

## THE PROBLEM OF UKRAINIAN ETHNOLOGY IN PANTELEIMON KULISH'S SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE

### Rezumat

#### Problema etnologiei ucrainene în patrimoniul științific al lui Panteleimon Kulish

Panteleimon Kulish este considerat o personalitate importantă a națiunii ucrainene, ce prezintă interes și în zilele noastre. Relevanța lucrării constă în determinarea locului istoricului în viața culturală și științifică a Ucrainei și a ideilor sale despre identitatea poporului ucrainean. Articolul descrie și analizează principalele gânduri ale lui P. Kulish despre națiunea ucraineană, istoria și caracteristicile sale principale pe baza operelor istorice și etnografice. În lucrarea lui P. Kulish principalele calități ale ucrainenilor sunt descrise și comparate cu informațiile furnizate de alți istorici ucraineni ai secolului al XIX-lea și se analizează formarea ideologiei istoricului, punctele sale istorice, sociale și politice.

**Cuvinte-cheie:** ucraineni, biografie, Panteleimon Kulish, patrimoniul științific.

### Резюме

#### Вопросы украинского народоведения в научном наследии Пантелеймона Кулиша

Пантелеймон Кулиш считается важной фигурой украинской нации, а его личность вызывает интерес в наши дни. Актуальность работы заключается в определении места историка в культурной и научной жизни Украины и его идей о самобытности украинского народа. В статье описываются и анализируются основные мысли П. Кулиша об украинской нации, ее истории и основных характеристиках на основе его исторических и этнографических работ. Описываются основные качества украинцев в творчестве П. Кулиша и сравниваются с информацией, представленной в работах других украинских историков XIX в., а также анализируется формирование идеологии исследователя, его исторические, социальные и политические взгляды.

**Ключевые слова:** украинцы, биография, Пантелеймон Кулиш, научное наследие.

### Summary

#### The Problem of Ukrainian Ethnology in Panteleimon Kulish's Scientific Heritage

Panteleimon Kulish is considered to be an important figure of the Ukrainian nation and his personality presents interest nowadays. The thesis timeliness lies in the necessity to define the historian's place in the cultural and scientific life of Ukraine and to refer back to his ideas about Ukrainians' originality. The goal of the paper is to describe and analyse P. Kulish's main thoughts about the Ukrainian nation, its history and main characteristics based on his histo-

rical and ethnographic works. Describing the main features of Ukrainians in P. Kulish's works and comparing them with the information provided by other Ukrainian historians of the XIX century the author also analyses the formation of the historian's ideology, social and political views.

**Key words:** Ukrainians, biography, Panteleimon Kulish, scientific heritage.

Panteleimon Kulish (1819–1897) is a famous Ukrainian historian, writer, folklorist, and public figure who greatly contributed to the ideological and organizational formation of Ukrainian history. He is known by his literary works, among which the historical novel *'Black Council'* has the leading place, as well as his views on the history of Ukraine, folkloristic achievements, and the "kulishivka" phonetic spelling.

P. Kulish's creative works and ideology underwent some changes during his lifetime. Before his exile to Tula in 1847, P. Kulish had been forming and developing as a folklorist, writer and poet having a vision with romantic ideas with the focus on ethnic individualism of Ukrainians. In those times, he met the representatives of Ukrainian, Polish and Russian intelligentsia: Mykhailo Maksymovych, Mykhailo Yuzefovych, Mykola Kostomarov, Taras Shevchenko, Michał Grabowski, Kostiantyn Swidzynski, Petro Pletnyov etc. Since 1840s, P. Kulish had been formed as a historian. In 1840, he wrote his first historical novel *'Mykhailo Charnyshenko, or Malorosia Eighteen Years Ago'*, which he published with the support of M. Yuzefovych. Later on, in 1846 he published another historical novel *'Black Council. The Chronicle of 1663'*. Some years after the exile in Tula, the historian published *'Notes on Southern Rus'* (1856), for which he had obtained sources at the beginning of the 1840s. This work described the past and modern times of Ukrainians, their traditions and culture, in the best way. The change of the historian's views from romantic to critical is seen in two historical works *'The History of the Reunification of Rus'* (1874–1877) and *'The Separation of Malorosia from Poland'* (1887–1889).

An important period in P. Kulish's life began upon his entering Kyiv University in 1837. There, the young student got under the influence of his professor, a famous ethnologist, publisher and di-

rector of the almanac *Kievlianin* Mykhailo Maksymovych<sup>1</sup>, who drew his attention to the collection of ethnologic resources. Kulish became acquainted with Maksymovych's works while studying at Novhorod-Siversky gymnasium. P. Kulish bought his collection of Ukrainian folk songs published in 1834 and M. Kostomarov bought the same book on the same day in Kharkiv. "Both of us, on the same day changed from Russian into Ukrainian narodniks", – wrote P. Kulish in his autobiography [18, p. 37].

Kulish made a review of archives at institutions and monasteries in Kyiv region in the summer of 1883. During his ethnologic trips, the historian got acquainted with a Polish writer, historian and expert of Ukrainian history, Michał Grabowski. Kulish wrote the poem 'Ukraina' in Oleksandrivka village, Chyhyrynpovit, at Grabowski's villa. In the letter to Mykhailo Yuzefovych of 31 June 1893 the historian wrote, "Grabowski is a clever and bright mind... he told me a lot about our history, which we, the Dnieper Ukrainians, couldn't dream about" [21, p. 5-7].

The historian got to know the national folklore and legends better, which he thought to be "a sincere expression of people's thoughts and views on its history" [3, p.121]. If not to take into consideration these national legends, one cannot see historical events and include them into the nation's life, fate and nature. That is why Kulish studied them as the main source of the Ukrainian history. He wrote down legends about the Zaporozhians, gaidamaks, time of Polish domination on the Right bank and got enough information about historical events in the suburbs of the old hetman capital Chyhyryn [17, p. 17]. In the letter of 31 July 1843, Kulish wrote, "Now, I am like a bee going to, onto into? a honeycomb. When I meet a grey, I do not leave it until I squeeze out of him the aromatic flower of the national poetry, either in a legend, or in a song. Studying these Ukrainian antiques improves me as the study of sculpture antiques improves a painter" [18, p. 38].

Kulish really impressed Grabowski. The latter mentioned it in the letter of 31 July 1843 to his friend, the Polish writer Józef-Ignacy Kraszewski<sup>2</sup>, "In his speech, full of ardour, of real poetry and sources impressed me especially. He thought national songs and true people's thoughts to be these sources, but in this subject, outdated and ordinary done by our pedants-folksmen, his thoughts were so juicy, and consideration of art was so right that I could not but wonder and enjoy that precision. He studied the people as an alive book; he showed me a big volume of Ukrainian songs, which was collected more systematically, than all collections known before; a lot of legends... but the most important thing – the study

of people and its poetry was noticeably useful for him and was good food for his mind, able to digest and absorb it" [15, p. 322-324].

In the 1840s Kulish got acquainted with other representatives of intelligentsia. He met a student of Kyiv University Vasyl Bilozersky, his future wife's brother. At that time, he got acquainted with Taras Shevchenko whom he did not like "because of his cynicism". To tell the truth, soon they became good friends – "began to travel around Kyiv, to draw, to cook fish on the bank of the Dnieper". Also, at Mykhailo Yuzefovych's Kulish met Mykola Kostomarov, who was a teacher at a gymnasium [1, p. 118-120]. Under the influence of Kyiv intelligentsia, romantic history writing of that time, influences of preromantic enlightenment in Herder's and Rousseau's version and based on the ethnographic materials, Kulish came to the conclusion about the distinctiveness of the Ukrainians, their great history and originality [21, p. 78].

Later on, together with T. Shevchenko, V. Bilozersky<sup>3</sup>, M. Hulak<sup>4</sup>, O. Markovych<sup>5</sup>, Kulish joined the creation of Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood. Then he wrote two works: 'Tale of the Ukrainian People' (1846) and 'Ukrainian National Legends' (1847). In 'Tale of the Ukrainian People', a work for older children, the historian placed some lessons of Ukrainian history. He confirmed that a nation without its religion could not be a nation. Losing the religion was the first step to its assimilation by another nation. P. Kulish also wrote about national leaders' role, who lead the nation in problem situations. He described some examples in 'Tale of the Ukrainian People': Nalyvaiko, Pavliuk, Triasylo who rebelled against Polish oppression. All of them were support for the nation, when it seemed to stop the existence [7, p. 382].

The other work, 'Ukrainian National Legends' was the collection of ethnography and folklore materials. This book was published with the help of Jossyp Bodiansky<sup>6</sup>, a professor of Moscow University. In fact, it was a collection of legends that P. Kulish wrote down while travelling in Ukraine. After each story, the historian wrote from whom and where he had got the legends, which were thematically divided into three chapters: "Historical Legends", "Fantastic Legends" and "Mixture". On the pages of the collection, there are stories about the Zaporozhians, Cossacks, Tatars, legends of the Golden Gates, wars of Khmelnytsky, Mazepa and Paliy, legends of Kyrylo Kozhumiaka, scenes of the domestic everyday life [8, p. 90]. 'Ukrainian National Legends' was an introduction to his planned encyclopedia 'The Life of People in Malorosia' where Kulish was about to publish not

only geographical, historical and juridical information but also the national legends [18, p. 38].

That time P. Kulish's views on history were under the influence of *'The History of the Ruses'* and national idealistic views on the Cossacks. The historian considered Cossack time "the most brilliant period in Ukrainian history" and called the Cossacks true heroes of their people and successors of Kyivan Rus [16, p. 288].

After having enough materials, Kulish wrote his famous historical novel *'Black Council'* (1846). It is the most known of Kulish's works. At first, a part of this work appeared in 1845 in *Sovremenik* journal, which was edited by Petro Pletniov<sup>7</sup>. Based on the plot of the events of June 1663, the historian tried to find out the place of a man in society, explain his role in history. On 17-18 June 1663, the Black Council in Nizhyn took place, where not only the Cossacks, but also villagers and townspeople gathered. Ivan Brukhovetsky became a new hetman with the help of Moscow army and the support of the lower classes of society. To Kulish's mind, the leader appears among people in a critical situation. This man can be a leader of the epoch, lead his nation to prosperity, or quite the reverse – ruin the achievements of the previous generations [9, p. 245].

P. Kulish "sympathized more with representatives of cultural class of the Cossacks than the democratic Zaporozhe" in his *'Black Council'*. The better Kulish knew history sources, the more he thought the Cossacks to be the destroyers, who ruined the previous achievements of culture. Such views could be the result of influences of the experts on the Ukrainian and Polish history, Grabowski and Swidzynski [17, p. 32-33].

Kulish's perspective career was destroyed by participating in Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood. After a report of a student-moskal Petrov, the historian was arrested, as all of the participants. Despite the fact that his involvement in this Brotherhood was not proved, a scolding of gendarme was categorical: "Kulish, a teacher of school 5 in Saint Petersburg, who did not participate in this brotherhood, but was on friendly terms with its participants, must be arrested and deported to Oleksiyravelin for four months and then to Vologda for hard labour..." [22, p. 13]. Probably, Kulish's works about the distinctiveness of the Ukrainians, their great history and originality were a true reason for his being arrested. His ideas did not suit the imperial scheme of Russian history that argued about one Russian people. For this kind of activity, Kulish had to spend three years and three months in Tula. However, he worked with the same enthusiasm there, learning new languages and

working on historical books sent by J. Bodiansky [17, p. 19-24].

This period was crucial in P. Kulish's life. "After a great academic career and public influence, he dived into a swamp of province existence". Then, his life was characterised by poverty, malnutrition, hard work. The man who lived before in the biggest Ukrainian cities and was about to get his scientific career had to be somewhere in the far Russian land. His wife, Oleksandra Myhaylivna Bilozerska, in her request to the tsar of 5 March 1849 wrote: "During a year and a half of our staying in Tula we spent my entire dowry". Kulish was faced a choice – to change his views or to live in exile. The historian chose the first one, but he did not stop writing in the Ukrainian way [22, p. 25-34].

In 1847, P. Kulish wrote to the gendarmes: "I know that my personality has a strange, humiliating for me meaning. That is why I wish to show everyone that my ideal of possible justice in the world, rationality and practical love lies in the Russian government. As for the old times of Russians and Ukrainians, particularly, I look with horror and pity, and, to my mind, it has just come a time of full wonderful state life for Russia, which Peter the Great started. My *'Chorna Rada'* is corrected and redone in some places and shows all the disorder of the Ukrainian past and, based on a long-time study of historical sources, will prove to all the sensible people that our past is like a night tale and that a bright day of calm life has come for Malorosia just in modern time. If I could be so happy that the government would give me back its trust and allow me to print, I would go to a new with this novel. I am sure it will make people think about me in another way; both those who blame my unreasonable thoughts and those who consider me to be a La Mancha hero. The former and latter irritate my soul and, your majesty, understand how happy I could be if you believed in my in your opinion!" [13, p. 110].

The new period in P. Kulish's life began at the beginning of 1850s: in December 1850, he was released with prohibition to work in the educational sphere and print his literary works. No work was published for several years, but in 1856 *'Notes on Southern Rus'* was published. This work was the ethnographic study "with new basis, in which the historian introduced true material to the reader, that described great pictures of Ukrainian past life and Ukrainian culture. The historian introduced not only true history and ethnological materials, but also the Ukrainian culture to readers [21, p. 19].

P. Kulish thought that a nation is born of culture. He gave the central place in it to a man, who could

create, be a leader of people. The nation cannot exist without culture, art and intellectual people, all that Kulish called intelligentsia. The historian called on the Ukrainian intelligentsia to serve the national-liberating ideas of the Ukrainians. In *'The Call to the Ukrainian Intelligentsia'* he condemned "the most respectable houses", which forgot their origin and began to ignore their faith, and their tongue negligence. Kulish emphasized that responsibility of backwardness in culture and enlightenment was on "the best" people, who did not make their things, but "looked at another's" [2, p. 6-7].

P. Kulish's *'Notes'* was highly appreciated by his contemporaries. Taras Shevchenko wrote in his diary: "Particularly I am grateful to him for his *'Notes on Southern Rus'*... It is a diamond in the modern literature." A French scientist Alfred Rambo devoted to his *'Notes'* a special part in the study about Ukraine and its history songs [18, p. 38-39]. Kulish's name became well known in Galicia and Bukovina. Yakiv Holovatsky<sup>8</sup> asked the historian to help to write a reader of Ukrainian literature since Ivan Kotliarevskyi's time that was ordered by the Ministry of Science of the Habsburg Monarchy [20, p. 7].

In 1860s, infringements of the Ukrainian word began. In 1862 *Osnova* stopped publishing, on the Right bank of the Dnieper P. Kulish's *'Grammar'* was prohibited to sell, and in 1863 a minister Valuev published an order, which prohibited to print books wrote in Ukrainian. All of that "had made an awful impression on the historian" who thought that a tongue proved the existence of the nation. He laughed at those, who forgot their tongue, because they lost their national memory [17, p. 32-33]. Kulish was one of those on the Left bank who considered the Ukrainian language to be the element that could unite two separate parts of Ukraine. In his letter to Y. Holovatsky the historian wrote his thoughts about "iazychie that prevailed on pages in Galicia: "Why don't you, sincere brothers, take our language, but write in a way it was written at our academies and was given up? We have not one but two literatures. Your literature is as far from ours as Moscow. And your orthography is so strange for those who had not been in your lands and did not hear your pronunciation; they will read your books in the Moscow language. Couldn't you take it into consideration in your *Slovo*? Read again what we write about our literature in *Osnova*. It seems you should think so, in other way we go by two different ways and God knows when we shall gather together." [20, p. 8-9]

The historian called on the nation to be united, create science and literature, "put the banner on it". He confirmed that everything great began from

small and powerful – from little power. That is why the nation can come to its state by little steps. In *'The Call to the Ukrainian Intelligentsia'* P. Kulish called to put out a social level, called "lords and peasants" to join a nation and save the "holly inheritance" – the word. He thought the word to be a thing that made a nation from people [2, p. 24-25].

Panteleimon Kulish was one of those Ukrainian historians of the 19th century who proved the independence and originality of Ukrainians while studying the history of Ukraine. Calling the Ukrainians the "Ukrainian nation" and "the Southern Rus people", the historian connected them neither to Poles nor to Russians. He considered this nation to be the indigenous people of Ukraine and defined Ukrainian territory by "Malorosia, White, Black and Red Rus, the Don land and the Black Sea land". P. Kulish found out that Ukrainians did not call themselves by one ethnonym. Russian names "Cherkasy" or "Malorosy" had no popularity in the society. The Ukrainians considered themselves descendants of the Ruses and Cossacks and called themselves "people, just the people".

The historian started studying history of Ukraine (he used this appellation as the other members of Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood) "called Rus in ancient time" since Rus. He considered Rus to be a common homeland for Ukrainians and Russians. Another Ukrainian historian, M. Kostomarov studied that problem in his work *'Two Rus Peoples'* and used the same definition. P. Kulish did not deny the Normans theory, however, he thought the Slavs to be indigenous people of that state and the Normans to be migratory but dominant group that had been able to unite different principalities under the authority of the Rurik dynasty.

Studying the history of Ukraine, Panteleimon Kulish took into consideration the main characteristics of Ukrainians that distinguished them from other nations. Having found out Ukrainians were a distinctive nation and had no connection either to Poles or to Russians, but who had a glorious history, the historian tried to explain the nation's psychology and found those characteristics that had distinguished them. P. Kulish mentioned the main features of Ukrainians not only in his history but also in the literary works. Unlike other Ukrainian historians of the 19th century, who only characterized the nation, he could describe the Ukrainians in their everyday life. He studied the nation as a society where every man had his own characteristics, advantages and disadvantages that could not be simplified to something average. In his works, the Ukrainians were not described as grey silhouettes that created one homogeneous mass, but as living people. The historian

used observations and national legends as the main sources for describing the traditional features of Ukrainians. In his works, Panteleimon Kulish often mentioned those characteristics of his parents, fellow students and Ukrainian intelligentsia he had seen. He began collecting the national legends of Cossack period during his ethnographic trips in Ukraine in 1840s. Staying in different places and speaking to the Ukrainians, Kulish penetrated into their everyday life and could observe their behavior in different life situations. Comparing the population of cities and villages, the historian had noticed they had different qualities: he concluded there were two types of the Ukrainians in the 19th century – a “villager” and a “citizen”. Based on the main features of each group that division often, but not always, coincided with a place of living. Kulish considered the former to be the traditional type of Ukrainians and described it positively. The latter accepted the dominant culture and repudiated the native tongue and traditions.

Panteleimon Kulish considered the language asserted the Ukrainians' mentality. Rich in national legends and songs, it told about their bravery, equality and sensitivity. As for the historian, who spoke the ancient Greek language, ancient Hebrew, Latin and six European languages, the language was not only a means of communication. Kulish thought “a word”, as his contemporary M. Kostomarov called “the soul of nation's life”, showed its psychology and kept the old and glorious history of Ukraine in legends, coming back to the furthest time of the national life. Having found its beginning in the ancient Slavic language, the historian emphasized that Ukrainian was the language, but not the dialect based on Polish or Russian. Ruthenian, the first name of the Ukrainian language, since the 18th century (with the appearance of the Russian Empire) wrongly had been used for the Russian language. Having found out the Ruthenian language, the only in Rus, had been the common language of that state, Panteleimon Kulish considered it to be “the main representative of all Slavic nations”. Since Rus decline, the Ukrainian language had been developing in the Duchy of Lithuania and had become the official language of the Lithuanian court. The first Statutes of Lithuania were written in Ruthenian and all judicial proceedings were led in that language. The Ruthenian language did not vanish in the Kingdom of Poland and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Sygizmund III declared in 1589 that language to be used in the judiciary of Ruthenian Voivedoship. Ukrainian was the main language of communication of princely families in Poland to the end of the 17th century when it had been changed by Polish.

For Ukrainians the language was a vital national word that was expressed in a song. P. Kulish considered the melodiousness of Ukrainians to be the evidence of their sensitivity: it made one cry or smile. The historian paid special attention to the Ukrainian song reminding of his mother's singing: almost in every work P. Kulish described singing girls or Ukrainian kobzar, whose songs he had heard while travelling in Ukraine in 1840s.

Kulish took into consideration a special attitude of Ukrainians to religion. It did not have an external ceremonial character but had a deep internal and sacral basis for them. The historian considered piety to be the main feature of Ukrainians: it was expressed in sincerity, love and in the same time in the fright of “a clear and chaste heart” to God. P. Kulish exemplified it by their hoping on “holy love that makes our mortal life as Eden” [5, p. 90-91]. They did not hope for a hetman, did not wait any help from a Polish king or a Moscow tsar, trusting their life to God and considered Holy Mother their Patroness [4, p. 138]. There should have been icons of God, Holy Virgin-Mother and other saints in each “Christian house”. Being adorned by rushnyks and flowers, “in bright rizas”, they were that sacral place in front of which a Ukrainian stayed “on knees crying” [5, p. 94-95]. M. Kostomarov found the same value of the religion while characterizing Ukrainians and Russians. He considered the “filling of God's presence”, “internal appeal to God”, “heart leading to sacred” to distinguish them from the traditional external character of Russians [14, p. 70-73].

Crossing through sacred for the Ukrainians was a terrible sin and it could be followed by punishment. That was a reason of the deference to parents: they did not begin any responsible deed without parents' blessing, kept their word and did not infringe it. Offending the father or mother was supposed irreparable and got the blame of society. Kulish gave such examples in his works *Mykhailo Charnyshenko, or Malorosia Eighty Years Ago* and *Girl's Heart*. Ukrainians had a special attitude to the Christian holidays: it was prohibited to work on those days and those who broke the prohibition were ashamed by people. In one of his early works, *That Happened to Burdiug Cossack on the Green Week*, Panteleimon Kulish had described what could happen to a man in such situation in the Ukrainians' vision [10, p. 18-27]. Religion tolerance to other Christians that the Ukrainians considered “their relative” was one of the main features of the nation [8, p. 90]. It could be the reason why Ukrainian territories had been incorporated into Lithuania, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and Moscow with no considerable op-

position. To the historian's mind, the main reason of conflicts between Ukrainians and other nations, particularly with Poles and Jews, was the arbitrariness of the latter but not different religion views. The other Ukrainian historian of the 19th century Volodymyr Antonovych agreed with P. Kulish in that characteristic. He found out Ukrainians had complied with the principle "do not take mine and I should not take yours" in religion [12, p. 98]. By that fact, hostile relations between Ukrainians and the "Islam world" could be explained; in the 13th century, Christian shrines had been ruined and people were killed. "Unexpected Tatar pogrom" to "Cossack heart" had been marked in "brave Ruses by eternal hostility to Mongols" [6, p. 58]. Sacral meaning of Christianity for Ukrainians and of Islam for Turks and the hostility based on religion became the reason of fierce struggle: in its result, the Ukrainian Cossacks could inflict a crushing defeat to the Golden Horde. Nevertheless, in spite of hostility, the Cossacks took some traditions from the Tatars.

Panteleimon Kulish considered Ukrainians to be frank to each other and other Christians and to be careful with foreigners and people of other religions. Ukrainians were particularly tolerant to Catholics and they perceived the Church Union negatively, because it restricted the Orthodox and "Poles began oppressing this kind-hearted people" [7, p. 53]. The best way of the two nations' existence could be mutual tolerance of Orthodox and Catholic Church with the cohesion of Ukrainians and Poles accordingly, but not the union with Orthodox restricting. In those conditions, they could avoid such painful opposition for the two nations, as, for example, Koliyivshchyna with its numerous victims of both Ukrainians and Poles [11, p. 113-156].

Rejecting any religious reasons the historian interpreted the conflicts between Ukrainians and Jews by usury and extortion of the latter. A character of a Jew-usurer was kept in the mind of the Ukrainians for some time, which was wrongly associated with the whole nation and equation to "zhyd" was a great offence among the Cossacks [8, p.28].

Panteleimon Kulish found out "social equality" among the Ukrainians that was expressed in Zaporozhian Sich. The historian informed the Cossacks considered Sich to be their "family": calling "Sich – mother and the Great Meadow – father", they called each other "brothers" and their otaman- "father". Those who wanted to join the Zaporozhian Cossacks should have had fame or passed strict trials. A term of living in Sich was not regulated: one could come and leave it any time he wished. Cossacks equality was seen in solving important problems; each of

them participated in it. The Cossack court was based on such principle: it was led by the vote majority in hovel, and in common affairs it was led by the council where each of them had a vote [6, p. 58].

**Conclusion.** Panteleimon Kulish's ideology, expressed in his history, social and political views, had a considerable development: European literature, Kyiv scientific groups, Polish intelligentsia and Tula exile influenced on it. Kulish, one of the most famous Ukrainian historians of the 19th century, could describe Ukrainian history in different aspects since Rus time. Having paid attention to the Cossacks period in Ukrainian history, the historian studied the main characteristics of Ukrainians and proved them as a separate nation with its own history. He did not characterize the nation by only one criterion, but treated it as people among whom every man had his own qualities, strengths and weaknesses.

#### Notes

1. Mykhailo Maksymovych (1804–1873) – a Ukrainian scientist, encyclopaedist, historian, philosopher, poet, botanist, the first rector of Kyiv University.
2. Józef-Ignacy Kraszewski (1812–1887) – a Polish writer, publisher, historian, journalist, scholar, painter and author who produced more than 200 novels and 150 novellas, short stories and art reviews.
3. Vasyl Bilozersky (1825–1899) – a Ukrainian journalist, public and political figure.
4. Mykola Hulak (1821–1899) – a Ukrainian scientist, historian, philosopher, mathematician, translator, pedagogue, publicist, literary critic and legist.
5. Opanas Markovych (1822–1867) – a Ukrainian folklorist, ethnologist and public figure.
6. Josyp Bodyansky (1808–1878) – a notable slavist of Ukrainian ethnicity who studied and taught at the Moscow University.
7. Petro Pletniov (1791–1865) – a Russian poet and literary critic.
8. Yakiv Holovatsky – a notable Ukrainian historian, literary scholar, ethnographer, linguist, bibliographer, lexicographer and poet.

#### Bibliography

##### Panteleimon Kulish's Works

1. Kulish P. Zhyzn Kulisha [The Life of Kulish]. Kyiv: Ukrainyskyi svit, 2005. 382 p.
2. Kulish P. Zazyvnyi lyst do ukrainskoi inteligensii. [The Call to the Ukrainian Intelligentsia]. Kyiv: Edition of "Ukrainskapres-grupa", 2012. 55 p.
3. Kulish P. Zapiski o Yuzhnoi Rusi [Notes on Southern Rus]: in two volumes. V. 1. Saint Petersburg, 1856. 322 p.
4. Kulish P. Zapiski o Yuzhnoi Rusi [Notes on Southern Rus]: in two volumes. V. 2. Saint Petersburg, 1857. 354 p.
5. Kulish P. Marusia Bohuslavka: poema z 1620-kh rokov: z peredmovoii i poiasnieniam [Marusia Bohuslavka:

- a Poem of 1620s: with a foreword and explication by V. Shchurat]. Lviv, Edition of "Literaturni perlyny", 1928. 130, IV p.
6. Kulish P. Otpadenie Malorossii ot Polshy [The Separation of Little Russia from Poland]: in three volumes. V. I. Moscow: University Typography, Strasn. Boulevard, 1888. 281 p.
  7. Kulish P. Povest ob ukrainskom narode (Tale of the Ukrainian People). Saint Petersburg, 1946. 116 p.
  8. Kulish P. Ukrainskie narodnye predania [Ukrainian National Legends]. Moscow: University Typography, 1847. 90 p.
  9. Kulish P. Chornarada, khronika 1663 roku [Black Council, the Chronic of 1663]. Saint Petersburg: A. Jakobson's Typography, 1857. 428 p.
  10. Sochinienia i pisma P. A. Kulisha [Works and Letters of P. A. Kulish] / Edited by I. Kamanin. V. 5. Kyiv: A. M. Kulish's Printing-house, 1910. 245 p.
  11. Khata / Published by P. A. Kulish. Saint Petersburg, 1860. 200 p.
- Sources**
12. Antonovych V. Moia spovid. Vybrani istorychni ta publitsystychni tvory [My Shrieft. Selected History and Publicistic Works]. Kyiv: Lybid, 1995. 816 p.
  13. Kyrylo-Mefodiivske tovarystvo [Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood]. In three volumes / by M. I. Bunych, I. I. Hlyz, O. O. Franko. V. 2. Kyiv, 1990. 693 p.
  14. Kostomarov M. Dve russkie narodnosti [Two Rus' Peoples]. In: Osnova. Saint Petersburg, 2007, 3, p. 33-80.
  15. Grabowski M. Listy literackie [Literature Letters] / Published by A. Bar. Kraków, 1934. 452 p.
- Literature**
16. Andreiev V. Kulishyak istoryk kozatstva u tvorchosti Doroshenka [Kulishas a Historian of the Cossacks in Doroshenko's Works]. In: Naukovi zapysky of the Institute of Ukrainian Archeographie and Source criticism of M. Hrushevskiy NASU. V. 6. Kyiv, 2001, p. 286-291.
  17. Doroshenko D. Panteleimon Kulish. Kyiv, Leipzig, 1923. 207 p.
  18. Kyryliuk Ye. Kulish – folklorist. In: Ukraina, 10, 1944, p. 37-39.
  19. Nakhlik Ye. Panteleimon Kulish i "Ruska triytsia". Do problem ideolohichnykh shukan sered ukrainskoi intelihentsii XIX stolittia. [Panteleimon Kulishand "Ruthenian Triad". On the Problem of Ideological Searching among the Ukrainian Intelligentsia in XIX Century]. Lviv: Lvivski Novyny, 1994. 28 p.
  20. Romanchenko I. Kulish – biohraf i krytyk Hoholia [Kulish – Biographer and Criticof Gogol]. Romen, 1943. 78 p.
  21. Yas O. Istorych nipohliady Panteleimona Kulisha v svitli intelektualnykh hmetamorfoz 1870–80-kh [Panteleimon Kulish's Viewson History in the Lightof Intellectual Metamorphoses of 1870–80-ies]. In: Istoriografichni doslidzhennia Ukrainy, 17, 2007, p. 78-106.
  22. Yefromov S., Doroshkevych S. Panteleimon Kulish. Kyiv, 1927. 197 p.
- Artem Kokosh** (München, Bavaria, Germania). Doctorand a Universităţii Libere din Ucraina.
- Артем Кокош** (Мюнхен, Бавария, Германия). Докторант Украинского свободного университета (Український Вільний Університет).
- Artem Kokosh** (Munich, Bavaria, Germany). PhD student of Ukrainian Free University.