

TO THE EDITOR:

It has occurred to me that the following comment on Robert A. Maguire's review of my translation of Nikolai Gogol's *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, which appeared in the March 1970 issue, might interest your readers as well as others whose translations have been reviewed by Mr. Maguire.

"Condemned, condemned," sang the demon choir,
"Condemned to Robert A. Maguire!"

Angels: Often the letter and often the spirit,
Well-crafted the introduction,

Demons: But oh! the peccata
Of the errata
Merit your instruction.

Angels: The context we get, composition and critics,
Notes adequately informing,

Demons: But oh! the peccata
Of the errata
And murkiness deforming.

Angels: Never before a version in English,
Even non-Slavists are for it.

Demons: But oh! the peccata
Of the errata
Will always go before it.

Angels: 'Tis a marvel indeed that no one had done it—
Mayhap 'twill be used in courses.

Demons: But oh! the peccata
Of the errata
Exact Academy sources!

"Condemned, condemned," sang the angel choir,
"Condemned by Robert A. Maguire!"

(See also, on this subject, S. Shevyrev, "Pokhozhdeniia Chichikova, ili Mertvyedushi, Poema N. Gogolia," in *Moskvitianin*, 1842, no. 7–8, first paragraph.)

JESSE ZELDIN
Hollins College

Professor Maguire does not wish to reply.

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor C. Bickford O'Brien, in reviewing my monograph *Prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky* (March 1970), raised several questions which need clarification. The reviewer states: "The research has been handicapped by very limited sources. Despite this obstacle, Vynar has uncovered much useful data about Vyshnevetsky and removed some of the perplexities." It should be pointed out that in my study I used essential and relevant historical sources and even included some of the

documents in the appendix. It should also be stressed that the primary sources directly dealing with Vyshnevetsky's activity are rather scarce. However, if the reviewer is familiar with additional sources it would be beneficial to list them.

Professor O'Brien further questions that the central motive behind Vyshnevetsky's activity was opposition to Tatars and states that "many doubts remain about Vyshnevetsky's role in Cossack history that the author's arguments have not dispelled." In order to support his statement he raises the following specific question: ". . . if aristocrats like Vyshnevetsky were so influential in the genesis of the Cossack movement, how did their ideas gain support and why were these men chosen as leaders instead of others?" In my opinion there is no doubt concerning the participation of aristocracy during the early organizational phase of Ukrainian Cossacks. The names of Prince Dmytro Putiatych, governor of Kiev, Jurij Pac, governor of Kiev, Prince Bohdan Hlynsky, governor of Cherkassy, Ostap Dashkevych, descendant of Kievan boyars and starosta of Cherkassy, Predslaw Lantskoronsky, starosta of Chmelnik, and many other members of Ukrainian nobility were associated with the growth of the Cossack movement. Some of them in later historical tradition were even considered as "first Cossack hetmans." In the case of Prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, as correctly suggested by George Vernadsky, "he tended to identify himself with the Cossacks as their leader" (*Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*, p. 255).

One of the predominant and central topics which occupied the attention of all spheres of the population within the Ukraine in the sixteenth century was the question of defending their lands from the Tatar raids, as well as designing offensive strategy against the Tatar and Turkish settlements in the steppes. It could be said that this permanent Tatar danger played a significant role in the rather rapid development of Ukrainian Cossackdom. Among the Ukrainian nobility Vyshnevetsky was one of the most outstanding organizers of the Cossacks, and the first of the Cossack leaders who built their fortress on the Dnieper island Khortytsia in the cataract region. His identification with the Cossack style of life and their struggles against the Tatars, and his competency as a military leader explain why he, and not the other contemporaries, was the most favored Cossack leader.

In my monograph I emphasized not only Vyshnevetsky's anti-Tatar attitude as the "central motive" of his activity. I also stressed and documented his contribution to the development of Cossack organization as a strong and independent military force in the Ukraine in the sixteenth century. Furthermore, I also presented in the form of a hypothesis Vyshnevetsky's political concept of separation of Moldavia and Turkish protectorate and the establishment of independent Moldavian principality. This concept, in the writer's opinion, also constitutes a central motive in Vyshnevetsky's military and political activity.

It is hoped that in the future, when new archival materials are discovered (especially in Turkish archives), the dynamic life of Prince D. Vyshnevetsky and his role in East European history will be re-examined and more fully interpreted.

LUBOMYR R. WYNAR
Kent State University

Professor O'Brien does not wish to reply.