be happening now, as it happened before with the "greatest mankind-loving, immortal," Mykola Hohol.⁷⁵ But in the development of a philosophic following for Yurkevych we have done nothing.

The great Russian thinker, Vladimir Solovyov, an acknowledged follower of Yurkevych and his personal friend, was not an easy thinker to follow. The apparent lack of a wide following, in Solovyov's case, was probably due to his peculiar formulation of the concept of the Divine Wisdom (Sophia), and probably to his misunderstood sympathies with the Roman Catholic Church. Thus, he did not initiate any large School of philosophers. Solovyov was too precise in the details of concepts and insights to encourage a large following. But when we turn to his critique of the abstract principles, in his concern with the contemporary, we can hear in him the echoes of his teacher. Let us take a brief look at the most important principles in Solovyov's system. Thus, when we consider his teaching on man we see that "for Solovyov man has three main spiritual principles: Will, Reason, and Emotion."⁷⁶ And now let us place these principles against the three main principles in Yurkevych's philosophy on man:

⁷⁵ This characterization of Hohol was given by none other than the great Ukrainian, Taras Shevchenko. Other Ukrainians refused to have anything to do with Hohol because he wrote mostly in Russian. even though in spirit he remained Ukrainian. Yurkevych also seems to be sharing similar fate. See Shevchenko's letter to Madame Repnina: *Taras Shevchenko*, vol. III, *Dramatychni Tvory, Zhurnal, Lystuvannia*," (Kiev 1949), p. 172 and p. 307.

⁷⁶ On this and concerning a partial exposition of these principles see Dr. Alexander Baran's article "The Concept of the 'Absolute' in the works of Solovyev," *Logos*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, (Yorkton, 1977), pp. 81-82.

The Solovyov's side of the table given here is based on Fr. Baran's elaboration of these three principles.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The genuine religious feeling and clear moral consciousness. | Will... it is the principle of social activity of man... it creates an "integral society" — <i>theocracy</i> . |
| 2. Conscious philosophic meditation on the facts of various experiences. | Reason... it determines the intellectual evolution... it ought to provide an "integral knowledge" — <i>theosophy</i> . |
| 3. Conscious mystical insight on the very essence of truth. | Emotion is the principle of creativity. It ought to lead to the "integral creativity" — <i>theurgy</i> . |

This table shows a striking similarity between the two systems and it should explain the lifelong appreciation of Solovyov towards the philosophic thought of his master. On this we shall leave this matter for the reader's contemplation.

Before going any further we should mention one curious coincidence: Solovyov and many of the later Russian philosophers who in one way or another were followers of Pamphil Yurkevych, started their careers as atheists or Marxists. Solovyov, a declared atheist in his youth, turned back to faith in God while he was studying under Yurkevych (Moscow, 1869-74); the renowned Nicolas Berdyayev (1874-1948) was an active Marxist and on account of this he was exiled in 1898. Later he turned back to faith and became a leading existentialist. For him the "eschatological metaphysics" meant "the maximum experience of human existence" where man realizes himself creatively and thus prepares himself for the coming of the Kingdom of God.⁷⁷ Berdyayev's friend, the late Fr. Sergey Bulgakov (1871-1944) was another young Marxist who later returned to faith, and, like Berdyayev, to the philosophic critique of Marxism. He became another typical "philosopher-theologian," particularly in the development of his concept of the "Sophia" (we met this concept in Solovyov's "Divine Wisdom" — "Sophia"). Bulgakov, like Solovyov, attempted to work out a synthesis between science and philosophy of religion but it was not successful. After Solovyov and Bulgakov, Frank tried to solve this problem but he too was not destined to reach the "promised land" of the Russian spirit-

⁷⁷ See "Aktivno-tvorcheskiy Eschatologism," *O Rabstve i o Svobode Cheloveka*, (Paris 1939), pp. 211-222.

ual synthesis.⁷⁸ This is exactly the synthesis so optimistically proposed in the philosophy of Pamphil Yurkevych.⁷⁹

There is little of Yurkevych's influence on Bulgakov, except that the latter stands in the tradition initiated by the former.

Now let us take a look at other prominent figures in the new tradition of Russian philosophy, S. L. Frank (1877-1950), N. Lossky (1870-1965), A. Losev (1892—) and others who followed the Intuitivistic school. They made a vast contribution to Russian philosophic thought of the twentieth century. This thinking appears to be in line with Yurkevych's intuitivism of the heart.

Yurkevych's conclusion that "it is not the tree of knowledge that is the tree of life"⁸⁰ also is seen as the basis for the later development of the axiological and gnosiological motives in Russian philosophy. Thus, the twentieth century intuitivism and existentialism in Russian philosophy must be traced back to Yurkevych. This fact is acknowledged by the Marxist world,⁸¹ even though the idealistic circles are not so willing to admit it. I will cite one example. Boris Vysheslavtsev (1879-1954) in one of his books published an article on the meaning of the heart in philosophy and in religion. He speaks about the place of the heart in the Bible, in ancient philosophy, and in Indian mysticism; but he completely ignores Yurkevych's philosophy of the heart and quite insignificantly mentions it with Florensky's work in a footnote.⁸² In the footnote Vysheslavtsev says that Yurkevych (in 1860) and Fr. P. Florensky (in 1914) only posed the question on the role of the heart and provided a collection of citations on this matter. Yet Yurkevych's treatise on the meaning of the heart, obviously proves to be much more than Vysheslavtsev is ready to admit.⁸³

⁷⁸ W. W. Zenkovsky, *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*. vol. 2, (Paris, 1950, YMCA-Press), p. 455-456.

⁷⁹ "The Heart . . .," *Trudy*, 1860, I, pp. 117-118.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁸¹ *Philosophskaia Encyclopedia*, (Moscow, 1970), p. 603.

⁸² B. Vysheslavtsev, *Serdtshe* (Paris, YMCA Press, 1929) p. 7; *Vechnoe v Russkoi Filosofii* (New York, 1955) p. 206. Vysheslavtsev probably was misled by Florensky's citation of Yurkevych's work. See Fr. P. Florensky, *Stolp i Utverzhdenie Istiny* (Moscow, 1914) pp. 535-539.

⁸³ One is confronted here with an obvious irony; in the Marxist publications Yurkevych is credited with the development of the philosophy of the heart and for being the founder of the new Christian philosophy as it is expressed in the thoughts of intuitivism, personalism and existentialism. On this, for example, *Philosophska-*

ya *Encyclopedia* book 5, published in Moscow in 1970, on pp. 602-603 makes the following assertion:

(Yurkevych) "develops his Christian teaching on the heart as the deepest ground of the human being and as the spiritual and moral source of vital activity. It is in the life of the heart — experiences, emotions and reactions, — and not in the thought with its form of generality that the individuality of the person is expressed. On these positions Yurkevych takes his stand against the idea of autonomy of reason which was the basis of the German classic philosophy and against modern intellectualism that recognized the essence of the human being in the rational principle. Yurkevych insists that 'the tree of knowledge is not the tree of life,' — reason is only the top and not the root of man's spiritual life. In accordance to his anthropological teaching he develops his gnosiology: knowledge, according to Yurkevych, originates as a result of the activity of the soul, bound with its whole disposition, and spiritually moral aspiration; only after having penetrated the heart, knowledge can be made one's own. These axiological and gnosiological motives relate the process of Yurkevych's thought to some initial intuitions of much later philosophic trends — *philosophy of life, existentialism and personalism*. Yurkevych's proposition of the concrete knowledge that forms the manner of man's existence, against the abstract thinking, became the characteristic of Russian religious and existential thought of the late 19th and 20th centuries.

"Yurkevych stands at the very beginning of Russian 'concrete' idealism, that later was developed by Solovyov, Trubetskoi brothers and others. In his work 'Reason according to the teaching of Plato and experience according to the teaching of Kant'... Yurkevych inclines to the idealism of Plato considering, nevertheless, that for the transference from the ideal being to the real being one needs not only the logical idea (Hegel) or the 'substance' (Plato) but the individually (personally) 'existing,' which transforms that, what can be (idea) into that, what is, (reality). Changing platonism in the spirit of personalistic (theistic) understanding of the Absolute, Yurkevych parts with panlogism of Hegel (as abstract idealism) and with pantheistic and personless idealism of Plato."

But besides V. Solovyov, N. Lossky, V. Zenkovsky, other Russian thinkers — Frank, Vysheslavtsev, Berdyaev, etc., whose philosophy is penetrated with the ideas and problems initially expressed and introduced by Yurkevych — they do not mention their Ukrainian predecessor at all. Vysheslavtsev seems to follow the method of Chernyshevsky; he degrades Yurkevych's work on the heart, probably, not having read it, otherwise he could not have made the statement that it is only an "introduction of the problem and a collection of citations" ("Znachenie serdtsa v filosofii i v psichologii," *Vechnoye v Ruskoj Filosofii*, (N. Y., 1955), p. 206.

Yurkevych becomes the subject of similar treatment by Berdyaev, — as if the former did not exist at all. Berdyaev's philosophy is overloaded with Yurkevych's problems and ideas; he even states that his most favorite philosopher was the beloved philosopher of Yurkevych — German mystic Jacob Boehme, and interestingly enough, his attractions to the German philosopher are the very same as those of Yurkevych. (See the autobiographic work of Berdyaev, *Samosoznanie* (Paris, 1949) pp. 106, 110, 195, 369). As an illustration, let us take a look at the following words of Berdyaev:

"All the time I was struggling against monophysitism in all its forms. But, I at all times loved and appreciated the German mysticism, respecting it as one of the greatest phenomenon in the history of the spirit. From among the great German mystics, more than any other, I loved J. Boehme. For me he had enormous signi-

There are individuals among the Russian emigré circles who do speak about Yurkevych's influences on their modern thinking, and they do it with due recognition. Fr. V. V. Zenkovsky and professor Nicolas O. Lossky acknowledge this influence in their histories of Russian philosophy.⁸⁴ Fr. V. V. Zenkovsky (also professor of philosophy) speaks about Yurkevych's philosophy very admirably and at the same time expresses regrets over the unwarranted neglect of the philosopher and of his works. Yet, whether acknowledged and recognized or not, Pamphil Yurkevych does appear on the horizon of the philosophic development in Eastern Europe as a unique figure. He stands out as a man of keen philosophic insight and of courage. And he, as a thinker, cannot be denied recognition of the significant role he played in the past, nor can he be denied his influence in shaping the concrete idealistic thought after his time.

The best known Russian thinker in the West, obviously, is Nicolas Berdyaev; he is renowned for his Christian existentialism, for his concern with the concrete individual, the personality and the problem of man's freedom. Yet, the concerns we find in Berdyaev's philosophy were the concerns of Yurkevych who gave them definite expression in such works as his treatise on the meaning of the heart, on the spirit of man, etc. Now, if we can accept Professor N. Lossky's statement that the modern Russian Christian philosophy and world conception begun more than a hundred years ago and that it called out a whole galaxy of religious philosophers,⁸⁵ then we must admit that not only V. Solovyov, but also his master, Pamphil Danylovych Yurkevych, stands at the head of this list of thinkers.

ficance. I always mention him in my prayers together with Dostoyevsky and some other favorites. The mystical gnosis of J. Boehme possessed semitico-cabalistic coloring and therefore the problem of man had for him a special meaning."

At this point, adhering to the scientific objectivity, one finds himself in this arbitrary situation: one cannot say that these thinkers were misinformed; one also cannot charge them with being purposefully biased against Yurkevych. Most of the discussed men were renowned personalities... But Yurkevych, nevertheless, was ignored.

⁸⁴ Fr. V. V. Zenkovsky, *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*, vol. I. & II, (Paris, 1950);

N. O. Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy*, (New York, 1951).

⁸⁵ Nicolas O. Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy*, (New York, 1951), p. 247.

At this stage and in the light of the foregoing illustrations one can quite naturally pose the following questions:

1. In what shape would Russian philosophic thought be and what heights would it have reached without the pioneering efforts of Pamphil Yurkevych?

2. Vladimir Solovyov is recognized as one of the great philosophers. Would there be a Solovyov as we know him without Yurkevych who had shaped his thinking and gave him the foundation for his philosophic deliberations and formulations to which Solovyov himself seems to testify?

These, indeed, may be provocative questions but they are worth some consideration.

V. YURKEVYCH IN THE SECOND PART OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

(a) THE GROWTH OF INTEREST IN THE NEGLECTED PHILOSOPHER

It seems ironic that many great men in the history of mankind gained recognition only after a tragic fate had played its part in their lives. Let us just recall the end of Socrates, Cicero, or even Galileo, Copernicus, and many others to call the bitterness of this irony to our mind. Yurkevych (even if it would look presumptuous to speak of his greatness) did not escape his share of a similar fate. He had much to offer his groping contemporaries; he knew what they were looking for and what they needed; and he was man enough to tell them this truth. But, he was silenced by falsehood and ignorance, and purposely neglected. Then, branded with the powerful label of "mrakobiessiye" (an enemy of progress and culture) he was avoided even by those who did not follow the "forces of progress."

To repeat our earlier allegation, Yurkevych's philosophy seems to have begun to attract positive attention in 1914, on the threshold of the Great Revolution, but there was no hope for it during or after the Revolution, with the militant Marxists in power. The disillusioned followers of Marx, like Berdyaev, Frank, and Bulgakov, returned to the Christian faith and criticised Marxism, at the same time not deeming it wise to acknowledge that they were following in the footsteps of the ostracized philosopher, Yurkevych. In the late 1920's, Yurkevych became the object of study by the Ukrainian scholar, Dmytro Chyzhevsky, who, as an emigré, was working in Prague. Thus, it was Chyzhevsky who was instrumental in arousing interest in Yurkevych among the Ukrainians in the diaspora. We have spoken already of Yuriy Lavrynenko's essay (1947) on

Yurkevych,⁸⁶ and of some brief, mostly biographical accounts about the philosopher on the occasion of the centenary of his death.

My interest in Yurkevych was aroused accidentally, by sympathy and curiosity. Looking for some material on the Ukrainian baroque in the Ukrainian Concise Encyclopedia I came across a short note on Yurkevych. This forgotten and neglected philosopher aroused my particular sympathy. It was the time when I begun to contemplate on the concept of Pastoral Anthropology, thus Yurkevych's anthropology became of particular interest to me. I started to look for more information, and, on the advice of professor S. Pohorily, in Chyzhevsky's work I found a list of Yurkevych's philosophic works with information as to when and where they were published. In the Spring of 1974 I began the search for this material. By the Summer of 1976 the collection was completed and in my possession. The news about my research was publicized, and a fresh interest in the philosopher was expressed both in the press and verbally. Hopes were voiced about having this collection published in Ukrainian translation. These hopes may materialize in the near future. Now we should end here with a note that Yurkevych arouses interest not only in his sympathizers; his critics also are on the rise.

(b) THE MATERIALISTIC CRITIQUE OF YURKEVYCH

After World War II, in the Soviet publications although only sporadically, Marxist criticism of Yurkevych was resumed and appeared in various encyclopedias and in histories of philosophy. In one Ukrainian publication, devoted to the studies of ideological quests in Ukraine in the nineteenth century, Yurkevych's philosophy is discussed in a whole chapter.⁸⁷ Except for the Moscow edition of the *Philosophskaia Encyclopedia* (1970) book 5, where the criticism of Yurkevych is mild and the information to some extent acceptable, all other publications subject the philosopher to quite an unscholarly criticism. Scientific criteria, even in its Marxist-Leninist conception, does not seem to

⁸⁶ Lavrynenko obviously bases his essay on Chyzhevsky's material on Yurkevych, as he does not seem to have had any access to Yurkevych's works in the originals.

⁸⁷ V. Hubenko, "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini." *Borotba mizh Materialismom ta Idealismom na Ukraini v XIX st.*, (Kiev 1964).

be binding for them. Here again we meet with Chernyshevsky's method of slander and ridicule. But all this reaction to Yurkevych, in its own way, points to the weight of his thought and to the apparent danger it still represents to Marxism and its philosophy. Thus, it seems, that Yurkevych cannot be ignored anymore but must be brought back before public attention and his system critically analyzed. For the sake of interest, here are some examples of Hubenko's critique of Yurkevych, cited from his essay "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini," ("From the History of Idealistic Philosophy in Ukraine.")

Yurkevych's discussion of Plato and Kant is treated by Hubenko in, obviously, a light and contemptuous manner. He scorns Yurkevych's efforts to synthesize his own gnosiology on borrowed ideas of these thinkers, and tells us that the only scientific basis for any philosophic interpretation and synthesis is offered by the Marxist-Leninist philosophy.⁸⁸ Hubenko goes on to say that Yurkevych is an irreconcilable enemy of materialism... many of the materialistic positions he twists unwittingly... nowhere does he cite the true statements of L. Feuerbach, or other materialists...⁸⁹ Further, he was not a worthy opponent of any polemics... and his material did not contain anything worthy of a serious scientific discussion.⁹⁰ Yurkevych was a philosopher-idealist even though not a noteworthy thinker, but he was an active opponent of progress in philosophy and politics and this is why he was remembered by the bourgeois ideologists and was used by them. He is highly esteemed by the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists... but, the war of ideas has its objective logics... it picks up from the past anything outlived, everything rotten and dead it chooses for its reinforcement. Thus, the theistic philosophy of Yurkevych, and his likes, with its unscientific approach now attracts the attention of the bourgeois ideologists.⁹¹ Thus, Yurkevych is judged by the spokesman of Marxism, Hubenko.

⁸⁸ B. Hubenko, "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini," *Borotba mizh Materializmom ta Idealizmom na Ukraini v XIX st.*, (Kiev 1964), p. 108-109.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 114.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 117.

⁹¹ B. Hubenko, "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini," *Borotba mizh Materializmom ta Idealizmom na Ukraini v XIX st.*, (Kiev 1964), pp. 119-120.

(c) YURKEVYCH IN THE EVALUATION OF CHRISTIAN
IDEALISM

It, indeed, is questionable whether the "bourgeois" attraction to Yurkevych's philosophy can present any threat to Marxist ideology at large, or to its system in the USSR; and there is no evidence that Yurkevych is being read or studied by a number of people large enough to pose any political danger to the Soviet Union. But, judging by the negative, and, as it seems, unprovoked reaction to this thinker, one can come to the conclusion that Yurkevych's Christian philosophy must still be powerful enough to cause discomfort and arouse cautious attention.

Although Yurkevych was accused of servilism,⁹² his interests were not in politics. He was a Christian thinker, a very well oriented philosopher, and from this derives his worth. Indeed, he is valued for his Christian idealism, for his humane concerns, and for the formulation of a philosophy which could help resolve the plight of mankind in Yurkevych's time as well as in the present. Yurkevych came out with his definition of the concrete human being that, if considered and accepted, would much enhance his reputation today. When he spoke for a social system that would respect the right of man and thus guarantee his freedom for a personal development and a free exercise of his responsibilities, he must have had some democratic system in his mind. Yurkevych stood far away from any suspicion of servilism.

In the appraisal of those who had the opportunity to get acquainted with Yurkevych's thought he is seen as a Christian thinker and he is credited with sowing the seeds of Christian existentialism in Eastern Europe. The brilliant Christian philosopher, V. Solovyov, owed his return to Christianity, and his idealistic philosophy, to his teacher, Yurkevych. He admired the philosopher and valued the worth and depth of his thought. But in his own time Yurkevych was not successful, although his tragedy was not due only to the popular radicalism of his time; it was due to the inability of his contemporaries to comprehend him. Fr. V. V. Zenkovsky, a philosopher and member of the Paris group of Russian thinkers, in his evaluation of Yurkevych, said:

⁹² Ibid., p. 112.

"Yurkevych, definitely, was far ahead of his time and there is no wonder why he had an influence on V. Solovyov. It is regrettable that the remarkable works of Yurkevych are almost completely unavailable to the reader —they were never reprinted. But when the time will come and his works will be collected and published, his deep insights will return to life in Russian thought. In particular, I must underline his formulations in the spirit of concrete idealism."⁹³

Many will agree with the remark of the late Fr. Vasil'y V. Zenkovsky in giving recognition to Yurkevych and in hoping that his philosophy will come alive. This is our hope. Now let us take a look at Yurkevych's philosophy as it is reflected in the thought of some thinkers in the West.

(d) THE SIMILARITY TO YURKEVYCH'S THOUGHT IN WESTERN THINKERS

There is no basis on which one can speak of the influence that Yurkevych could have had on any thinker in the West, but it appears to be a fact that he was pursuing some problems simultaneously as they were being dealt with in Western Europe; and in at least one case his philosophy preceded the Western thinkers by half a century. The appearance of the existential approach in Christian thought seems to have occurred at the same time in Western and in Eastern Europe, and, in that, as a spontaneous reaction to the existing state of events and to the needs of man. We already mentioned the similarity of Yurkevych's concerns, later defined as the existential preoccupation with man, to those of Kierkegaard. But in the concentration on the meaning of the heart, that was central in Yurkevych's philosophy, the West had to wait for the German thinker, Max Scheler (1874-1928) and his theory of *emotional intuitivism*, formulated over fifty years after Yurkevych.

The emergence of the existential awareness in Christian thought, apparently, simultaneously and independently in different parts of Europe proves to be an interesting phenomenon, worthy of special attention; this may be possible when Yurkevych's works are available to the inte-

⁹³ V. V. Zenkovsky, *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*, vol. I, (YMCA-Press, Paris 1948), p. 321.

rested student. Citing this phenomenon as indeed interesting, we shall leave it at that with the hope that time and unbiased study may eventually readjust slightly the chart of the emergence of the existential thought; then, due recognition may be given to Yurkevych for his pioneering contribution. His works can prove beyond doubt that he does deserve some acknowledgement in this area.

Apart from that, it seems that Yurkevych's philosophic insights can help in bringing harmony in the conflicting spheres of the vertical and the horizontal components in explaining the mystery, the life, and the needs of modern man.

At this point it should be pointed out that Western thinkers were indeed introduced to some of Yurkevych's philosophy through his followers, particularly, through V. Solovyov and N. Berdyaev. However, it was only Solovyov, who near his death in 1900, acknowledged Yurkevych and spoke about his teacher gratefully, devoting to him his essay "Tri Kharakteristiki" (Three Characteristics). Therein Solovyov speaks about the central point in Yurkevych's gnosiology, which we discussed earlier. According to Yurkevych's teachings, man can achieve the highest knowledge through 1. Heartfelt religious feeling, 2. Sincere and conscious philosophic meditation, and 3. Sincere and conscious mystical insight. And then, Solovyov reminds us, only on the basis of the final agreement among the conclusions of these three principles, will access to the highest knowledge be possible. Solovyov philosophized on the basis of these principles and through his works they were opened to the West.

Another indirect route for Yurkevych's ideas to the West was through Christian existentialism of Nicolai Berdyaev, who is probably the most widely read Eastern European philosopher in the world. He thinks in different categories but, in his concern about the concrete individual, he is treading in the steps of Yurkevych. There is no doubt that there are definite connections between the thought of Yurkevych and Berdyaev, but the extent of Berdyaev's indebtedness to Yurkevych still remains to be more deeply investigated.

When we turn to the central theme in Yurkevych's thought, to the philosophy of the heart, the situation ap-

pears to be more definite. This problem begins to occupy a prominent place in modern philosophy with the German thinker Max Scheler (1874-1928). In the twenties of our century, B. Vysheslavitsev dealt with the problem of the heart in both Indian and Christian mysticism.⁹⁴ He worked in Paris but there is no evidence for his eventual influence on any thinker in Western Europe. But we indeed find that the problem of the "emotional intuitivism" was very important in Max Scheler's philosophy. According to Scheler, man's "feeling is an intentional mental act directed upon objective values and to bringing them into the subject's consciousness."⁹⁵ Scheler's theory of "emotional intuitivism" was worked out in his book *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik* (1913, 1916). Whether Scheler was informed about Yurkevych's theory of the heart we don't know; but he was influential enough to draw the attention of many philosophers to the "logic of the heart," which was so important not only for Yurkevych but for other Ukrainian thinkers.⁹⁶

At the conclusion we should say that if Yurkevych was not very influential in his time, it is evident enough that the ideas he was wrestling with in the fifties and sixties of the nineteenth century, engaged the minds of prominent thinkers in Western Europe fifty to eighty years later.

Therefore, some comparative study of Yurkevych and such Western thinkers as Max Scheler, and particularly, Karl Jasper (1883-1969) with his insistence on man's uniqueness and on his value as a free being; comparative study of Yurkevych's concept about the intellectual and spiritual development of man with the teaching of the Swiss psychologist, Carl Jung (1875-1961) about the development of personality — the individuation of man; or the American theologian-realist, Reinhold Niebuhr (1892-1971), definitely would prove philosophically fruitful, and morally rewarding.

⁹⁴ See his *The Heart of Man in the Indian and Christian Mysticism* (YMCA Press, Paris 1929).

⁹⁵ N. O. Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy*, (International University Press, Inc., New York, 1951), p. 385.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

VI. CONCLUSION

(a) YURKEVYCH AND THE SEARCH FOR AN ACCEPTABLE PHILOSOPHY TODAY

The foregoing reflections on the person of Yurkevych and on the main points of his thinking are sufficient to reveal the predominant problems of Pamphil Yurkevych's philosophic interest as well as the reason for his lifelong intellectual struggle. It appears beyond doubt that the central concern of Yurkevych is ultimate truth including truth about man, the concrete individual, and his relation to the values that stand over and beyond our world and time.

Yurkevych was a Christian thinker and he thought in concrete terms. He saw that the ultimate and the eternal reveal themselves in the conscious experience of the individual, in the mysterious depth of man's heart and this became the central problem in his philosophy. The heart with its faculties to feel and to use reason is seen as the focal point where man becomes complete in his spiritual uniqueness. This was very important to Yurkevych and it became the predominant approach to man in the latter part of the nineteenth and in the twentieth centuries.

The importance of Yurkevych's philosophy also rests on another conviction: he does not determine man's uniqueness and his personal value on the deduction of the individual from the group; but to the contrary, he subjects the worth of the collective man on the unique value of the concrete individual.⁹⁷ This was the crying warning of the philosopher against the dehumanizing philosophy of rationalism, mechanistic progress, the later proletarianization and the popular animalization of man. Thus, the concrete, the spiritual, and the eternal worth of the unique individual

⁹⁷ P. D. Yurkevych, "The Heart," *Trudy* . . . , 1860, pp. 93-95; "Iz Nauki o Chelovecheskom Dukhe," *Trudy* . . . , 1860. III, p. 426.

and his destiny became the ultimate concern of Yurkevych and his concern alone points to the importance and the significance of his thought.

Of course, Yurkevych was thinking in the context of his time—the third quarter of the nineteenth century; but the subject of his thought was man, the phenomenon of universal concern and eternal value. He spoke of man, of the importance of his consciousness and self-awareness; of his longing and striving to the truth, to the perception of the mystery and the meaning of his concrete existence. In fact, Yurkevych spoke for the true worth of man and against false notions about him; his philosophy was sound and correct and as such it can be accepted as a true philosophy, the Christian philosophy of universal value that can be useful to modern man.

In our time of prevailing spiritual confusion, of man's questioning of himself, "Who am I?", "Why am I?", Yurkevych's philosophy of the concrete Christian idealism with its sober yet noble look at man and his existence can prove to be, at least a part of, the answer to modern man's questioning of himself. Many have already turned to similar propositions and many are accepting them today, even though in different formulations. In the same manner Yurkevych's Christian idealism with its existential overtone can be accepted, first of all, by many of our strayed or confused contemporaries. The spiritual needs of modern man are widely spoken of and painfully felt; some try to fulfil them by mere cultural means, some turn to various humanistic programs and propositions, and yet only the searching, the thoughtful and the willing will realize that Yurkevych indeed offers propositions so desperately needed today.

Yurkevych bases his philosophy on Christian principles and hence his philosophic propositions appeal first to those concerned with Christian idealism and with the Christian approach to man. There are many among the idealistically concerned who are frustrated — frustrated with the so often dehumanizing systems that, ironically, by form and content, profess to be Christian. The concrete Christian idealism of Yurkevych, his concern for the individual human being, his realistic but positive approach to man's existence and his insistence on the unique worth of the in-

dividual, certainly can put heart into both, the idealistically frustrated, the secularized, or those caught-up in the prevailing overt formalism of our day.

It seems obvious that the value and significance of Yurkevych's thought can be appreciated, primarily, by the spiritually alert; but it is also true that Yurkevych has something to offer to those who are spiritually numb. In Yurkevych's philosophy there is a positive challenge, particularly to the frustrated, but, yet, courageous, men of our time. It spoke to his confused contemporaries as is evidenced in this study (see part (a), chapter III, and remember Yurkevych's influence of V. Solovyov) and it has something to offer to our contemporaries — to the total man with his most important spiritual faculties: the heart, and reason (see the table in part (c), chapter IV of this study.) It deserves serious contemplation.

Historically, Yurkevych stands at the head of a great chorus, as one of the first few, modern thinkers whose main concern was (and still is) the mystery of man. He left behind him some clear definitions, for this area of man's concern, that can benefit and enrich us all; the spiritually alert and struggling, the spiritually discouraged and frustrated, and the spiritually lost but searching. Honesty and genuineness in this area would inevitably compel us all to take Yurkevych, on the one hand, seriously and, on the other hand, gratefully.

(b) THE CHALLENGE TO REVIVE A FORGOTTEN LEGACY

However unnatural and ironical it may be, it is indeed fortunate that the works of Pamphil Danylovych Yurkevych for the first time will be available for the study, professional evaluation and an unbiased scientific critique of a wide circle of people not in his native Ukraine, or Russia where most of his works presumably are kept, but in Canada. Now it will be possible to study Yurkevych in his original texts, at first in Russian, and later in Ukrainian, and eventually in English translations. It is our duty to recall Yurkevych back home and to claim his legacy for the enrichment of our Ukrainian culture and for the enrichment of thought on man in the whole world. We believe that our philosopher has something to contribute to the universal study of man; but the challenge to introduce

Yurkevych to the world is ours. As a matter of fact, the legacy of P. Yurkevych still awaits a Ukrainian translator to make him accessible to the Ukrainian reader and student. As a thinker, Yurkevych deserves the attention of people from all quarters: the general public, the students of the history of Ukrainian thought, the philosophers, theologians, and all searchers and lovers of truth. Pamphil Yurkevych provides helpful sources for all those mentioned, as can be seen from this study, and this can be verified by consulting Yurkevych's works; they are highly recommended as being capable of spiritually enriching a wide circle of people.

In conclusion, the author of this study and editor of the first collection of Pamphil Danylovych Yurkevych's works again repeats that he does not consider himself an authority for the undertaken task, but he cannot deny that he has derived a certain sense of satisfaction for having initiated what hopefully will lead to the more profound study and evaluation of Yurkevych by qualified people, the philosophers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

YURKEVYCH, Pamphil D., "Ideia" (The Idea), published in the *Journal of the Ministry of National Education*, 1959, X, XI.

- "Materializm i Zadachi Philosophii" (Materialism and the Duties of Philosophy), *ibid.* 1860, III.
- "Serdtsse i Yeho Znachenie v Dukhovnoi Zhizni Cheloveka, po Ucheniu Slova Bozhia" (The Heart and Its Meaning in the Spiritual Life of Man according to the Word of God), *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, 1860. I.
- "Mir s Blizhnimi kak Uslovie Christianskaho Obschezhitia" (Peace with Fellow Men as the Condition of Christian Community (or Fellowship), *ibid.*, 1861, III.
- "Iz Nauki o Chelovecheskom Dukhe" (From Teaching on the Spirit of Man), *ibid.*, III.
- "Po Povodu Statey Bohoslovskaho Soderzhania, Pomeschenykh v Philosophskom Lexikone" (On Account of the Articles of Theological Contents, published in the Lexicon of Philosophy), *ibid.*, 1861, I, II.
- "Dokazatelstva Bytia Bozhia" (Proofs of the Existence of God), *ibid.*, 1861, III, IV, V.
- "Yazyk Fiziologov i Psichologov" (The Language of the Physiologists and the Psychologists), *Russkiy Vestnik*, 1862. IV, V, VI, VIII.
- "Razum po Ucheniu Platona i Opyt po Ucheniu Kanta" (Reason according to the Teaching of Plato and Experience according the Teaching of Kant), *Moskovskia Universitetskia Izvestia*, 1865/6, V.
- "Ihra Podspudnykh Sil" (The Play of the Hidden Forces), *Russkiy Vestnik*, 1870, IV.

The two books on education:

- *Chtenia o Vospitanii* (Readings on Education), Moscow, 1865, pp. 272.
- *Kurs Obschey Pedagogiki* (The Course of General Pedagogics), Moscow, 1869, pp. 404.

- SOLOVYOV, V., "O Filosofskikh Trudakh P. D. Yurkevicha", *Sobranie Sochineniy* vol. I. "Tri Kharakteristiki", *ibid.*, vol. VIII.
- BARAN, Alexander, Dr., "The Concept of the 'Absolute' in the Works of Solovyev," *Logos*, vol. XXVIII, No. 2, Yorkton, Sask., 1977.
- BERDYAEV, Nicholas, *The Destiny of Man*. (Harper & Row, Publishers, New York. 1960), pp. 310.
- *Dostoevsky*, trans. by Donald Attwater. (Meridian Books, The World Publishing Co., Cleveland and New York, 1957), pp. 228.
 - *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, (Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, 1961), pp. 131.
 - *Philosophia Svobodnago Dukha* (Philosophy of the Free Spirit), (YMCA Press, Paris. n.d.), pp. 236.
 - *O Rabstve i Svobode Cheloveka* (Paris 1939).
 - *Ya i Mir Obyektov* (Paris).
 - *Samosoznanie*, Paris, 1949.
- CHYZHEVSKY, Dmytro, *Narysy z Istorii Filosofii na Ukraini*. (Prague, 1931).
- *Philosophia H. S. Skovorody*, (Warsaw, 1934), pp. 224.
- EDIE, James M. and others, *Russian Philosophy*, vol. III, (Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1965), pp. 521.
- FLORENSKY, Fr. P., *Stolp i utverzhdenie Istyny*, Moscow 1914, 535-9.
- FRANK, S. L., *Realnost' i Chelovek* (Reality and Man), the Metaphysics of Man's Being. (YMCA Press, Paris, 1956), pp. 416.
- *Smysl Zhizni* (The Sense of Life), (YMCA Press, Paris), pp. 171.
- HUBENKO, B., "Z Istorii Idealistychnoi Filosofii na Ukraini," *Borotba mizh Materializmom ta Idealizmom na Ukraini v XIX st.* (Kiev, 1964), pp. 107-120.
- HRYPORIV, N., *Ukrainska Natsionalna Vdacha* (The Ukrainian National Character), (Ukrainian Publishing Co. of Canada, Winnipeg, Man., 1941), pp. 61.
- KIERKEGAARD, Soren, *Edifying Discourses*, (First Harper Torchbook. 1958), pp. 265.
- KHODZITSKY, Fr. A., "Prof. Filosofii P. D. Yurkevych," *Vera i Razum*. 1924, 18-24.
- KOLUBOVSKY, J. N., "Materialy dla Istorii Filosofii v Rossii," *Voprosy Filosofii i Psichologii*, 1890, book 5.
- LAVRYNENKO, Y. (Yuriy Dyvnych), "Viaduk u Maybutne," *Litavry*, No. 1, (Salzburg, 1947), pp. 57-67.

- LOSSKY, Nicholas O., *History of Russian Philosophy*, (International University Press, Inc., New York, 1951), pp. 416.
- MULLER, Herbert J., "Kierkegaard and Dostoevski," *Religion and Freedom in the Modern World*, (Phoenix Books. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1965), pp. 46-66.
- SCHMEMANN, Alexander, *Ultimate Questions — An Anthology of Modern Russian Religious Thought*, (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, 1965), pp. 310.
- SHEVCHENKO, Taras, vol III, *Dramatychni Tvory, Zhurnal, Lystuvannia*. (Kiev, 1949), pp. 172, 307.
- SHPET, H. H., "Philosophskoe nasledie P. D. Yurkevycha", *Voprosy Filosofii i Psichologii*, 1914.
- SKOVORODA, H. S., *Hryhoriy Skovoroda — Tvory v dvokh tomakh*, vol. I & II, (Kiev, 1961).
- VYSHESLAVTSEV, B. P., *Serdtsse* (YMCA Press, Paris, 1929); *Viechnoie v Russkoi Filosofii*, (Izdatielstvo im. Chekhova, New York, 1955).
- ZENKOVSKY, V. V., *Istoria Russkoi Filosofii*, vol. I & II, (YMCA Press, Paris, 1948 and 1950).

REFERENCES;

Istoria Russkoi Filosofii, Moscow 1961.

Encyclopedicheskiy Slovar (Efron & Brokhauz, 1903). vol. 68 & 81.

Philosophskaia Encyclopedia, (Moscow, 1970).

Ukrainska Radianska Encyclopedia, vol. 16 (Kiev 1964), pp. 127-131, 439.

Ukraine — A Concise Encyclopedia, vol. I, (University of Toronto Press, 1963), pp. 953-959.

Z Istorii Philosophskoi Dumky na Ukraini, (Naukova Dumka, Kiev 1965), pp. 191.

Nechuj-Levytsky, Ivan, *Khmary* (Trident Press, Winnipeg 1952).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

The author of the introductory treatise, and also the editor of the first collection of Yurkevych's works, is, at present, a priest of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada. Stephan Jarmus was born in 1925 in the village of Lidykhiw, near Pochaev in Volyn, Western Ukraine. He completed his pastoral training in London, England in 1956, and achieved his Licentiate in Theology at St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg in 1962.

After a number of years as an editor of various publications, he returned to his studies and in 1974 he acquired his B.A. degree at the University of Manitoba and his B.D. at St. Andrew's College (on submission of a B.D. thesis), and immediately began his Master's program in the Inter-faith Pastoral Institute at the University of Winnipeg. In 1977 he received his STM, and in 1978 began his doctoral studies at the San Francisco Theological Seminary in California.

Rev. S. Jarmus is the author of a number of publications, namely: Metropolitan Ilarion and his Methodology of Scholarly Work, (1972), A Contribution to the Thoughts on Contemporary Pastorship, (1975), "Charismatism," (1975), and The Problem of Pastoral Calling, (1978).

In addition to his being a practising pastor, and continuing his doctoral studies, Fr. S. Jarmus is engaged in the development of the concept of Pastoral Anthropology as well as in the teaching of Pastoral Theology and Homiletics in the Theological Department, and the History of Eastern Christianity in the Art Department at St. Andrew's College, University of Manitoba.

He is married to Constance Houghton, and they are blessed with a fifteen year old son, Andrew.

St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg

University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

A Ukrainian Canadian College

sponsored by

The Ukrainian Greek-Orthodox Church of Canada

PROGRAM OF STUDIES

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY

BIBLICAL STUDIES

- T.091 — *Sacred History*: An introduction to the content of the Bible.
- T.101 — *Old Testament*: A survey of the history, literature, and religion of Israel.
- T.201 — *Old Testament*: Study of the Prophets.
- T.301 — *New Testament*: Study of the Gospels.
- T.401 — *New Testament*: Life and faith of the early Christian community.
- T.501 — *New Testament*: Study of the main aspects of the New Testament theology.
- T.601 — *Biblical Studies*: Guided reading and research.
- T.611 — *Biblical Studies*: Guided reading and research.
- T.092 — *Christianity Through the Ages*: An introduction to the history of the Church (East and West).
- T.102 — *Church History*: History of the Church from the Apostolic Age to the Fall of Constantinople.
- T.202 — *Church History*: History of the Church from 1453 to the present times.
- T.302 — *Church History*: The Ukrainian Orthodox Church.
- T.412 — *Patristics*: The Great Christian Writers, Fathers, and Doctors of the Church.

- T.602 — *Studies in Church History*: Guided reading and research.
- T.612 — *Studies in Church History*: Guided reading and research.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

- T.093 — *Orthodox Christian Doctrine*: Basic beliefs of the Orthodox Christian Church.
- T.103 — *Dogmatics*: Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.
- T.203 — *Dogmatics*: The Christian Doctrine of God.
- T.303 — *Dogmatics*: Cosmology and Christology.
- T.313 — *Ethics*: Issues in Christian Ethics.
- T.403 — *Dogmatics*: Ecclesiology and Eschatology.
- T.413 — *Canon Law*: Issues in Orthodox Ecclesiology.
- T.503 — *Comparative Theology*: A comparative study of Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant Theology.
- T.603 — *Studies in Theology*: Guided reading and research.
- T.613 — *Studies in Theology*: Guided reading and research.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

- T.094 — *Orthodox Christian Worship*: An introduction to the liturgical life of the Church.
- T.104 — *Liturgics*: The liturgical year: daily, weekly, and yearly cycle of services.
(Practical study of Typikon).
- T.114 — *Pastoral Theology*: The Eastern Orthodox Pastoralology.
- T.204 — *Liturgics*: Sacraments and Sacramentalia.
(Practical study of the Typikon).
- T.214 — *Pastoral Theology*: The Eastern Orthodox Ministry in its Liturgical Context.
(Field work).
- T.304 — *Liturgical Theology*: Origin and historic development of the Christian worship. The Typikon. A detailed examination of liturgical elements. The Orthodox Christian liturgy as a whole.
(Liturgical practicum).

- T.314 — *Pastoral Theology*: Basic principles of Orthodox Christian Religious Education.
(Field work).
- T.414 — *Pastoral Theology*: The Eastern Orthodox Ministry in the Context of Christian Life.
(Methods of Pastoral Counselling).
(Field work).
- T.424 — *Homiletics*: Teaching and Preaching in the Church.
(Theoretical considerations).
- T.524 — *Homiletics*: Teaching and Preaching in the Church.
(Practicum).
- T.604 — *Liturgical and Pastoral Studies*: Guided reading and research.
- T.614 — *Liturgical and Pastoral Studies*: Guided reading and research.

CHURCH MUSIC

- T.095 — *Introduction to Church Music*: Basic Elements of Music Theory.
- T.105 — *Church Music*: Contemporary Ukrainian Chant: "Samoilka".
- T.205 — *Church Music*: Contemporary Ukrainian Chant "Kyivskyi".
- T.305 — *Church Music*: A survey of Ukrainian Church Music.
- T.605 — *Studies in Church Music*: Chosen topics and research.
- T615 — *Studies in Church Music*: Chosen topics and research.

DISSERTATION

- T.620 — *Thesis*.

FACULTY OF ARTS
(UKRAINIAN STUDIES)

LANGUAGE

- 52.091 *Introductory Ukrainian*
- 52.127 *Conversational Ukrainian*
- 52.349 *Church Slavic in Ukrainian Redaction*

LITERATURE

- 52.242 *Ukrainian Canadian Literature*
- 52.243 *Ukrainian Canadian Folklore*
- 52.352 *Ukrainian Polemical Literature*

RELIGION

- 20.135 *History of Eastern Christianity*
- 20.252 *Eastern Christianity in North America*
- 20.253 *Eastern Christianity in the Contemporary World*
- 20.357 *Major Thinkers in the Eastern Christian Tradition*

HISTORY

- 11.255 *History of Ukraine*
- 11.390 *Modern Ukrainian History*
- 11.391 *Ukrainians in Canada*

GEOGRAPHY

- 53.360 *Geography of Ukraine*

POLITICAL STUDIES

- 19.280 *Government, Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine*

ART

- 54.374 *History of Byzantine Art*
- 99.310 *Ukrainian Arts in Canada*

CORRECTION: Please note that on page 78 between the lines beginning with T.611 and T.092 the subtitle *HISTORY AND PATRISTICS* is omitted.

