



## The President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

Dmytro Doroshenko: A Ukrainian Émigré Historian of the Interwar Period

Author(s): THOMAS M. PRYMAK

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1/2 (Spring 2001), pp. 31-56

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036824>

Accessed: 14-04-2015 01:02 UTC

---

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.



*Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Dmytro Doroshenko:  
A Ukrainian Émigré Historian of the Interwar Period

THOMAS M. PRYMAK

Dmytro Ivanovych Doroshenko (1882–1951) was undoubtedly the most important and prolific Ukrainian émigré historian of the twentieth century. He made significant, indeed, sometimes irreplaceable contributions in the fields of biography, historiography, contemporary history, historical synthesis, bibliography, and memoir writing, and was a major spokesman for the new “statist school” of Ukrainian historiography, which stressed Ukrainian strivings for statehood throughout the centuries. Writing during the 1920s and 1930s—that is, at a time when the “Ukrainian question” was just beginning to attract the attention of the Western public and the very name “Ukraine” was little-known among Western scholars—Doroshenko popularized Ukrainian history in works published in German, English, Czech, Polish, Russian, French, Italian, and Swedish, as well as in Ukrainian. If a complete bibliography of his published works were compiled, it would, perhaps, list close to a thousand titles.<sup>1</sup>

EARLY LIFE

Doroshenko was born into an old Ukrainian family that during the seventeenth century had given Ukraine two distinguished Cossack hetmans. He was raised by his Ukrainophile father in a patriotic spirit, and from his early days at the universities in Warsaw and St. Petersburg participated in Ukrainian student activities and social and cultural life. He had a quiet, gentlemanly manner and a distaste for both personal and political conflicts. These characteristics, combined with a sincere devotion to scholarship, made him a productive and successful writer and academic.<sup>2</sup>

From 1899, Doroshenko’s first publications appeared in the journal *Literaturno-naukovyj vistyky*, which was published in Austrian Galicia, where,

*Harvard Ukrainian Studies* XXV (1/2) 2001: 31–56.

unlike the Russian Empire of the time, the Ukrainian language could be freely used in print. Most of these early publications were descriptions of Ukrainian cultural life in the Russian capital and elsewhere, but during this period Doroshenko also published two detailed bibliographies of material dealing with Ukrainian history, literature, and culture. The first of these was held up by the authorities for several months and lost about a third of its material to the Russian censor's red pencil. It was, nevertheless, the first publication of its kind in many years and was an indication of Doroshenko's later interests in bibliography and historiography.<sup>3</sup>

During the first years of the twentieth century, young Doroshenko's political convictions were somewhat contradictory. He worked with the more cautious older generation of Ukrainian cultural activists, where his real sympathies seemed to lie, but seemingly out of the necessity of contact with the mainstream of his own generation, he also joined the illegal Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP) whose supporters were generally very young. As a member of RUP's "Northern Committee" he helped smuggle Ukrainian-language books from Galicia into Russia by way of autonomous Finland.<sup>4</sup>

The revolution of 1905–1907 forced democratic and national concessions from a reluctant Russian imperial government, and an elected Duma was granted. In Ukraine the ban on publications in the Ukrainian language, which had been in effect since 1863 and strengthened in 1876, was suspended. Doroshenko immediately threw himself into cultural work in this field, publishing in journals, newspapers, and magazines in Kyiv, St. Petersburg, and elsewhere. His contributions to the Kyiv daily paper *Rada* were particularly extensive.

During the following years, Doroshenko studied history under Mytrofan Dovnar-Zapols'kyi (Mitrofan Doňnar-Zapol'skii) at the University of Kyiv, joined the moderate Society of Ukrainian Progressives (Tovarystvo Ukraïns'kykh Postupovtsiv, or TUP), and edited the Ukrainian-language journal of the newly founded *Zapysky Ukraïns'koho naukovoho tovarystva* (Annals of the Ukrainian Scientific Society), which was headed by the famous Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi. Upon graduating in history from the University of Kyiv in 1909, Doroshenko was unable to find pedagogical work in Kyiv because of the reactionary and anti-Ukrainian character of the local administration; thus he moved to Katerynoslav (today Dnipropetrovsk) where he became closely associated with the Ukrainian Cossack historian Dmytro Iavornyts'kyi. He edited a local newspaper and participated in the local *Prosvita* (Enlightenment) society for the peasantry.

During these same years, Doroshenko came into contact with the conservative historian V'iacheslav Lypyns'kyi (Wacław Lipiński), who was of Polish

origin from Right-Bank Ukraine and was elaborating a theory of how “Ukrainians of Polish culture” could remain loyal to an independent Ukrainian state based on territory rather than ethnicity. Lypyns’kyi’s ideas about the leading role of the élite (the *szlachta* [gentry] and the Cossack officer class) in Ukrainian history and the strivings of this élite for independent statehood had a powerful effect upon Doroshenko. The two men became fast friends and remained in contact with each other until Lypyns’kyi’s untimely death from tuberculosis in 1931.<sup>5</sup>

During the the First World War Doroshenko was active in the Union of Cities and other social and charitable organizations that had a moderate liberal-democratic character. With the coming of the revolution, he was elevated to high administrative positions in Kyiv and elsewhere, and for a time in 1917 the Russian Provisional Government appointed him Commissar for the Russian-occupied parts of Galicia and Bukovina—areas populated primarily by ethnic Ukrainians. When TUP was transformed into the moderate Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Federalists, Doroshenko remained loyal to it, but as the revolution grew more radical, he held back and began a turn to the right. He filled several important posts in the government of the radical and socialist Ukrainian Central Rada, but he was very unhappy with the general swing to the left and, when the Rada and the Ukrainian People’s Republic established by it were overthrown by Hetman Pavlo Skoropads’kyi in a conservative coup, Doroshenko supported the action and was named Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Skoropads’kyi regime. His ideological mentor Lypyns’kyi served as his ambassador to Vienna. Doroshenko represented the Ukrainian national tendency in the Skoropads’kyi government, which had a generally pro-Russian orientation; he had the heavy responsibility of maintaining smooth relations with Germany, which protected and supported the Hetman. This position involved the contradictory balancing of pro-Russian, pro-German, and Ukrainian national interests. In the end the task proved impossible, and within less than a year—that is, shortly before Skoropads’kyi was overthrown by popular national-democratic forces—Doroshenko retired from politics. He taught briefly at the new Ukrainian State University of Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi (1919), and then went into exile.<sup>6</sup>

#### EMIGRATION

During his early days in emigration, Doroshenko retained his personal connections with Skoropads’kyi (who resided in Berlin on a German government pension) and Lypyns’kyi (who resided in Vienna); he contributed to various publications sponsored by the Hetmanite or monarchist movement and for a brief time edited its weekly paper *Ukrains’ke slovo*, which was published in

Berlin from 1921 to 1924.<sup>7</sup> Throughout the 1920s, he changed his place of residence several times and often travelled back and forth between Berlin and Prague. In the latter city, the Czech government, which had welcomed Slavic refugees from Russia and Ukraine, financially supported the newly established Ukrainian Free University with which Doroshenko became closely associated. He also taught Ukrainian history for a while at Charles University. During this early period in emigration, Doroshenko was amazingly productive. In the early 1920s he published a whole series of biographies of important Ukrainian cultural leaders of the nineteenth century; he produced a general work on the national awakenings among the Slavic peoples; he penned the important—indeed, unique—*Ohliad ukrains'koï istoriohrafii* (Survey of Ukrainian Historiography); and he published detailed memoirs of his experiences during the war, revolution, and the Hetmanite periods from 1914 to 1919.<sup>8</sup>

In 1926, the Skoropads'kyi circle, with financial support from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, managed to establish the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin (Ukrains'kyi naukovi instytut u Berlīni), and Doroshenko was appointed its first director. For the next five years he managed this institute and against the wishes of some of his colleagues, including his vice-director, Oleksander Skoropys-Yoltukhovs'kyi, kept it strictly scholarly and as far removed from politics as possible. These were years of intense scholarly activity during which Doroshenko lectured extensively and taught institute courses in Ukrainian history, historiography, and the history of Ukrainian literature. He also wrote and published extensively in both Ukrainian- and German-language publications. He edited three substantial volumes of the institute's *Abhandlungen* and contributed articles to various other German publications such as Meyer's encyclopedia and the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*.<sup>9</sup> He also wrote on Cossack history, the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1918, and on Western knowledge and literature about Ukraine throughout the centuries. From 1930 to 1932 there appeared his detailed and well-documented two-volume history of Ukraine during 1917 and 1918. This eyewitness work on contemporary history stressed the positive effects of the effort to build a Ukrainian national state during the chaos of the time and was a basically conservative approach to the revolution; it is one of his most enduring, if controversial, achievements.<sup>10</sup>

During the 1920s numerous Soviet scholars were able to travel for research purposes to the West, especially Germany, which at the time had relatively good relations with the USSR. Some of these scholars visited Berlin. One of them, a certain Gontsov, whose work was known to Doroshenko, visited him at the Berlin institute and conveyed greetings from Serhii Yefremov, Liudmyla Staryts'ka-Cherniakhivs'ka, Maria Hrinchenko, and other Kyivan friends of

Doroshenko and his wife. Doroshenko welcomed Gontsov, who later told him that the Kyivans wished to see an independent newspaper with a “conservative-progressive” tone founded in Switzerland. Funding was supposed to be available for five years, and Gontsov offered Doroshenko the position of editor. The historian eagerly agreed, but was soon disappointed by events. Gontsov turned out to be a provocateur, and the whole newspaper scheme a trap that was probably intended to compromise Doroshenko’s Kyivan friends. Even in emigration, it seems, the Soviet secret police were to be feared.<sup>11</sup>

The Gontsov affair proved to Doroshenko just how political scholarship could be, but, all the same, he continued to insist upon scholarly integrity. This came out very clearly in the various academic publications of the Berlin institute for which the historian was responsible. In 1931, however, the world financial crisis caused the German government to cut off funding for the institute while Skoropads’kyi and Skoropys-Yoltukhovs’kyi pressed the institution to become more overtly political and take on more practical work. Although prominent German scholars such as the eminent Slavist Max Vasmer supported Doroshenko, he resigned in protest and moved back to Prague.<sup>12</sup> There he withdrew from active participation in the Hetmanite movement but continued to teach at Charles University (to which he had been appointed in 1926 by Tomáš Masaryk, the president of Czechoslovakia) and at the Ukrainian Free University. At Charles University he lectured in Czech, whereas at the Ukrainian Free University he lectured and taught in Ukrainian. (Two of his closest friends of this period were the philologist Vasyl’ Simovych and the director of the Museum of the Liberation Struggle of Ukraine, Dmytro Antonovych.) However, at the Ukrainian Free University, as at the Berlin institute, Doroshenko always put scholarship ahead of politics. For example, when in the mid-1920s Oleksander Lotots’kyi and Oleksander Shul’hyn, two supporters of Symon Petliura, the leading Ukrainian republican who had helped to overthrow the Hetman, applied to join the faculty at the Ukrainian Free University, they encountered strong resistance, and only Doroshenko’s threat to resign his professorship got them accepted.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, throughout this entire period in Prague, Doroshenko kept in close touch with affairs in Germany through his student, the historian Borys Krupnyts’kyi, who was married to a German woman and continued to live in Berlin.<sup>14</sup>

Doroshenko’s connections with Lotots’kyi and other Ukrainian republicans soon proved quite useful. After 1926, the republicans had some influence in Poland with which they had been allied during the Polish-Soviet war. Doroshenko was in close contact with the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw (Ukrains’kyi naukovi instytut u Varshavi), which had been established in 1928 by the former military allies, the East-minded Pilsudski govern-

ment, and the government of the Ukrainian National Republic in exile. Moreover, it was this institution, headed by his friend Lotots'kyi, that published his masterly two-volume *Narys istorii Ukraïny* (Survey of Ukrainian History). Doroshenko's *Narys* was the first modern synthesis of Ukrainian history to stress the role of élites, especially the Cossack officer class, in the historical process and to put strivings for statehood at the center of his story. Reprinted several times, it remains, perhaps, the most widely read of all of Doroshenko's books.<sup>15</sup>

Concerned about a substantial reduction of Czech government support for Ukrainian émigré institutions in Czechoslovakia, impressed by Lotots'kyi's vigorous publication activities, and eager to engage in real archival research which he could not do in Prague, Doroshenko jumped in 1936 when the University of Warsaw offered him a chair in Church history in the Department of Orthodox Theology. Throughout his stay in Poland, Doroshenko taught at the university and published widely both in Lotots'kyi's institute ventures and in foreign journals. Although the institute and Doroshenko himself were sometimes boycotted by Galician Ukrainian students, who resented their contacts with the Polish government, both were amazingly productive.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to his other activities, Doroshenko made his dream a reality and conducted intensive research in archives in Warsaw, Cracow, Poznań, and Lviv on the Cossack period of Ukrainian history, especially the period of his distant relative Hetman Petro Doroshenko (1627–1698), who led the Ukrainian Cossacks during the central phase of the so-called "Ruin" era of Ukrainian Cossack history. In view of the subsequent destruction of Polish archives during the Second World War, Doroshenko's work on the "Ruin," although not known at the time, would become irreplaceable.<sup>17</sup>

At this point, mention should be made of Doroshenko's two famous lecture tours across Canada, which during the interwar period had a very large Ukrainian immigrant population. In the summer of 1937 under the patronage of the Ukrainian Orthodox Brotherhood of Canada, officially known as the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League of Canada (Soiuz ukraïntsiiv samostiinykiv Kanady), he crossed the ocean, taught a summer course on Ukrainian history in Edmonton in western Canada, and lectured to various Ukrainian communities scattered across the country. He aroused such enthusiasm that he was invited to repeat the tour in the summer of 1938. (During this second tour, he lectured on the history of Ukrainian literature.)<sup>18</sup> At the same time, Doroshenko established contact with prominent Canadian scholars, especially the historian George Simpson, a professor at the University of Saskatchewan. A permanent result of these contacts was the publication of a one-volume English-language edition of



his *Narys istoriï Ukraïny*, which appeared in Edmonton in 1939. This was the first general history of Ukraine to be published in the English language.<sup>19</sup>

In early 1939, when Lotots'kyi became ill, Andrii Iakovlev took over as head of the Warsaw institute. As in Berlin, pressure to politicize the institution grew intense. With his close friend in retirement and political pressures building, Doroshenko began to cut his ties to the institute. The outbreak of war and the German occupation of Poland decided the issue. In late 1939, Doroshenko returned to Prague, where the Nazi regime was considerably less severe, and worked at the Ukrainian Free University, which continued a somewhat precarious existence. In 1942, the university came under the scrutiny of the Germans, who threatened to close it down. Only the most strenuous efforts of Doroshenko, Ivan Mirchuk, his successor at the Berlin institute, and others prevented this from happening.<sup>20</sup> Throughout the war Doroshenko confined himself largely to academic affairs and accepted no political or administrative position under the Nazi regime. He did, however, become active again in the Hetmanite movement in Prague, and he worked intensively on the history of German-Ukrainian relations. In 1941, the very year of the German invasion of the Soviet Union, he published a major survey of German scholarship and literature on Ukraine throughout the ages.<sup>21</sup> As the war drew to an end, Doroshenko began to receive desperate calls for assistance from Ukrainian scholars who wanted to flee west to Prague. Doroshenko expended much energy obtaining the necessary papers from German officials and managed to bring historians Oleksander Ohloblyn, Nataliia Polons'ka-Vasylenko, and others together with their families to the Czech capital. Some of these scholars found work at the Museum of the Liberation Struggle of Ukraine, whose director was Doroshenko's close friend Dmytro Antonovych and whose patron society was headed by Doroshenko himself.<sup>22</sup>

In 1945, the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia forced Doroshenko and other Ukrainians living in Prague to flee once again. Abandoning his library and the major part of his personal archive in the Czech capital, he moved to western Germany where for a brief time he was resident in Augsburg and Munich. In November 1945, in Augsburg, émigré scholars from both eastern and western Ukraine organized the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences (Ukrain'ska Vil'na Akademiia nauk, or UVAN), and the veteran émigré, Doroshenko, was elected its first president. However, the insecurity of life in devastated Germany, where the danger of forcible "repatriation" to the USSR was very real, weighed heavily upon him, and as early as the summer of 1945 he was writing to his friend George Simpson of the University of Saskatchewan and trying to emigrate to Canada.



At the same time, he was also in touch with the Rev. Semen Sawchuk of St. Andrew's College, an Orthodox institution in Winnipeg, at that time the main center of Ukrainian cultural and political life in Canada. At first, there were some problems obtaining a Canadian visa, but by 1947, his contact with Sawchuk paid off, and he was successful in getting an appointment to St. Andrew's College.<sup>23</sup> (Other UVAN members followed Doroshenko to Winnipeg where by 1949 they reorganized as the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in Canada.) During his residence in Winnipeg, Doroshenko published a second volume of memoirs, this time devoted to the prerevolutionary period, contributed to the history of the local Ukrainian community with which he was already somewhat familiar, and updated some of his previous research.<sup>24</sup> Together with the young Manitoba scholar Paul Yuzyk, he also began work on a major bibliography of publications concerning the Ukrainian Canadians.<sup>25</sup> However, the severe prairie climate, health problems, and a disagreement—or at least misunderstanding—with Sawchuk and the administration of St. Andrew's College, which unexpectedly cut off his salary, and the scarcity of alternative academic work in western Canada caused the veteran historian considerable distress. In 1949, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of his scholarly and public career, his Canadian friends rallied to his aid. A booklet was printed in his honor, and a collection was made to provide him with some financial support.<sup>26</sup> But by this time Doroshenko's health was beginning to fail seriously. In 1950, after two unsuccessful throat operations, the disappointed and ailing historian returned to Europe by way of the United States. He died in Munich on 19 March 1951, and his loss was sorely felt by Ukrainians scattered throughout the West.

#### HISTORIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY

Doroshenko's contributions to the development of Ukrainian historiography were as extensive and varied as they were original and significant. For discussion here, I divide them into seven major categories: (1) general works of synthesis; (2) historiography; (3) contemporary history; (4) biographies of major figures of the Ukrainian national awakening of the nineteenth century; (5) specialized studies of Cossack history; (6) studies of the depiction of Ukraine in Western literature and scholarship; and (7) personal memoirs.<sup>27</sup>

A quick perusal of this list reveals an obvious trend. Doroshenko excelled at synthesis, historiographical studies, and surveys of the published literature on various subjects. This was no accident, but rather a necessity determined by his status as an émigré historian cut off from the relevant archives and libraries in his native land. But his success at such synthesis and related work was helped

by a beautiful style that combined simplicity of exposition with logical clarity. His vocabulary was never obtuse, his writing never contorted. These characteristics stood in stark contrast to those of several other Ukrainian historians who came before and after him.

Doroshenko's most popular book is his two-volume *Narys istorii Ukrainy*. It has gone through several Ukrainian editions, been translated into both English and Spanish, and was still in print as late as the 1990s.<sup>28</sup> In this survey, Doroshenko accepts Hrushevs'kyi's general scheme of Ukrainian history, which claims Kyivan Rus' for Ukraine, then traces the national story through Lithuanian and Cossack periods to the national awakening of the nineteenth century. Like Hrushevs'kyi, Doroshenko uses the name "Ukrainian" to refer to the people of both Kyivan Rus' and Cossack times, even though this name was used not at all in the first case or very infrequently in the latter by contemporaries themselves. This usage indicates his commitment to the idea of national continuity throughout the ages on the basis of ethnolinguistic identity. This commitment would not be remarkable were it not for the fact that Doroshenko was a follower of Lypyn'skyi, who postulated a non-ethnic territorialism in his political and historical work. Theoretically Lypyn'skyi's territorialism gives space to "foreign" state structures and non-Ukrainian minorities on Ukrainian soil, but Doroshenko simply did not follow this model. Like Hrushevs'kyi, Doroshenko put the emphasis on the Ukrainian people to the almost total exclusion of non-Ukrainian elements. However, unlike Hrushevs'kyi, Doroshenko did not stress the role of the common people and popular revolts that ostensibly gave Ukrainian history its common thread through these many centuries of "foreign" rule.

Rather, Doroshenko emphasized the creative power of the Ukrainian élites and their attempts to promote autonomous and even independent state forms and polities. Thus he portrayed Cossack leaders such as Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi (1595–1657), Petro Doroshenko (1627–1698), and Ivan Mazepa (1640–1709) in a very positive light, believing as he did that all had striven for some form of national unity and national statehood. As a corollary to this approach, he emphasized the role of individual leaders and personalities rather than mass movements; that is, without ignoring cultural history or the social questions raised by Hrushevs'kyi and other Ukrainian historians, Doroshenko stressed biography and politics over impersonal sociological phenomena, moving narrative over penetrating analysis. Indeed, even at the very end of his *Narys istorii Ukrainy*, Doroshenko gives no summary of his general thesis or any analytical conclusion whatsoever. He ends with a prophecy, the brief statement that "in spite of their dispersion throughout the whole world, Ukrainians everywhere retain a consciousness of their national unity and live a common life of joy and

woe, sharing also the unfailing hope that sooner or later the Ukrainian state will arise on the banks of the Dnipro with its historical capital of Kyiv, and ensure freedom of national development to the whole Ukrainian people.”<sup>29</sup>

To the *Narys istoriï Ukraïny* must be added two other titles of historical synthesis. The first is his history of Ukraine for use at the higher levels of secondary education; the second is his history of the Slavic peoples of Eastern Europe and their national awakenings. The first of these—published as *Kurs istoriï Ukraïny dlia vyshchyykh klasy serednykh shkil* (A Course of the History of Ukraine for Higher Classes of Middle Schools) in its earliest form, and *Istoriia Ukraïny z maliunkamy dlia shkoly i rodyny* (A History of Ukraine with Illustrations for School and Family) in its final edition,<sup>30</sup> paralleled the story told in *Narys istoriï Ukraïny* with the same narrative strengths and analytical weaknesses. In the latter version of the school text, the description of the interwar Polish rule in Galicia and western Volhynia was sharpened. Reference was made to the mass repression of the Ukrainian population during the Polish government’s “pacification” campaign of 1930, ostensibly against Ukrainian terrorism.<sup>31</sup> Such a statement was, of course, missing from the previous *Narys istoriï Ukraïny*, which had actually been published with the help of the Polish government. The latter version of Doroshenko’s school text was embellished by dozens of illustrations that made it a quite attractive volume. After the Second World War, it was widely used in Ukrainian schools in Western Europe and North America, schools founded by Ukrainian political refugees or so-called Displaced Persons. These schools flourished from the 1950s through the 1970s.

Doroshenko’s final major work of general synthesis was his *Slov’ians'kyi svit v ioho mynulomu i suchasnomu* (The Slavic World in the Past and Present), which was published in three small volumes in the early 1920s. In this work, Doroshenko gave statistical data on the various Slavic peoples and surveyed their histories with an emphasis on the national awakenings of the nineteenth century. But Doroshenko’s *Slov’ians'kyi svit* made no concessions to romantic Slavophile notions of Pan-Slavic harmony and unity. In the introduction to the first volume he specifically stated that he believed that common ethnic and racial factors played no significant role in the development of Slavic state and national interests; rather he was interested only in the parallels in the national development of the Slavic peoples, the influences these parallels had on Ukrainians, and Ukrainian influences on the other Slavic peoples. “This is the view of a partisan of Ukrainian statehood with a critical approach to the idea of Slavic commonality,” wrote his student Borys Krupnytskyi many years later.<sup>32</sup>

After historical synthesis, the second major category of Doroshenko’s contributions to Ukrainian historical scholarship was bibliography, especially his-

toriography. In this area his most notable achievement was undoubtedly his *Ohliad ukrains'koi istoriohrafii* (Survey of Ukrainian Historiography) published in Prague in 1923. This work was the first and only of his major books to be translated into English and reprinted in the United States during the long Cold War.<sup>33</sup> Doroshenko's *Ohliad* differed considerably from the historiographical studies of Ikonnikov and other scholars who preceded him. No simple bibliographical guide, the *Ohliad* categorized the various Ukrainian chronicles and histories throughout the ages according to their contribution to national development. Doroshenko was a great admirer of the early nineteenth-century *Istoriia Rusov* (History of the Rus' People), in which he perceived elements of the advanced statist thought of his own time, but he also gave ample credit to the populist historians of the mid- and late nineteenth century, men such as Mykola Kostomarov, Volodymyr Antonovych, Dmytro Iavornytskyi, and Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, even though he was personally critical of their social radicalism and ostensible lack of appreciation for the state-building forces of premodern Ukraine. Doroshenko's *Ohliad* was meant, as the author clearly states in his introduction, to give a general overview of Ukrainian national historical thought.<sup>34</sup>

The third major category of Doroshenko's historical corpus is contemporary history. In this area, his primary contribution was undoubtedly his two-volume history of the revolutionary years 1917–1918. *Istoriia Ukrainy 1917–1923 rr.* (A History of Ukraine 1917–1923) was the work of an eyewitness and participant who was at the same time a professional historian. The very title of the work points to its ideological content, for Doroshenko did not stress social questions and revolution but rather national politics and statebuilding. The first volume was subtitled *Doba Tsentral'noi Rady*; the second volume *Ukrains'ka Het'mans'ka Derzhava 1918 r.* (The Ukrainian Hetman State of 1918). Thus not only did Doroshenko reject Soviet and émigré Russian conceptualizations such as “the February Revolution,” “the October Revolution,” and “the civil war,” but he also downplayed Ukrainian socialist and radical democratic notions such as “the Ukrainian Revolution.” In his first volume, Doroshenko told the story of Ukraine's relations with Russia, the Four Universals or Proclamations of the Ukrainian Central Rada, and the progressive emergence of a Ukrainian national state; in the second volume, he related how this state was transformed from a republic into a monarchy or “Hetmanate” and described its administrative achievements and foreign policy. Both volumes have a calm, detached tone, although Doroshenko's sympathies for the Hetmanate are quite clear. Indeed, the second volume is almost an official Hetmanite history, for both Skoropads'kyi and Lypyns'kyi contributed heavily to it, checking and correcting Doroshenko's text.<sup>35</sup> Further volumes on the period from 1919 (by

far the most chaotic and destructive year of the revolutionary era) to 1923, when Soviet Ukraine became a constituent republic of the new USSR, never appeared. Whether Doroshenko abandoned his project out of lack of sympathy for the subject, which now became the defeat of the landed Ukrainian gentry and moderate forces in general and the victory of the revolution and the communists, or whether he abandoned it for some other reason, is not known.

A second important work on contemporary history completed by Doroshenko during the interwar period was his *Z istorii ukrains'koi politychnoi dumky za chasiv svitovoï viiny* (From the History of Ukrainian Political Thought during the World War), published in Prague in 1936. Using Ukrainian émigré archival sources he had discovered in Western Europe—in particular, the private papers of the Ukrainian socialist Lev Iurkevych (1884–1918)—Doroshenko recounted the history of the Ukrainian national movement from 1905, when the RUP split into nationalist and social democratic factions, to 1917, when the revolution suddenly broke out. Not only did Doroshenko make use of numerous rare booklets, pamphlets, and periodicals published by various Ukrainian factions and parties, but he also quoted original unpublished letters by Lenin, Trotsky, and others who had become famous for their leadership of the revolution; that is, Doroshenko was able to outline the attitudes of the major revolutionary leaders toward the Ukrainian question of the early twentieth century. This brief (99-page) second venture into contemporary history not only displayed Doroshenko's interest in current politics but also confirmed his status as a historian who could make very good use of archival sources when these were available to him.

The fourth major category of Doroshenko's historiographical corpus is biography, with an emphasis on the major figures of the Ukrainian national awakening of the nineteenth century. Doroshenko's preference for political over social history and his exceptional narrative skills had always inclined him toward biography. He began writing in this field before the revolution with articles and pamphlets on many of the major figures of the national awakening. These he revised and expanded during his early years in exile until his biographical corpus became quite substantial. During the period after 1919, he finally produced a series of respectable studies of the major figures of the national awakening. These included modest but original volumes on Taras Shevchenko, Panteleimon Kulish, and Mykola Kostomarov for the initial period of the awakening; a substantial book on Volodymyr Antonovych and some smaller contributions such as his essay on Vasyl' Horlenko for the next period, and a booklet on Yevhen Chykalenko, his elder contemporary, for the twentieth century.<sup>36</sup> All of these works, with the exception of the studies of

Horlenko and Chykalenko, whom he personally knew, were synthetic portraits based primarily upon published materials.

All were deeply sympathetic to their subjects in evaluating their varied contributions to the Ukrainian national cause. The booklet on Shevchenko clearly presented the poet as a national bard and a liberal reformer rather than a national or social revolutionary; the volume on Kulish, with whom Doroshenko shared some common political and social views, was exceptionally detailed. The volumes on Kostomarov and Antonovych were positive treatments that viewed the protagonists' "populist" social radicalism with a striking degree of tolerance. Doroshenko even defended Kostomarov's highly unpopular restriction of the Ukrainian vernacular "for home use" as a necessary defensive measure that defused the attacks of Russian nationalists and reassured the imperial government of the inoffensive essence of the Ukrainian national movement. The work on Kostomarov remained unsurpassed until the 1990s, and the study of Antonovych is still the major contribution on this subject.

Our fifth major category of Doroshenko's historiographical corpus is "specialized studies on Cossack history." Without a doubt, Doroshenko's most important contribution in this area is his monograph *Het'man Petro Doroshenko: Ohliad ioho zhyttia i politychnoi diial'nosti* (Hetman Petro Doroshenko: A Survey of His Life and Political Activity). Doroshenko had begun to research his seventeenth-century Cossack relative during the early 1930s and with the Czech orientalist Jan Rypka published two small booklets on the subject of Ukrainian-Ottoman relations in the seventeenth century. The first of these dealt directly with Petro Doroshenko's Turkish policy.<sup>37</sup> Doroshenko believed that the negative picture of his Cossack relative in Ukrainian chronicle writing and later historiography was unjustified and resulted solely from his alliance with the unpopular Muslim Turks, which was directed against both Poland and Muscovy. In his monograph, Doroshenko strove to prove that his relative wished to unite both Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine into a single autonomous national polity under Ottoman protection and that this was a reaction to Polish-Muscovite agreements to partition the country. The Cossack Hetman thus had a lofty national purpose behind his disastrous Turkish policy, and this granted him an honorable place in seventeenth-century Ukrainian history. Having the benefit of many important documents (including the letters of Polish King Jan Sobieski) that had been published since the early 1880s when Kostomarov finished his famous monograph on the same period (*Ruina*), and making use of archives in Warsaw, Cracow, Poznań, and Lviv, Doroshenko produced what some consider to be his masterwork, a book that is a fitting successor to the tenth volume of Hrushevs'kyi's great *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* (History of Ukraine-Rus') and one that takes up the story where



Hrushevs'kyi left off.<sup>38</sup> Doroshenko never lived to see his monograph published. He was forced to leave the manuscript behind when he fled Prague in 1945. It resurfaced in the West following the Prague Spring of 1968 and was published in 1985 by UVAN, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. Unfortunately, the work did not make the scholarly impact it deserved since by this time most of the émigré historians with expertise in the period had died and there were very few younger specialists to replace them. With the revival of historical scholarship in independent Ukraine since 1991 and the new availability of émigré works there, Doroshenko's study will finally find an appropriate audience.

The sixth type of Doroshenko's historiographical legacy involves the study of Ukraine in Western scholarship and literature. Our historian began work in this area shortly after finding himself in exile. His first major contribution to this field was published in German in 1927 while he was director of the Ukrainian Institute in Berlin.<sup>39</sup> Upon examining Western literature about Ukraine, Doroshenko was surprised to discover that the country and its history were better known to West Europeans of the late eighteenth century than to those of the early twentieth. He was particularly impressed by the histories of Jean Benoit Scherer (1788) and Johann Christian von Engel (1796), who used authentic Ukrainian sources and wrote detailed studies of Cossack Ukraine. He later penned a separate study on Scherer<sup>40</sup> and encouraged one of his students, the historian Borys Krupnyts'kyi, to take up Engel as the subject of his doctoral dissertation, which Krupnyts'kyi defended in 1929 at the Berlin university under the supervision of the influential Russian-area specialist Otto Hoetzsch.<sup>41</sup>

During the 1940s, the general rise in interest in Russo-German relations caused Doroshenko to expand his study. In 1941, there appeared his master work on the subject. Published under the timely but misleading title *Die Ukraine und das Reich: Neun Jahrhunderte Deutsch-Ukrainischer Beziehungen*, the work had nothing to do with the German state but rather was a revision of his previous study on scholarship and literature with new materials on earlier and later periods and additional materials on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, Doroshenko maintained his original thesis that the eighteenth century was better informed about Ukraine than was the early twentieth. He explained this phenomenon by the fact that Ukrainian autonomous polities and political forms survived and were of interest to foreigners well into the eighteenth century, whereas by the nineteenth these forms had disappeared and Ukrainian lands had become ordinary provinces of the Russian Empire ruled from St. Petersburg. As usual, Doroshenko's narrative was smooth and attractive, even in German translation, and, unlike a parallel work published a few



years earlier by his Franco-Ukrainian colleague Il'ko Borshchak, gave considerable cultural background and biographical information about the various authors discussed.<sup>43</sup> About this same time, Doroshenko prepared for publication a second work on German cultural influences on Ukraine throughout the centuries, but in spite of the interest caused by the German occupation of the country from 1941 to 1944, this work was never published.<sup>44</sup>

Our seventh and final category of Doroshenko's historiographical corpus is memoir writing. Doroshenko's contribution in this area too is most impressive. His memoir of the Ukrainian national movement before the revolution is a gem in the literature; his detailed memoirs of the 1914–1919 period continue the story and give order and meaning to those chaotic times. Doroshenko shifted easily back and forth from his personal story to public events and always seemed to strike the right balance between the two. Moreover, without being the principal leader or actor, Doroshenko always seemed to be close to the center of events. This gave him an intimate but not completely partisan view. Thus he was able to make balanced judgments of most of the important events of the period 1904–1919 and the men and women who took part in them. His natural gentleness and tolerance for competing points of view exude from every page. Take, for example, his portrait of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi in 1906, at the time when the first Ukrainian Club was formed in the Russian State Duma. One would hardly know that Doroshenko's political views later came to diverge so sharply from that of his difficult older contemporary:

At that time all of us considered Hrushevs'kyi to be the leader of the Ukrainian national movement in Russia. His great scholarly and public services, his extraordinary organizational talent, lent him great authority and deep respect. In our eyes, he was a symbol of pan-Ukrainian unification; in those days his word was law for us. He was at the height of his powers, full of energy and wide plans. With Hrushevs'kyi's arrival in St. Petersburg everyone submitted to him without hesitation.<sup>45</sup>

Even during the height of the revolution, after the Central Rada had asked for German help and relations between the German army and the radical Ukrainian government became quite strained, Doroshenko, who was to try and smooth out these relations under the Skoropads'kyi regime, remained quite moderate in his judgment of Hrushevs'kyi and the literati and young socialists around him:

In general, official Ukrainian circles received the Germans quite coldly, as occupiers rather than allies. No one made any effort toward rapprochement, friendly relations, or [the exchange of] information. . . . Extraordinary dryness and brusqueness were characteristic of Professor Hrushevs'kyi's personal relations—and I had known him since 1904—and these characteristics of his set

the tone of the Ukrainian government's relations with the Germans from the moment that they first arrived in Kyiv.<sup>46</sup>

Hence the Skoropads'kyi coup and the conservative German-supported government in Ukraine in which Doroshenko was to play such an important role.

With this brief discussion of Doroshenko's memoirs, we complete our survey of the seven general categories of his scholarly corpus. From synthetic histories to historiography, to contemporary history, to biography, to Cossack history, to Ukraine in Western literature, and personal memoirs—these contributions were varied indeed. Of course, even in this comprehensive classification system there remain items which do not easily fit. For example, during his stay in Poland, Doroshenko wrote on Church history (both early Church history and Ukrainian Church history), but this work fits only with some difficulty into our system. (Perhaps his two booklets in this field can be considered general works of synthesis.<sup>47</sup>) Similarly, during the 1930s he penned several articles dealing with Western influences on Ukrainian culture,<sup>48</sup> as, during the war, he published articles in German on the Ukrainian community in Canada,<sup>49</sup> but neither of these subjects fits neatly into our scheme. Nor does his delightful but somewhat sad and haunting historical travelogue entitled *Po ridnomu kraiu: Podorozhni vrazhinnia i zamitky* (Through the Native Land: Travel Impressions and Notes), which came out in two separate editions during his lifetime and a third after his death.<sup>50</sup> These publications only underline the fact that Doroshenko's scholarly corpus was both substantial and diverse.

## CONCLUSION

Dmytro Doroshenko's enormously varied scholarly production was nonetheless ordered and directed by a few general principles. First, Doroshenko was a Ukrainian national historian writing in exile. With the possible exceptions of his work on early Church history and the national awakenings among the Slavic peoples, all of his books and articles dealt in a fundamental way with Ukrainian national life over the centuries: he wrote extensively on the Cossack period, the Enlightenment, the national awakening of the nineteenth century, and the revolution, and only the very earliest periods of Ukrainian history—Kyivan Rus' and the Lithuanian period—are not represented by specialist studies in his personal bibliography. Moreover, working in exile without recourse to the libraries and archives of his homeland, Doroshenko paid special attention to synthesis, surveys of the published literature, and reinterpretation of the sources from his own specific *derzhavnyk* (statist) viewpoint. At one point later in his career, Doroshenko modestly told his colleague Oleksander Ohloblyn that he was merely a popularizer who used the specialist research of others who

did the primary work in the archives.<sup>51</sup> This may have been too modest. Certainly, the major exceptions to this pattern are his contributions to “contemporary history,” in which he could use documents and materials carried into exile by various émigrés, as well as his own experience and the personal testimony of those around him, and his studies of the era of his relative Hetman Petro Doroshenko, for which he was able to do intensive archival work in Poland. The latter work, as previously mentioned, was published only many years after his death.<sup>52</sup>

Another characteristic of Doroshenko’s corpus is its linguistic diversity. Writing at a time when Ukrainian history was little known in the outside world, Doroshenko popularized his subject in synthetic works published in many different languages. His two greatest achievements in this area are undoubtedly his *Narys istoriï Ukraïny*, which was published in English translation in 1939, and his *Die Ukraine und Deutschland*, which appeared in 1941. But his booklet on Shevchenko, published in so many Western European languages, including three different English-language editions;<sup>53</sup> his articles on recent Ukrainian history in R. W. Seton-Watson’s London-based *Slavonic Review*, which had unmistakable political implications;<sup>54</sup> his explanation of Ukrainian conceptualizations of the history of eastern Europe to the German-speaking world, which had hitherto been unfamiliar with Ukrainian claims to an independent history;<sup>55</sup> and his many reviews and reports on recent Ukrainian historical scholarship, which were published in German, Swedish, Czech, and Polish, are also significant contributions in this area.

Doroshenko’s work as a popularizer of Ukrainian historical scholarship, however, seems to have been limited by his conservative political views and his personal cultural preferences; that is, he contributed to historical scholarship in Germany, England, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, but largely refrained from participation in the scholarly life of France and the United States. His booklet on Shevchenko was his only significant contribution to French scholarship, as indeed, it was to English-language American scholarship. Moreover, Doroshenko visited and lectured in both Canada and Switzerland, but published little and lectured even less in France and the United States. This pattern might have resulted simply from coincidence, but it is not beyond the range of possibility that it has something to do with his preference for conservative political systems over radical democracies. England, and even Canada, it should be remembered, were constitutional monarchies within the British Empire with which Doroshenko seems to have felt quite at home; France and the United States, with their origins in revolution and their spirits egalitarian and contrary to the class principle, were foreign to Doroshenko. From them, it seems, he was fated to keep his distance.

Finally there is the question of the state and social class in Doroshenko's work. There is no doubt that his promotion of the idea of Ukrainian statehood—which he seems to have seen, not as an end unto itself, but as a means to cultural, social, and political reform—was timely and in tune with the spirit of the age. The struggle for Ukrainian statehood gave a rationale not only to the problems arising from the revolution, but also to the efforts of previous Ukrainian leaders going back to the days of Khmel'nyts'kyi, Petro Doroshenko, and Mazepa. This was a theme that was largely muted in nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians such as Mykola Kostomarov and still somewhat hesitantly expressed in the work of Hrushevs'kyi. Only in Dmytro Doroshenko's time, largely as a result of the struggles of 1917–1921, did it become commonplace. During the interwar period, indeed, right through to 1991, when Ukraine attained state independence, the statist impulse was accepted by virtually all Ukrainian historians living in emigration. Thereafter, when intellectual freedom finally blossomed in Ukraine, it suddenly became the leading motif, a kind of national myth, as one foreign observer characterized it,<sup>56</sup> of almost all Ukrainian historical scholarship. The idea of statehood, as pioneered by Doroshenko in the interwar period, belonged to the future.

Social class was an entirely different matter. Doroshenko's conservative political views, which were strongly influenced by the political philosophy and historical conceptions of his friend V'iacheslav Lypyns'kyi, were based largely on his personal affection for the old landed gentry to which he traced his roots. It was the old Ukrainian *szlachta*, the Cossack officer class, and the landed gentry into which it was gradually transformed, that was the protagonist of much of Doroshenko's historical argument. This social class had provided the leadership of Cossack Ukraine; this social class adopted the *Istoriia Rusov* as its quasi-official historical ideology, and this social class provided some of the most influential leaders of the national awakening of the nineteenth century. This social class, too, Doroshenko hoped, would provide leadership for Ukraine during the troubles of 1917–1921. Those hopes were disappointed, and with the Bolshevik victories of 1919–1921, the world of the landed gentry and the small landowner was completely destroyed. Thus Doroshenko's and Lypyns'kyi's political conceptions, which were fully developed only during their period in emigration, have more than a little unreal quality about them. Doroshenko's class ideas had no place in the era of mass democracy and totalitarian dictatorship that was the twentieth century; rather they belonged to the past.

Nevertheless, Doroshenko's ideas of class and elitism were always tempered by a strong social conscience, by his natural tolerance, by a respect for the populism of his predecessors, and by the general spirit of democracy

inherent in the prerevolutionary Ukrainian national movement of which he had been a part. He proudly held aloft the banner of Shevchenko, the former serf who had become the national poet;<sup>57</sup> he was sincerely devoted to the enlightenment of the simple villagers in the *Prosvita* movement of the early twentieth century. Emigration largely cut him off from this popular base, but he discovered it anew in his visits to the Ukrainian communities in Canada in the 1930s, and it never completely left him. Thus with his feet planted firmly in the past and his gaze directed steadily toward the future, Doroshenko represented both the historical memory and the political aspirations not only of the somewhat narrowly based Hetmanite or monarchist party of which he was a prominent representative, but also of a significant part of the Ukrainian emigration of the interwar period. His substantial historical corpus and the universal respect in which he was held by his contemporaries, who were well aware of his remarkable gentility and uncommon literary talents, are testimony to his achievement.

## NOTES

1. See *Bibliohrafiia prats' Prof. D. Doroshenka za 1899–1942 roky* (Prague, 1942), which lists 804 items. See also Liubomyr Vynar [Lubomyr Wynar], “Dmytro Doroshenko: Vydatnyi doslidnyk ukrains'koï istoriohrafii i bibliohrafii,” *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 19/20 (1982–1983):40–78, reprinted separately as *Dmytro Doroshenko 1882–1951* (New York, 1983); and Vasyl' Omel'chenko, “Dmytro Doroshenko (1882–1951),” in Marko Antonovych, ed., *125 rokiv kyïvs'koï ukrains'koï akademichnoi tradytsii. Zbirnyk* (New York, 1993), pp. 407–17. In the early 1970s, the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute planned for its program of reprints an edition of Doroshenko's selected works in three volumes. Vasyl' Omel'chenko was to be the editor and actually began the work of updating the historian's bibliography to cover the period from 1942 to 1951; the work was never published. See Omel'chenko's note on this project in *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 37, nos. 1–3 (2000):241. Doroshenko's personal archives have been preserved, but they are very scattered. Parts are believed to exist in various repositories in Kyiv, Winnipeg, and New York.
2. Doroshenko has not yet found a biographer, though several brief biographical surveys were published during his lifetime. See Borys Krupnyts'kyi, “40-littia literaturno-naukovoï diial'nosti D. I. Doroshenka,” in Dmytro Doroshenko, *Pravoslavna tserkva v mynulomu i suchasnomu* (Berlin, 1940; repr. Winnipeg, n.d.), pp. v–xiii; “Pro literaturnu i naukovu diial'nist' prof. Dmytra Doroshenka,” in *Bibliohrafiia prats' Prof. D. Doroshenka za 1899–1942 roky*, pp. 5–8; Leonid Bilets'kyi, *Dmytro Doroshenko* (Winnipeg, 1949). For a more recent appreciation, see Liubomyr Vynar, “Dmytro Ivanovych Doroshenko: Zhyttia i diial'nist' (u 50-littia smerty),” *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 38, nos. 1–4 (2001): 9–67. Also see *Ukrains'kyi litopys*, vol. 1 (Augsburg, 1953), which presents articles, memoirs, and tributes devoted to Doroshenko, and the very detailed memoir of Doroshenko's namesake, Volodymyr Doroshenko, who was ostensibly a close friend but not a relative: Volodymyr Doroshenko, “Moï vziemyny z prof. D. Doroshenkom: Spohad u 1-shi rokovyny smerty i 70-littia narodyn,” *Svoboda* (Jersey City), nos. 96–112, April–May, 1952. Many of the biographical details that follow are taken from these works. In addition to these, a few articles on Doroshenko's émigré period have been published recently in Ukraine. These are based mostly on materials from his Prague archive now preserved in Kyiv. See the various titles by Dmytro Burim cited in the notes below.
3. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Ukazatel' istochnikov dlia oznakomleniia s Iuzhnoi Rus'iu* (St. Petersburg, 1904); idem, *Narodnaia ukrainskaia literatura* (St. Petersburg, 1904).
4. For this and other personal information prior to 1914, see Doroshenko's early memoirs cited in note 24 below.
5. Doroshenko's letters to Lypyns'kyi have been preserved. See *Lysty Dmytra Doroshenka do V'iacheslava Lypyns'koho*, ed. Ivan Korovyts'kyi, which constitutes vol. 6 of *V'iacheslav Lypyns'kyi. Arkhiv* (Philadelphia, 1973). Also see Marko Antonovych, “V. Lypyns'kyi i D. Doroshenko: Do naukovoï spivpratsi dvokh velykykh istorykiv,” *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 19/20 (1982–1983):5–8.

6. On Doroshenko's role in the revolution and the establishment of the Ukrainian national state, see his memoirs cited in note 8 below.
7. On Doroshenko's participation in the Hetmanite movement, see Dmytro Burim, "D. I. Doroshenko ta ukraïns'kyi het'mans'kyi rukh na emihratsii," *Naukovi zapysky: Zbirnyk prats' molodykh vchenykh ta aspirantiv*, vol. 3 (Kyiv, 1999), pp. 445–62. Burim quotes a very revealing and uncharacteristically rambling letter of Doroshenko of 4 August 1925 to M. A. Storozhenko, his fellow émigré and senior historian, on the development of his monarchist sympathies. In this letter, Doroshenko claimed that he was never a radical democrat or revolutionary at heart but could find no other outlet for his "Ukrainophile" sympathies prior to the emergence of the Hetmanite regime in 1918: "I went to the university . . . and entered the Ukrainian community. Here I saw that one could not be a 'nationally conscious Ukrainian' without being a socialist or a radical and that one could not work for the good of Ukraine without 'working' in some kind of social revolutionary party. . . . I joined the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (although I was not comfortable about it), and later the Social Democratic Ukrainian Party [*sic*], and out of necessity I worked there, but my heart was not in it. However, there was no way out: either give up politics and limit oneself to purely 'cultural' work or go over to the socialists. . . . I was never enthusiastic about doctrines . . ."
8. The biographies were of Panteleimon Kulish (1923), Mykola Kostomarov (1924), and Taras Shevchenko (1929). See also Dmytro Doroshenko, *Slov'ians'kyi svit v ioho mynulomu i suchasnomu*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1922); idem, *Ohliad ukraïns'koï istoriohrafii* (Prague, 1923; repr. Kyiv, 1996); idem, *Moi spomyny pro nedavne mynule*, 4 pts. (Lviv, 1923–1924; repr. New York, 1969).
9. See Dmytro Burim, "Naukovo-orhanizatsiina, vykladats'ka ta doslidnyts'ka diial'nist' D. I. Doroshenka v period isnuvannia Ukraïns'koho naukovooho institutu v Berlini (1926–1931 rr.)," *Naukovi zapysky: Zbirnyk prats' molodykh vchenykh ta aspirantiv*, vol. 3 (Kyiv, 1997), pp. 491–510. For general descriptions of the Berlin Institute, see Mykhailo Sulyma, "Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut," in *Ukraïntsi v Berlini 1918–1945*, ed. Vasyl' Veryha (Toronto, 1996), pp. 81–6, and O. O. Pieschanyi, "Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut u Berlini," *Ukraïns'kyi arkhieohrafichnyi shchorichnyk* 5/6 (2001):152–62.
10. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923*, 2 vols. (Uzhhorod, 1930–1932; repr. New York, 1954).
11. Nataliia Doroshenko, "Uryvky spomyniv," *Ukraïns'kyi litopys* 1 (1953):139–51, esp. 146. More generally, see Nataliia Doroshenko-Savchenko, "Dmytro Ivanovych Doroshenko: Z nahody 5-richchia smerty," *Svoboda* (Jersey City), in 5 parts ending 2 May 1956. I used this publication from a complete copy—which, however, lacked full bibliographical data—in the Eugene Onatsky Papers, box 9, folder "Doroshenko, Dmytro and Volodymyr," Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
12. Burim, "Naukovo-orhanizatsiina diial'nist'," pp. 505–7. See also idem, "Dva pohliady na istoriiu konfliktu 1930–1931 rr. v Ukraïns'komu naukovomu instytuti v Berlini," *Naukovi zapysky: Zbirnyk prats' molodykh vchenykh ta aspirantiv*, vol. 3 (Kyiv, 1997), pp. 474–90. Volodymyr Doroshenko, "Moi vziaemyny," pt.



7, writes: "The withdrawal of Dmytro Doroshenko from the Ukrainian Scientific Institute had an immediate effect on the activity of this institution which was transformed from a scholarly institute into an outpost of popular propaganda. The solid 'Scholarly Journal' ended, and in its place from time to time little pamphlets would appear."

13. Nataliia Doroshenko, "Uryvky spomyniv," p. 145.
14. See Borys Krupnyts'kyi, "D. I. Doroshenko: Spomyny uchnia," *Naukovyi zbirnyk* (New York: UVAN, 1952), 1:9–22. Krupnyts'kyi received a large number of letters from Doroshenko, which, unfortunately, were lost at the end of the Second World War.
15. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Narys istorii Ukraïny*, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1932–1933; repr. in one vol. Munich, 1966 ; repr. in two vols. Kyiv, 1992).
16. See Dmytro Burim, "Varshavs'kyi period zhyttia i diial'nosti D. I. Doroshenka (1936–1939 roky)," *Naukovi zapysky: Zbirnyk prats' molodykh vchenykh ta aspirantiv* (Kyiv, 1999), 6:283–96. Doroshenko actually compared Lotots'kyi's activities in Warsaw with those of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi in Galicia during the pre-1914 period, which most observers believe to have been a high point of Ukrainian scholarship during the twentieth century.
17. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Het'man Petro Doroshenko: Ohliad ioho zhyttia i diial'nosti*, ed. Vasyli Omel'chenko (New York, 1985).
18. These lecture tours were the brainchild of Petro Lazarowich, an Edmonton lawyer who had been a student at the Ukrainian Free University in Prague and had met Doroshenko there. Olha Woycenko, letter of 1 February 1986 to the author. More generally, see Burim, "Varshavs'kyi period," pp. 289–91, who gives a detailed account of Doroshenko's Canadian trips.
19. Dmytro Doroshenko, *History of the Ukraine*, trans. Hanna Chikalenko-Keller, ed. George Simpson (Edmonton, 1939). On the generally positive reception of this book, see Thomas M. Prymak, *Maple Leaf and Trident: The Ukrainian Canadians during the Second World War* (Toronto, 1988), app. E: "Ukrainian History and the War," pp. 145–6; idem, "General Histories of Ukraine Published in English during the Second World War," *Ab Imperio*, no. 2 (2003):455–76.
20. Mykola Nevryli, "UVU: Baza nezalezhnoi ukraïns'koï nauky u vil'nomu sviti (1921–1945)," in Mykola Mushynka, ed., *Vid Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka do Ukraïns'koho Vil'noho universytetu* (Kyiv, 1992), p. 208. On 4 December 1942, Doroshenko wrote to his fellow historian, Oleksander Ohloblyn: "As to the Ukrainian University in Prague, I should add that it stands on very shaky ground. In fact, I do not know how it holds on. It can be liquidated any day, and we live from semester to semester." See Vynar, "Dmytro Ivanovych Doroshenko: Zhyttia i diial'nist'," p. 43. For general observations in English, see Roman S. Holiat, "A Short History of the Ukrainian Free University," *Ukrainian Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (1963):204–26.
21. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Die Ukraine und das Reich: Neun Jahrhunderte Deutsch-Ukrainischer Beziehungen* (Leipzig, 1941); repr. under the considerably less provocative title: *Die Ukraine und Deutschland: Neun Jahrhunderte Deutsch-*

- Ukrainischer Beziehungen* (Munich, 1994). According to the editors of *Ukrains'kyi litopys* 1 (1953):7, the German government commissioned Doroshenko to carry out this work prior to the outbreak of the Second World War. During the entire Nazi period, Doroshenko must have been considerably disconcerted by the false rumor, credited by some Ukrainians, that he was of partly Jewish background on his mother's side. See Liubomyr Vynar [Lubomyr Wynar], "Zapovit Natalii Doroshenko," *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 36, nos. 2–4 (1999):267–9.
22. N. Doroshenko, "Uryvky spomyniv"; Volodymyr Doroshenko, "Moï vzaïemny," pt. 8.
  23. On Doroshenko's relations with George Simpson, see the brief comments of Thomas M. Prymak, "George Simpson, the Ukrainian Canadians, and the 'Pre-history' of Slavic Studies in Canada," *Saskatchewan History* 41, no. 2 (1988):52–66, esp. 54, 62. (The author also gleaned much useful information about Doroshenko's stay in Canada, and, in particular, his relations with Semen Sawchuk, from interviews and conversations carried out during the mid-1980s with the late Olha Woycenko of Ottawa.) Ukrainian-Canadian servicemen in the Canadian armed forces in occupied Germany seemed to have played some role in saving Doroshenko from forcible repatriation to the USSR. At a conference on Ukrainian Displaced Persons (DPs) sponsored by the Multicultural History Society of Ontario (held in Toronto in the mid-1980s) one of these DPs, a member of the audience, publicly thanked one of these servicemen, Bohdan Panchuk, on behalf of Doroshenko. More generally, see Bohdan Panchuk, *Heroes of Their Day: The Reminiscences of Bohdan Panchuk*, ed. Lubomyr Y. Luciuk (Toronto, 1983).
  24. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Moï spomyny pro davne mynule (1901–1914 roky)* (Winnipeg, 1949); idem, ed., *Propam'iatna knyha Ukrains'koho Narodnoho domu u Vynypegu* (Winnipeg, 1949); Ivan Kryp'iakevych et al., *Velyka istoriia Ukraïny*, 2d ed. with additional material to 1948 by Dmytro Doroshenko (Winnipeg, 1948). Doroshenko's additions to the *Velyka istoriia Ukraïny* contained a rather detailed description of the harsh Nazi policies toward the country during the war.
  25. According to the Finding Aid to the Paul Yuzyk Collection, the card file of this bibliography is preserved in the Yuzyk papers, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, vol. 6, file 7, MG 32, C67.
  26. See, in particular, the covering note in the Olha Woycenko Papers, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, vol. 23, files 12 and 13, MG 30, D212.
  27. Leonid Bilets'kyi, *Dmytro Doroshenko*, p. 17, gives an alternate classification scheme: (1) scholarly-pedagogical; (2) scholarly-research; (3) bibliographic; (4) synthetic; (5) memoiristic-historical work.
  28. See note 15 above. See also Dmytro Doroshenko, *A Survey of Ukrainian History*, ed. Oleh W. Gerus (Winnipeg, 1975); idem, *Historia de Ucraina*, ed. E. A. Martinez Codo (Buenos Aires, 1962).
  29. Doroshenko, *History of the Ukraine*, p. 655.

30. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Kurs istoriï Ukraïny dlia vyshchych klias serednykh shkil* (Vienna, 1921); idem, *Istoriia Ukraïny z maliunkamy dlia shkoly i rodyny* (Cracow, 1942; repr. New York, 1957).
31. *Istoriia Ukraïny z maliunkamy dlia shkoly i rodyny*, pp. 245–6.
32. Borys Krupnyts'kyi, "D. I. Doroshenko i slov'ians'kyi svit," *Ukrains'kyi litopys* (Augsburg, 1953), 1:57–64, esp. p. 59.
33. Dmytro Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 5–6 (1957):1–306. This volume also contained an update written in the same style: Oleksander Ohloblyn, "Ukrainian Historiography 1917–1956," pp. 307–435. Doroshenko's portion of this volume was translated into English by George Luckyj. Interestingly, Volodymyr Doroshenko, "Moï vzaïemyny," pt. 12, criticized this translation project at the time because he felt that Doroshenko's historiography did not give an overview of various historical "trends" and in this respect was inferior to the previous accounts by Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi that were published in Russian at the beginning of the twentieth century and in Ukrainian in the 1920s in portraits of various Ukrainian historians.
34. The author's statement appears on page 3 of the introduction. In his "D. I. Doroshenko: Spomyny uchnia" (p. 12), Borys Krupnyts'kyi gives the impression that on the basis of his detailed course on historiography, which he taught at the Berlin institute, Doroshenko expanded his *Ohliad* into a full "History of Ukrainian Historiography," but because of lack of funds and a publisher, the work never appeared. Burim, "Naukovo-orhanizatsiina diial'nist'," pp. 497, 508, tells us that only parts of this work were actually written and that one completed chapter, "Pol'ska istoriografiia Ukraïny" is preserved among Doroshenko's papers at the Central State Archive of the Highest Agencies of Power and Administration of Ukraine, Kyiv.
35. Antonovych, "Lypyn'skyi i Doroshenko," p. 13.
36. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Panteleimon Kulish* (Leipzig, 1923); idem, *Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov* (Leipzig, 1924); idem, *Schewtschenko: Der Grosse ukrainische Nationaldichter* (Berlin, 1929), which appeared in French (Prague, 1931), English (New York, Winnipeg, and Prague, all three in 1936), Italian (Prague, 1939), and Ukrainian (Vienna, 1942). I have used the 1936 New York edition, which bears the title *Taras Shevchenko: Bard of Ukraine*. See also idem, *Ievhen Chykalenko: Ioho zhyttia i hromads'ka diial'nist'* (Prague, 1934); idem, *Vasyl' Horlenko* (Paris, 1934), which was not available to me; idem, *Volodymyr Antonovych: Ioho zhyttia i naukova ta hromads'ka diial'nist'* (Prague, 1942). In addition to these, Doroshenko also wrote, but did not publish, a significant study in several chapters on the life and work of the historian Dmytro Bantyshe-Kamens'kyi. Only one of these chapters was printed. See Dmytro Doroshenko, "Kniaz' M. Repnin i D. Bantyshe-Kamens'kyi," in Vasyl' Simovych, ed., *Pratsi Ukraïns'koho Vysokoho pedagogichnoho instytutu im. Mykhaila Drahomanova u Prazi. Naukovyi zbiryk*, vol. 1 (Prague, 1929), pp. 90–108, esp. note 1.
37. *Bibliografiia prats' Prof. D. Doroshenka za 1899–1942 roky* (Prague, 1942) lists Dmytro Doroshenko and Jan Rypka, *Hejtman Petr Dorošenko a jeho turecká*

- politika* (Prague, 1933); idem, *Polsko, Ukrajina, Krym a Vysoká Porta v první pol. XVII stol.*, (Prague, 1936). I have seen the article version of the first booklet in *Časopis Národního Muzea*, 1–2 (Prague, 1933), pp. 1–55.
38. Vasyl' Omel'chenko, "Peredmovia," in Doroshenko, *Het'man Petro Doroshenko*, p. 19.
  39. Dmytro Doroshenko, "Die Ukraine und ihre Geschichte im Lichte der west-europäischen Literatur des XVIII und ersten Hälfte des XIX Jahrhunderts," *Abhandlungen der Ukrainischen Wissenschaftlichen Institutes* (Berlin, 1927), 1:1–70.
  40. *Bibliohrafiia prats' Prof. D. Doroshenka za 1899–1942 roky* lists Dmytro Doroshenko, "Schererovy 'Annales de la Petite Russie' a její místo v ukraínské historiografii," *Sbornik věnovany I. Bidlovi* (Prague, 1928), pp. 351–8; résumé pp. 498–9.
  41. Krupnyts'kyi, "D. I. Doroshenko: Spomyny uchnia," pp. 13–14. More generally, see Thomas M. Prymak, "On the 200th Anniversary of the Publication of Johann Christian von Engel's *History of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Cossacks*," *Germano-Slavica* 10, no. 2 (1998):55–62.
  42. For a more detailed analysis of this work, see Thomas M. Prymak, "Two Books on the Depiction of Ukraine in West European Literature," *Ukrainian Quarterly* 54, nos. 1–2 (1998):74–88. It is unfortunate that Doroshenko never left a memoir discussing his problems with the Nazi censors. However, much can be gleaned from the brief account of his pupil Borys Krupnyts'kyi, "Tsenzura tret'oho raikhu (Uryvok zi spomyniv)," *Ukraina*, no. 4 (1950):264–6.
  43. Borshchak's work was more detailed than that of Doroshenko, but was more of a simple bibliographical guide. See Elie Borschak, *L'Ukraine dans la littérature de l'Europe occidentale* (Paris, 1935). This book had earlier been serialized in the Paris journal *Le monde slave* (1933–1935).
  44. See the editorial remark in *Bibliohrafiia prats' Prof. D. Doroshenka za 1899–1942 roky*, pp. 7–8. The work was entitled: "Deutsche geistige Strömungen in der Ukraine und deren Einfluss auf die Gestaltung des ukrainischen Geistesleben."
  45. Doroshenko, *Moï spomyny pro davne mynule*, p. 83.
  46. Doroshenko, *Spomyny pro nedavne mynule*, p. 237.
  47. Doroshenko, *Pravoslavna tserkva v mynulomu i suchasnomu*; idem, *Korotkyi narys istorii khrystiians'koï tserkvy* (Winnipeg, 1949).
  48. Dmytro Doroshenko, "Shakespeare in Ukrainian," *Slavonic Review* 9.27 (1931):708–12; "Goethe-Übersetzungen in der ukrainischen Literatur," *Germanoslavica* 2 (1932):381–7; "Das Goethe-Jubiläum bei den Ukrainern," *Germanoslavica* 2, no. 1 (1933):119–21; "Deutsche Elemente im Ukrainischen," *Germanoslavica* 2, no. 2 (1933):243–7; "Das deutsche Recht in der Ukraine," *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* 5, no. 4 (1931):502–18.
  49. *Bibliohrafiia prats' Prof. D. Doroshenka za 1899–1942 roky* lists "Die ukrainische östlich-orthodoxe Kirche in Kanada und in den Vereinigten Staaten

- von Amerika," *Kyrios* 1–2 (1940):153–7; and "Die Ukrainer in Kanada," *Volksforschung* 5, nos. 2–3 (1942):179–87.
50. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Po ridnomu kraiu: Podorozhni vrazhennia i zamitky*, 3d ed. (New York, 1956). This edition is a photoreprint of the second revised and expanded edition published in Lviv in 1930.
  51. Oleksander Ohloblyn, "Z lystiv Dmytra Doroshenka do O. P. Ohloblyna," *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 2, nos. 3–4 (1965):84–8, esp. p. 86.
  52. Vasył Omel'chenko, "Dmytro Doroshenko (1882–1951)," pp. 407–17, defends Doroshenko's reputation as a scholar who used primary materials from the archives, whereas Ivan Korovyts'kyi, "Dmytro Doroshenko," introduction to "Lysty do Lypyn'skoho," pp. xv–xli, esp. p. xxxvi, stresses his role as a popularizer. Similarly, Volodymyr Doroshenko, "Moï vzaïemny," pt. 12, considers him to be primarily a popularizer, even stating that as a professional historian, he should not be ranked with either his predecessors Volodymyr Antonovych, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, and Mykola Vasylenko, or with his contemporaries Myron Korduba, Stepan Tomashiv'skyi, and V'iacheslav Lypyn'skyi, or even with the younger Galicians Vasył Harasymchuk, Ivan Dzhydzhora, and Ivan Kryp'iakevych. However, it should be noted that the author of this rather severe judgment, Volodymyr Doroshenko, was himself not a professional historian, but rather a librarian and a bibliographer.
  53. Each English-language edition had a different introduction: R. W. Seton-Watson (for the Prague edition), George Simpson (for the Winnipeg edition), and Clarence Manning (for the New York edition).
  54. Dmytro Doroshenko, "Ukrainian Historiography since 1914," *Slavonic Review* 7 (1924):233–9; "Shakespeare in Ukrainian," *Slavonic Review* 9 (1931):708–12; "The Uniate Church in Galicia (1914–1917)," *Slavonic Review* 12 (1934):622–7; "Mykhajlo Dragomanov and the Ukrainian National Movement," *Slavonic Review* 16 (1938):654–6.
  55. Dmytro Doroshenko, "Die Namen 'Rus,' 'Russland,' und 'Ukraine' in ihrer historischen und gegenwärtigen Bedeutung," *Abhandlungen des Ukrainischen Wissenschaftlichen Institutes* 3 (1931):1–21; "Was ist osteuropäische Geschichte? (Zur Abgrenzung der ukrainischen und russischen Geschichte)," *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* 9, no. 1 (1935):21–67. See also a Ukrainian version published some thirty years after Doroshenko's death: Dmytro Doroshenko, "Shcho take istoriia Skhidnoi Evropy?" *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 19, nos. 1–2 (1982):5–21; *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 19/20, nos. 2–4, 1 (1982–1983):106–18.
  56. Andreas Kappeler, *Kleine Geschichte der Ukraine* (Munich, 1994), p. 9: "Die tausendjährige staatliche Tradition ist allerdings ein nationaler Mythos." Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto, 1988), made "statelessness" a major theme of his book.
  57. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Rozvytok ukrains'koï nauky pid praporom Shevchenka* (Winnipeg, 1949).