



Visions of the “Ruina”

Literary depictions of Cossacks and the development of a Ukrainian identity

Mark Romaniw

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Ukrainians were faced with a difficult reality. The territory of Ukraine, once controlled by the predominantly Ukrainian Cossacks, was now controlled by the Russian Empire and became subject to that empire’s social and political system. The decline and demise of Cossack autonomy ended a period of indigenous rule over Ukraine. Ukrainians, now part of a foreign (if somewhat familiar) state, were faced with a dilemma: what is the role of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire? Among the primary societal figures debating this question were representatives of a burgeoning Ukrainian literature who developed a sense of Ukrainian identity in the present by reaching into the Cossack past. The various ways in which writers approached the Cossack past determined their prescriptions for the Ukrainian present; what traditions could be salvaged from the Cossack age and was it possible to recreate its idealized glory in some manner?

The Cossack experience left a potent legacy to the population of the territories absorbed by the Russian Empire. Romanticized notions of Cossack society defined the way that Ukrainians began to see themselves, particularly in the context of a Russian Empire that was encouraging their assimilation and the concurrent abandonment of that legacy. With the development of a vernacular Ukrainian literature in the early eighteenth century, the legacy of Cossack society and the bitter lessons of failed Cossack statehood could easily be popularized. Indeed, the ways in which the Cossack experience entered the evolving Ukrainian national consciousness was the result of works written by Ukrainian literary, political, and cultural figures

who acted as commentators on the role of Ukrainians in contemporary society.

The nineteenth-century writers did not create a single unified vision of the past, but rather several versions of the same myth. Each version of the Cossack myth was intended to provide a direction for nineteenth-century Ukrainian society. However, each version reaches a different conclusion regarding the role of Ukrainians in the nineteenth-century Russian Empire.

Cossack Society and the Ruin

Cossack society evolved in the “wild field” of the steppe, a borderland between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Ottoman Empire and their Tatar vassals, and the rising state of Muscovy. Although other nationalities were represented among the Cossacks, an overwhelming majority was either Ukrainian or Belarusian, originating from the basin of the Dnipro River and its tributaries. Socially, the Cossacks were originally burghers from along the frontier of the Commonwealth, although during the late sixteenth century large numbers of peasants escaped from their magnate landlords to join their ranks. Religiously, they were strongly Orthodox -- in fact, Orthodoxy may have been a more salient feature of their identity than ethnicity or social status. Cossack society was also distinguished by its political culture; the Cossacks were democratic, at least in the sense that they elected their leaders, who tended to be magnates or state officials from the Commonwealth’s frontier. They were fiercely protective of their rights and status with regard to the Commonwealth.¹

Due to their position in the borderland between three powerful rivals and to the martial skills they had developed as a result of their location, the Cossacks were a military asset to the Commonwealth. At the same time, because their society provided an alternative to serfdom there was constant friction between the Cossacks and Commonwealth authorities.² There was no clear notion of what role the Cossacks should play in the Commonwealth; while their military prowess was useful, their Orthodox religion and their relative egalitarianism were undesirable.

The unresolved status of the Cossacks and of the broader population base that provided new recruits was the primary long-term factor that

led to the 1648 uprising led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, a disaffected noble who was elected the Cossack hetman, or chief. As a result of the uprising, Khmelnytskyi was able to establish a Cossack state or Hetmanate that controlled the core or what is today the state of Ukraine. However, despite the establishment of the Hetmanate, the Cossacks were unable to ensure the survival of a Cossack state. The decline began in 1654 when Khmelnytskyi signed the Treaty of Pereyaslav with the Russian Tsar, placing the Hetmanate under the Tsar's protection. The period of "Ruin" following Khmelnytskyi's death in 1657 was characterized by "civil strife, foreign intervention, and further devastation" that led to "the loss of the promising opportunity created by the Khmelnytskyi uprising to attain political self-determination."³

After the 1667 Treaty of Andrusovo and the 1686 "Eternal Peace" agreement, the lands formerly controlled by the Hetmanate were divided between the Commonwealth and the Russian Empire; the Hetmanate was reduced to an autonomous political unit in Left Bank Ukraine, while Right Bank Ukraine was reunited with the Commonwealth and effectively restored to its pre-1648 status. By the late eighteenth century, Cossack society had been destroyed; the last hetman was forced to resign in 1765, the Zaporizhian Sich -- the center of Cossack society -- was razed in 1775, and the territory and army of the Hetmanate was absorbed fully into the Russian Imperial system.

Creating the Cossack Myth, Constructing Ukrainian Identity

Andreas Kappeler argues that during the nineteenth century, Ukrainians occupied several roles in the ethnic hierarchies of the Russian Empire. Cooperative, assimilated (or soon-to-be assimilated) Ukrainians were thought of as *malorossy* or Little Russians; they were regarded as equal to Russians, if somewhat different culturally and linguistically. Non-assimilated Ukrainians, however, were characterized by two different stereotypes: they were either the backward *khokhly*, the "charming, harmless, and even picturesque" but ultimately "stupid, uncultivated" peasants, or the treacherous *mazepintsy*, the foreign-supported separatist heirs of the Cossack hetman Ivan Mazepa.⁴ In other words, in the Russian view the only "cultured" option for Ukrainians was assimilation into the Russian Empire.

Resistance was either a sign of primitivism or of something more sinister - in either event, resistors were not to be trusted.

The Russian view of Ukrainians' role in the Russian Empire formed only one segment of the debate, however. Ukrainian political, literary, and cultural commentators, including writers like Ivan Kotliarevskiy, Nikolai Gogol, and Taras Shevchenko, were instrumental in shaping the way that Ukrainians viewed themselves in the context of the Russian Empire, and they primarily did so by recalling the Cossack past. In their writings, the Cossack past became a "myth" that gave Ukrainians a way to view themselves in the past, present, and future. As George G. Grabowicz explains, "myth is not only a narrative that tells a 'sacred,' deep, and abiding -- and intrinsically unverifiable -- 'truth,' but also a complete, closed symbolic system. A myth is always telling us something essential about the cultural reality; its purpose may be explanatory or normative ... ; in either case, it is an attempt to grasp the *totality* of a given set of phenomena by non-rational, symbolic means."⁵ The myth of the Cossack and of the Cossack past became a central element of Ukrainian national consciousness, representing not only a political or social, but also a moral ideal.⁶

The Cossack myth, however, was approached differently by various writers. The Ukrainian first work to discuss the Cossacks was Kotliarevskiy's comedic *Eneyida*. This Classical depiction of the Cossacks foreshadows their description in the works of Gogol and Shevchenko, although the sense of tragedy -- so palpable in the latter two authors' work -- is not as evident. Although they both act heroically and mourn the lost Cossack past, the Cossacks in Kotliarevskiy's work are conceived primarily as comic characters; the more serious tone of the latter half of *Eneyida* parallels some of the themes of *Taras Bulba*, but the burlesque style established in the first half of the book is difficult to overcome. In contrast to Kotliarevskiy's lighthearted treatment, both Gogol and Shevchenko paint Romantic portraits of the Cossack past: the Cossacks are noble, free, and glorious warriors, who live as immortals in the stories of their heroic deeds. Moreover, such Romanticized depictions are intensified by the tragic fates of these heroes.. However, Gogol and Shevchenko disagree on the basic nature of Cossack society and the sustainability of that system; whereas Shevchenko anticipates a rebirth of Cossack ideals, if not Cossack society, Gogol pronounces those ideals and that society bankrupt, at least in the

present.

Kotliarevskiy's *Eneyida* is a travesty of Virgil's *Aeneid*, written in the Classical style. Similarly to *Aeneid*, it follows the fortunes of a band of Trojans fleeing the destruction of Troy; however, it lacks a sense of tragedy and heroism and instead is a comic portrayal of the Trojans' flight. The tone of the fourth, fifth, and sixth books, in which Aeneas (*Eney*) and the Trojans finally arrive in Latium and struggle against the warrior Turnus (*Turn*) and the Rutulians, is notably more serious than the previous books, but it remains shaded by the comic style.

Throughout *Eneyida*, Aeneas and his followers are portrayed as Cossacks, and one can easily perceive the parallels between the razing of the Zaporizhian Sich (which had occurred during Kotliarevskiy's childhood) and the mythical destruction of Troy. However, the destruction of "Troy" in *Eneyida* and the "Trojans'" search for a new homeland does not carry the same emotional weight as it does in the *Aeneid*. Virgil mixes desperation and hope throughout his work, as evident in one of Aeneas' addresses to his followers:

Aeneas soothes [the Trojans'] melancholy hearts: "O comrades -- surely we're not ignorant of earlier disasters, we who have suffered things heavier than this -- our god will give an end to this as well. ... call back your courage, send away your grieving fear. Perhaps one day you will remember even these our adversities with pleasure. Through so many crises and calamities we make way for Latium, were fates have promised a peaceful settlement. It is decreed that there the realm of Troy will rise again. Hold out, and save yourselves for kinder days."⁷

Kotliarevskiy, on the other hand, never introduces the same combination of desperation and hope, nor is it his intention to do so. Virgil's epic is an account of the founding of an empire, a story which comes to an end with the victory of the Trojan refugees and the birth of Rome. For Kotliarevskiy -- and, indeed, for all Ukrainians at that time -- no certainty of such an end existed. Its satirical style notwithstanding, *Eneyida* assumes a more melancholy meaning when its historical context is taken into account.

The comic element is lessened in the latter half of the book. Whereas the first two parts show Aeneas and the Trojans carousing first in Carthage and then in Sicily and the third part shows a comedic version of Hell, the rest of the story concerns the struggle of the Trojans against the Rutulians for control over Latium. This aspect of the story contains more overt references to the Cossack past, anticipating later portrayals of the Cossacks by Gogol and Shevchenko. For example, as the Trojans are preparing for war against the Rutulians, the glory of the Cossacks is recalled:

Thus it was in eternal memory
 That once in our hetman state,
 So simply the army lined up,
 Not knowing: stand, don't hesitate.
 Such famous Cossack regiments
 From Lubny, Hadiach, Poltava,
 In hats, they were, like poppies, blooming.
 When they surge forward, their companies strike.
 They'll set their spears before themselves,
 And sweep everything away as with a broom.⁸

The heroism of the Cossacks and their camaraderie is also portrayed, and throughout the war against the Rutulians, the Trojans demonstrate their bravery. In one episode, two sentries -- Nisus (*Nyz*) and Euryalus (*Evrial*) -- volunteer to infiltrate the enemy camp at night, saying,

Forget your father, forget your mother,
 Fly to fulfill your obligation;
 When we pledged to Aeneas,
 Into his service we gave our lives,
 Now there is no free will to be had.⁹

Both Nisus and Euryalus are killed during their mission and the Rutulians display their heads before the Trojans' fortifications. The common bonds of loyalty are similarly displayed after Aeneas' close friend Pallas (*Pallant*) is killed, and Aeneas laments over his body, saying,

... O life! Turbulent sea,
 Who remains whole upon you?
 Forgive me, dear friend,
 I'll avenge this tearful sight,
 And Turnus will get his due!"¹⁰

More than in the first three parts, here Aeneas (as well as the Trojans/Cossacks) has many of the same characteristics as the Cossacks in Shevchenko's poetry and Gogol's *Taras Bulba*.

The tragic heroism of the Cossacks is revisited in the works of Shevchenko and Gogol, but each author reinterprets those core themes to create their vision of the Cossack legacy. Gogol's *Taras Bulba* is a Romantic novel that follows the story of the veteran Cossack Taras Bulba and his two sons, Andri and Ostap, as they join the Zaporizhian Cossacks and are consumed by the violence of the Cossack lifestyle. On the one hand, the Cossacks -- and especially the three primary characters -- are portrayed in heroic terms, as fearless defenders of Ukraine and of Orthodoxy. On the other, they are shown both as products and as victims of a barbaric period in history, as all three actively revel in the incessant warfare of the era, and all three eventually die as a result. Ultimately, Taras Bulba and his sons -- like Cossack society as a whole -- destroy themselves, leaving behind nothing more substantial than a legacy of legends.

Cossack society is shown as a natural or organic consequence of a tumultuous period in history. Like Taras Bulba himself, Cossack society was a product of "the harsh fifteenth century in that half-nomadic corner of Europe ... when the flames of war gripped the ancient peaceful Slavic spirit, and Cossackry -- that wide, raging sweep of the Russian character -- was introduced" ¹¹ In this brutal environment, "man, living a blood-drenched life of military campaigns, tempered his soul by stifling his humanity."¹² Nonetheless, honor was found among the barbarism and the Cossacks "came together and clasped hands in brotherhood! ... There is no holier tie! ... It is man alone who can bind himself to another through his soul and not merely through his blood."¹³ Thus Gogol describes, on the one hand, a broad historical culture of inhumanity, and on the other, a common spiritual bond of loyalty within that harsh environment -- the essence of his vision of the Cossacks.

Warfare is portrayed as the *raison d'être* of the Cossacks. At one point, Taras Bulba argues that if the Cossacks don't go to war, "Then Cossack strength will be wasted! The men will go to the dogs without a good cause to fight for, and our Cossacks will be of use neither to our fatherland nor to the Christian world! Then tell me what we are living for!"¹⁴ When they finally decide to go to war, their ultimate purpose is to "spread Cossack glory far over the steppes."¹⁵

The final result of the Cossacks' love of war is their doom. In a prophetic moment, the Cossacks realize this:

The Cossacks peered like eagles across the field at their destiny shimmering darkly in the distance, the whole terrain with its hillocks and paths strewn with their white bones jutting up from the grass, heaped with shattered carts and broken sabers and spears, and drenched with their Cossack blood. ... But there is good in a camp over which death stretches so wide and free. Not a single valiant deed will be lost, and Cossack glory will not be puffed away like a speck of gunpowder from the muzzle of a musket. There will be a bandura player with a gray beard hanging down to his chest who will sing of the valiant deeds, or perhaps a white-haired old man still filled with ripe vigor, who can see into men's souls and who will speak of these Cossacks in powerful and exalted words. And the Cossack's glory will spread proudly, galloping to the ends of the earth, and generations to come will speak of these valiant men.¹⁶

Throughout the novel, the physical death of Cossacks is contrasted by the immortality they attain as figures of legend. The demise of a Cossack -- or of the Cossacks as a group -- is not a final end. In fact, death seems a necessary step in their transcendence into legend. When Taras Bulba asks about the fate of his old comrades-in-arms and is told that they have died (all in gruesome ways), he solemnly remarks, "They were good Cossacks!"¹⁷ Taras Bulba himself dies exhorting his fellow Cossacks to remember him, and the novel ends with two Cossacks escaping in a boat and remembering "their Ataman."¹⁸

While the bravado of the Cossacks is found both in Kotliarevskiy's

work and in Shevchenko, it is difficult to judge Gogol's intent in crafting such explicitly larger-than-life characters. George S.N. Luckyj believes that "Gogol's intention was to create noble characters and to glorify the Cossack way of life. In execution, however, he often reached the level of a farce with Cossacks and Poles playing the parts of cops and robbers."¹⁹ It is likely, however, that the Cossacks are meant to be exaggerated; their single-minded pursuit of glory and their lust for battle are portrayed by Gogol as extremes to underscore the faults of their way of life. Gogol ultimately characterizes Cossack society as centering on a self-destructive cult of violence that offers no future. Consider the fate of Taras Bulba's sons: Andri, who betrays the Cossack brotherhood, dies; Ostap, who becomes a model Cossack, also dies. Taras Bulba himself is undone by his own zeal, captured after turning back to save his pipe, which he doesn't want to fall into Polish hands.

For Gogol, the Cossack era was long over, existing only in legends and in some deep aspect of the "Russian soul." It did not provide a model for modern society -- Ukrainian or Russian -- except, perhaps, as "a foreshadowing of imperial Russian Orthodox power."²⁰ Gogol, unlike his younger contemporary Shevchenko, stood in favor of the status quo for Ukrainians in the Russian Empire.

Shevchenko's poetry, like Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, falls into the category of Romantic literature and revisits many of the same themes as Gogol's work. A good portion of Shevchenko's writings -- poems such as "Son," "Velykiy Lokh," "Rozryta Mohyla," "Ivan Pidkova," "Hamalia," "Stoyit v seli Subotovi...," "Chyhryne, Chyhryne...," and "Tarasova Nich" -- are reactions to the decline of the Cossack age. In them, he expresses a longing to undo that decline; he sees the unfavorable position of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire as a direct result of the loss of Cossack freedom, for which he squarely blames the hetman Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. He anticipates the revival or resurrection of Ukraine.

Shevchenko's poetry, as George G. Grabowicz argues, is neither historical nor historiographical. Rather, it is "metahistorical" -- it does not offer "an account of *what* happened, and certainly not an account purporting to tell *all* that happened ... , but rather a focus on *why* something happened, and 'what it all meant.'"²¹ A simple paradigm dominates his work: that of a fall from grace, with Cossack society as an ideal that is betrayed

by its leaders and then destroyed by its enemies.

Like the Cossack age of Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, Shevchenko's vision of the past has all the trappings of a legend. In the poem "*Rozryta Mohyla*" (1843), a personified Ukraine describes her proud past:

My flowers grew,
My good children,
Once even I ruled
In the wide world --
I ruled...²²

The notion of ruling, or of being in command of one's destiny, is also found in the poem "*Ivan Pidkova*" (1839). In that poem, Shevchenko describes the end of Ukraine's golden age:

Once it was -- in Ukraine
Cannons roared;
Once it was -- the Zaporizhians
Knew how to rule.
They ruled, they attained
Both glory, and freedom;
It passed -- there remain
Burial mounds in the field.²³

In this poem, as in many others, burial mounds or vaults are portrayed as guarding the legacy of the Cossacks; the image of reclaiming a birthright from the grave is strongly evocative of the notion of resurrection. "*Rozryta Mohyla*" describes the Russians plundering the Cossacks' burial mounds in search of treasure. Both "*Velykiy Lokh*" (1845) and "*Stoyit v seli Subotovi*" (1845) concern the excavation of Khmelnytskyi's vault in the village of Subotiv. Shevchenko writes,

What were they searching for there?
What did they hide there,
Our ancestor -- Eh, if only,
If only they found that, which they hid there --
The children would not cry, the mother would not worry. ²⁴

The legacy of the Cossacks is not a physical treasure, Shevchenko explains, but the ability to transcend present hardship. Most importantly, it is beyond the reach of Russia:

Thus a small vault in Subotiv
 Moscow excavated!
 But the great vault
 She hasn't yet found.²⁵

Thus, first and foremost, the legacy of the Cossacks is hope; despite Ukraine's outward appearance of defeat and death, the truth is that she is only sleeping. The image of Ukraine and the Cossacks waiting in a death-like sleep recurs in the poem "*Chyhyryne, Chyhyryne...*" (1844):

... Ukraine fell asleep,
 Covered herself with weeds, bloomed with mold,
 In puddles, in mud her heart sagged
 And she allowed snakes into the cold hollow,
 But to her children in the steppe she passed on hope.
 ...
 Sleep, Chyhyryn, let perish
 The enemy's children.
 Sleep, hetmans, until there rises
 Truth in this world. (Shevchenko 222-224)
 Similarly, Shevchenko writes,
 ... and from under [the fallen church in Subotiv]
 Will rise Ukraine.
 And she will disperse the gloom of captivity,
 Illuminate the world of truth,
 And in freedom there will pray
 The children of the captives!²⁶

Shevchenko's poetry shows that the fall from grace that placed Ukrainians into Russian servitude -- specifically, into serfdom, which the Cossacks had rebelled against and which Shevchenko had experienced first-hand -- was not a permanent condition. There remained hope for a better

future that lay beyond the reach of the Russian oppressors. The Cossacks of the past were merely dormant and would arise again.

Until the dissolution of the Hetmanate and the destruction of the Zaporizhian Sich, the population of Ukraine had remained outside the political and social order of both the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Russian Empire. The Cossack society that flourished in the Ukrainian steppes remained an alternative to both the Commonwealth and the Russian Empire, even while Cossack leaders created a complex system of political relationships with neighboring states. The destruction of Cossack society left Ukraine as an integral part of the territory of the Russian Empire and Ukrainians were forced to reassess the most fundamental elements of their identity. Facing the question of assimilation into the Russian imperial system, Ukrainians defined their current situation by debating their past.

The Cossack myth, as it evolved in nineteenth century literature, sought to define the underlying logic of Ukrainians' relationship to the Russian Empire. Of the three authors examined, Shevchenko offers the clearest political message for Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. Whereas the messages of Kotliarevskiy and Gogol are ambiguous, it is Shevchenko who clearly links the Cossack past with the present reality and offers a projected future. Neither Kotliarevskiy nor Gogol does this, although they both play a role in formulating the overall myth of the Cossacks. Their characterization of the Cossacks as loyal, brave, and heroic has much in common with Shevchenko, but for both of them, the Cossack past is an irretrievable curiosity. Shevchenko treats it as something that can be recaptured and, in doing so, provides the central support for the development of a Ukrainian national consciousness.

Notes

¹ Serhii Plokhyy. *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*. Oxford University Press: New York City, NY, 2001. 21-26; Andrew Wilson. *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. Yale University Press: New Haven, CT, 2000. 58-63.

² Zenon Kohut. E. *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate 1760s-1830s*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1988. 25-26.

³ Orest Subtelny. *Ukraine: A History*. 3rd ed. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2000. 139.

⁴ Andreas Kappeler, Andreas. "Mazepintsy, Malorossy, Khokhly: Ukrainians in the Ethnic Hierarchy of the Russian Empire." in Andreas Kappeler, et al., eds. *Culture, Nation, and*

Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter 1600-1945. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies: Edmonton, Canada, 2003. 175.

⁵ George G. Grabowicz. "Three Perspectives on the Cossack Past: Gogol, Shevchenko, Kulish." in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. vol. 5, no. 2. June 1981. 173.

⁶ Grabowicz, George G. *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Shevchenko*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1982. 17-18.

⁷ Virgil 8.

⁸ Ivan Kotlyareskiy. *Eneyida*. Basilian Press: Toronto, Canada, 2004. 149.

⁹ Ibid. 188.

¹⁰ Ibid. 241.

¹¹ Gogol, Nikolai. *Taras Bulba*. trans. by Peter Constantine. Random House, Inc.: New York City, NY, 2003. 8-9.

¹² Ibid. 132.

¹³ Ibid. 100.

¹⁴ Ibid. 33.

¹⁵ Ibid. 45.

¹⁶ Ibid. 98.

¹⁷ Ibid. 27.

¹⁸ Ibid. 141.

¹⁹ George S.N. Luckyj. *Between Gogol and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine 1798-1847*. Wilhelm Fink Verlag: Munich, 1971. 115.

²⁰ Grabowicz/1981 189.

²¹ Grabowicz/1982 40-41.

²² Shevchenko, Taras Hryhorevych. *Kobzar: Povna Zbirka*. Folio: Kharkiv, Ukraine, 2002. 220.

²³ Ibid. 67.

²⁴ Ibid. 221.

²⁵ Ibid. 303.

²⁶ Ibid. 304.

Works Cited

Gogol, Nikolai. *Taras Bulba*. trans. by Peter Constantine. Random House, Inc.: New York City, NY, 2003.

Grabowicz, George G. *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Shevchenko*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1982.

- Grabowicz, George G. "Three Perspectives on the Cossack Past: Gogol, Shevchenko, Kulish." in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. vol. 5, no. 2. June 1981.
- Kappeler, Andreas. "Mazepintsy, Malorossy, Khokhly: Ukrainians in the Ethnic Hierarchy of the Russian Empire." in Andreas Kappeler, et al., eds. *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter 1600-1945*. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies: Edmonton, Canada, 2003.
- Kohut, Zenon E. *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate 1760s-1830s*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1988.
- Kotlyareskiy, Ivan. *Eneyida*. Basilian Press: Toronto, Canada, 2004.
- Luckyj, George S.N. *Between Gogol and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine 1798-1847*. Wilhelm Fink Verlag: Munich, 1971.
- Magosci, Paul Robert. *A History of Ukraine*. University of Washington Press: Seattle, WA, 1996.
- Ploky, Serhii. *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*. Oxford University Press: New York City, NY, 2001.
- Shevchenko, Taras Hryhorevych. *Kobzar: Povna Zbirka*. Folio: Kharkiv, Ukraine, 2002.
- Subtelny, Orest. *Ukraine: A History*. 3rd ed. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2000.
- Wilson, Andrew. *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. Yale University Press: New Haven, CT, 2000.