



---

Dmytro Doroshenko, 1882-1951

Author(s): Nicholas Chubaty

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 30, No. 74 (Dec., 1951), pp. 257-260

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4204303>

Accessed: 16/06/2014 04:08

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Arbusow, both as a scholar and as a man, had many virtues, not the least of which were his love of truth, his sense of justice, his modesty, and his simple and patient courage. The "unverbrüchliche Vornehmheit seiner Gesinnung," which Dr. Trillhaas rightly emphasises, will make his loss felt and lamented even in those circles which did not share his views.

London.

W. K. MATTHEWS.

## DMYTRO DOROSHENKO

1882-1951

DMYTRO IVANOVYCH DOROSHENKO, Ukrainian historian, statesman, and former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukraine, died in Munich on 19 March 1951. With him there has passed away a distinguished authority on the affairs of the Slavonic world, who since 1923 had been a contributor to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

Doroshenko was born in Chernigov, Eastern Ukraine, in 1882. He belonged to a well-known Ukrainian Cossack family, the most prominent member of which was Petro Doroshenko, Hetman of the Ukraine from 1665 to 1676 and a member of the party of independence, which sought to secure the freedom of the Ukraine from both Poland and Russia by alliance with Turkey. Dmytro Doroshenko was a descendant of the Hetman's brother.

Doroshenko completed his studies in the Historico-Philological Faculty of the University of St. Petersburg, then returned to the Ukraine and settled in Kiev, where he became grammar-school teacher and journalist. While in Kiev he assiduously studied the history of the Ukraine under the guidance of the Ukrainian historian Volodymyr Antonovych, Professor of the University of Kiev.

He began his political activities in 1905, when he became a collaborator of the only Ukrainian daily, the *Rada*, founded by the Ukrainian patriot Yevhen Chykalenko. In his political convictions he was a moderate Constitutional Democrat.

Soon after the outbreak of the Russian Revolution of 1917, the Russian Provisional Government appointed him civil governor of those parts of Austrian Galicia and Bukovina which were then occupied by the Russian Army. This appointment represented a certain measure of concession to the Ukrainians of the occupied regions, who before the Revolution had been persecuted by the Tsarist regime on religious and national grounds.

Doroshenko took no direct part in the foundation of the Ukrainian National Republic, which was established some months after the outbreak of the Revolution, for he was not in agreement with the demands of the Ukrainian socialists, who in the early period of the revival of the Ukrainian nation, the period of the so-called Central Rada, exercised a predominant influence on Ukrainian life. When, on 29 April 1918, political power in the Ukraine passed into the hands of Hetman Pavlo Skoropads'ky,

and the Ukraine witnessed the restoration of the hetmanate, he accepted Hetman Skoropads'ky's invitation to become Minister of Foreign Affairs. He continued to be an active monarchist during his entire life in exile, into which he went when he was compelled to leave the Ukraine, after its occupation by the Bolsheviks in 1919.

In exile Doroshenko devoted himself to scholarly work in Ukrainian history and lectured on this subject at the Charles University and the Ukrainian Free University in Prague, and in the years immediately preceding World War II at the University of Warsaw as Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Orthodox Theological Faculty of that University.

For his contributions to scholarship he was elected in 1923 an active member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the oldest Ukrainian learned institution, located in L'vov, the capital of Western Ukraine, then under Poland. He was the first Director of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin, a member of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, a member of the Ukrainian Historico-Philological Society in Prague and, at the end of his life, president of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, founded by Ukrainian *émigré* scholars in 1945. He took part in many scientific conferences of historians and slavists and represented Ukrainian scholarship as well as those learned societies of which he was a member.

Doroshenko began his scholarly pursuits on leaving the university and continued them until his death. His writings number more than 800 items. His first work was *A Bibliography of Ukrainian Literary Creation during One Hundred Years, 1798-1898*. This was published in 1904 and reprinted in 1917. At this time he also wrote studies of the Ukrainian author and literary critic Panteleimon Kulish, the White Russian people, the inauguration of the Shevchenko Society in L'vov, and the travel sketches of *Through My Native Land*.

While in exile he prepared a short biography of the first modern Ukrainian historian Mykola Kostomariv, the friend of Taras Shevchenko. His first major work was the three-volume treatise *The Slavonic World in the Past and at Present* (1923). He then published his popular one-volume *History of the Ukraine*, which appeared in two later editions (1942 and 1948), and was translated into English. He revised and enlarged this work, added a new bibliography and brought it out in two volumes as a publication of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw in 1932-1933.

In his conception of the history of the Ukraine, Doroshenko stood midway between the traditional populist school, represented by the older Ukrainian historians, Mykola Kostomariv, Volodymyr Antonovych, and Mykhaylo Hrushevs'ky, and the modern Ukrainian historical school, which was founded by Vyacheslav Lypyns'ky and has won the adherence of all the more important contemporary historians. The former school laid emphasis on the history of the Ukrainian masses and credited them with the merit of having saved the Ukrainian nation from destruction.

The modern school lays emphasis on the history of the Ukrainian state and the services of all those men of action and historical personages who participated in the building of the Ukrainian state. Doroshenko did not completely break with the old school, nor did he give complete allegiance to the new.

Doroshenko had begun his scientific career with studies in Ukrainian bibliography (1904). After emigrating he returned to this field and in 1923 wrote a *Sketch of Ukrainian Historiography*, which was published in Prague by the Ukrainian Free University. A product of his studies in West European libraries was his book *The Ukraine in West European Literatures* (1927). He has described his own political activities during World War I and the Revolution in *Reminiscences of the Recent Past*. To the same theme he devoted the two volumes of his *History of the Ukrainian State*, which deal with the episode of the Central Rada and the Hetmanate (1917–1918). At the end of his life he wrote his memoirs, which were published in the pages of the Canadian Ukrainian weekly, *Ukrayins'kyi Holos*. These three works are admirable sources for the study of those stormy years of Ukrainian history. In spite of his moderate democratic-monarchical views, Doroshenko achieved the maximum of objectivity in his description of the political activities of the opposing camps during the Ukrainian national revolution.

Besides the foregoing works Doroshenko wrote a series of monographs especially on the relations of the Ukraine with her allies and neighbours. For instance, he published in Swedish an historiographic work entitled *Swedish-Ukrainian Relations in Modern Ukrainian Historiography*. He discussed German-Ukrainian relations in *The Ukraine and the German State in their Cultural-Historical Relations*. He also prepared monographs on Hetman Mazepa, Mykola Repnin, Volodymyr Antonovych, and Yevhen Chykalenko. In the third volume of *Berichte des Ukrainischen Wissenschaftlichen Instituts* (Berlin), he had an article "Der Name Rus, Russland und Ukraina" (1939), in which he tried for the first time to define names which are so often confused in both scholarly and journalistic writing.

Towards the end of his life Doroshenko was obliged to work in Orthodox schools in Warsaw and Winnipeg and published a *General Sketch of the History of the Orthodox Church*.

All these are merely a fraction of the works which have won for Doroshenko an honoured place as an historian in the Slavonic World. As a university professor in Prague he trained a school of young Ukrainian historians, some of whom, for instance, Borys Krupnyts'ky and Semen Narizhny, have already made themselves a name in Ukrainian historiography. Doroshenko's pupils have maintained the same historical line between the populists of the old school and the state historians of the new. Their interests have largely centred on a study of the relations of the Ukrainian people with the western world.

Doroshenko was a man of profound intelligence and wide culture, and

these qualities gained him the respect of both those who agreed with him and those who differed. His writings are characterised by clarity of style and great objectivity, and can be confidently accepted as reliable sources of the history of the Slavonic peoples. Unfortunately Doroshenko's unsettled life as a political *émigré*, with the limited access to materials which this entailed, prevented him from fully developing that capacity for sober research which he possessed in so large a measure.

*New York.*

NICHOLAS CHUBATY.

## BENEDICT HUMPHREY SUMNER

1893-1951

THE death of Mr. B. H. Sumner, Warden of All Souls, has removed one of the outstanding figures of the British academic world and one of the most loved and respected personalities of Oxford. The loss is especially severe for students of Russian history, in which field Sumner was, at least in this country, supreme.

Sumner belonged already to the generation that had to learn its Russian history from books and papers, not from direct experience. Unlike Sir Bernard Pares before him, he was unable to live and move freely in Russian cities, to make friendships among practising Russian teachers, public servants, landowners or politicians. He could visit Russia only under the auspices of Intourist, catch glimpses of the buildings of Moscow and St. Petersburg, and hear Russian spoken in the streets around him. Even this was something, but it did not compensate for the warm human experience that an earlier generation had enjoyed. With Russian exiles he did not have very many contacts, perhaps in part because, not having shared the experiences that made them exiles, he was uncertain how to estimate them.

But remoteness has its advantages. Sumner's work has a quality of detachment and objectivity that is immensely impressive. His aim was always to see the course of Russian history as a whole. He would not be drawn into the political controversies connected with the interpretation of Russian history, but was well acquainted with the arguments and literature of the various ideological groups. He always desired friendship between Britain and Russia, and believed that the past experience of both countries showed this to be useful to both. But he no more succumbed to the uncritical praise of the Soviet ally which became widespread during the recent war than he allowed himself to be associated with the crude denunciations of all things Russian which have since become fashionable. He was sceptical of Russian liberalism, even in its greatest period in the first two decades of this century, but he never accepted the facile generalisation that personal liberty and representative institutions are things that the Russian character cannot appreciate. He was intellectually attracted by the Slavophiles and the Panslavs, but he