THE UKRAINIAN IMPACT ON RUSSIAN CULTURE 1750-1850

DAVID SAUNDERS

The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750–1850

By David Saunders

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta
Edmonton 1985

THE CANADIAN LIBRARY IN UKRAINIAN STUDIES

A series of original works and reprints relating to Ukraine, issued under the editorial supervision of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Editorial Board:
Bohdan Bociurkiw, Carleton University (Social Sciences)
Manoly R. Lupul, University of Alberta (Ukrainians in Canada)
Bohdan Rubchak, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle (Humanities)

Copyright © 1985 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Saunders, David 1951–
The Ukrainian impact on Russian culture, 1750–1850

(The Canadian library in Ukrainian studies)
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
ISBN 0-920862-32-2 (bound).
ISBN 0-920862-34-9 (pbk.)

1. Soviet Union—Civilization—18th century—Ukrainian influences.
2. Soviet Union—Civilization—19th century—Ukrainian influences.
3. Ukraine—Civilization—History.
I. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. II. Title. III. Series.
DK32.7.S37 1985 947'.06 C85-091180-X

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be produced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Cover design: Sherryl Petterson

Printed in Canada by Printing Services, University of Alberta
Distributed by the University of Toronto Press
5201 Dufferin St.
Downsview, Ontario
Canada M3H 5T8

To my mother and father

Contents

Acknowledgements ix
Chapter One 1
Chapter Two: The Convergence of Ukraine and Russia 15
Chapter Three: The Great North Road 41
Chapter Four: Highly Placed Ukrainians 65
Chapter Five: Ukrainians on Grub Street 113
Chapter Six: Ukraine and Russian Literature 145
Chapter Seven: Ukraine and Russian Historical Writing 177
Chapter Eight: Ukraine and Russian Slavic Studies 201
Chapter Nine: The Divergence of Ukraine and Russia 231
List of Abbreviations 255
Notes 259
Bibliography 329

Acknowledgements

An Englishman in Newcastle who publishes a book in Canada about Ukrainians in Russia needs a lot of help. I have been fortunate enough to receive it, especially from Harry Willetts of St. Antony's College, Oxford, who introduced me to Imperial Russian history when I was an undergraduate and supervised the doctoral dissertation on which this book is based. I should also like to thank the following: Professor A. G. Cross of the University of Leeds and Dr. R. J. W. Evans of Brasenose College, Oxford, who examined my dissertation; Dr. L. G. Mitchell and Dr. A. D. Stokes of University College, Oxford, who read draft chapters; the late Professor Ivan L. Rudnytsky and Professor John-Paul Himka of the University of Alberta, who read the whole and offered penetrating criticism; Professor I. A. Fedosov of Moscow State University and Professors V. V. Mavrodin and L. B. Semenov of Leningrad State University, who acted as my advisers in the Soviet Union; Mr. Victor Swoboda and Mr. Julian Graffy, of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London; Professor J. L. Black of Carleton University, Ottawa; Professor Peter Brock of the University of Toronto; and Mrs. Sharon Holleworth and Miss Janice Cummin, for the extraordinary efficiency of their typing. I am greatly indebted to the British Council, the Research Committee of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the Twenty-Seven Foundation and the Wolfson Foundation for scholarships and financial support. I received much assistance from the staff of the Central State Historical Archive in Leningrad, especially from Vladimir Somov, and I am grateful to

all the Soviet archival repositories in which I worked for permission to make use of their materials. Parts of Chapters Six and Seven have appeared in different guise in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, and *Nationalities Papers*.

None of those mentioned here bears any responsibility for my mistakes, for which I am entirely to blame. My parents should take most of the credit for any merit which the book may possess, because without their material and spiritual backing this study would not have been begun, continued, or ended.

David Saunders
Newcastle upon Tyne,
September 1983

Chapter One

Introduction

Followers of that scourge of the intelligentsia, the humorist Stephen Potter, interrupt experts on foreign countries by saying, "Yes, but not in the south." The phrase "will do for any argument about any place,... It is an impossible comment to answer."[1] It certainly applies to the Russian Empire between the mid-eighteenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries. Russia and Ukraine, the northern and southern parts of the empire, differed from one another politically, socially and culturally. They were different before 1750 and different in new ways after 1850, but the differences were particularly important at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries because the Russians were integrating their domains. As a result of the process of integration, northern and southern cultures interacted in more ways than they had in the past. Neither was sufficiently well-developed to ride roughshod over the other. By the mid-nineteenth century Russian dominance seemed assured, but before then Ukrainians had made a considerable impact on their northern neighbours. The Ukrainian contribution to the cultural identity of early nineteenth-century Russia is the subject of this book.

In 1831 a Russian described the difference between Russians and Ukrainians. "Little Russians," he wrote, using a conventional contemporary term for Ukrainians, "are on the whole very frank, pure-hearted, timidly submissive, but in moments of irritation, when insulted, bold to the point of recklessness, but not malicious. The respect and courtesy they show their elders are apparent at all times." Russians, by contrast, were "more furtive, more enterprising, stubborn in pursuit of their goals, given to wrangling."[2] Thirty years earlier a Russian traveller commented on the striking physical difference between the northern and southern parts of the empire. Just outside Kharkiv, a major town in Eastern Ukraine, he came across

> Humble white-daubed cottages; villagers with shaved heads riding on bullocks; taverns open and selling alcohol. In a pleasant, jolly hut I find different faces, different ladies' dress, different organization, and I hear a different language. Is this the empire's border? Am I entering a different state? No! The empire goes on, but the land called Little Russia starts here.[3]

Ukrainians, like Russians, reflected on the differences between north and south. A Ukrainian traveller to St. Petersburg found the inhabitants of the capital unnatural. Although other accounts spoke of the Russians' hospitality and straightforward behaviour, he noticed no such thing.[4] A Ukrainian who lived among Russians for forty years thought that arrogance was their distinguishing feature.[5] Gogol believed that Ukrainian folksongs, even when doleful, expressed involvement with life; Russian laments, on the other hand, were withdrawn and tried "to smother everyday needs and cares."[6] Many nineteenth-century intellectuals commented upon the difference between Russia and Ukraine. The Russian historian S. M. Soloviev spoke affectionately of one of his teachers at Moscow University, the half-Ukrainian Timofei Granovsky. He recalled his charm, his "Little Russian, southern physiognomy," his laziness about writing, his love of company, his goodness. A Russian teacher, Kriukov, came off badly by comparison.[7] S. T. Aksakov, author of a quintessentially Russian autobiography, described how the celebrated actor M. S. Shchepkin "brought to the Russian stage a true appreciation of Little Russian nationality, with all its humour and sense of the comic."[8] The principal figure in one of Nikolai Leskov's short stories found Ukrainian students "passionate

and stubborn."[9] Perhaps the Ukrainian-born poet Mykola Hnidych (Nikolai Gnedich) summed up the early nineteenth-century view of the difference between north and south when he called Ukraine "the Russian Italy."[10] According to a late eighteenth-century Ukrainian commentator, the botanist Linnaeus was surprised "that a land as richly blessed by nature as Little Russia has not attracted natural scientists or historians."[11] The record was set straight in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. A picture of Ukraine emerged: land of Cossacks, of the bandit Horkusha and the itinerant philosopher Skovoroda, land of cholera and locusts, of the great river Dnieper, of bootlegging, week-long wedding festivities, painting, folk medicine, song, tumuli, witches, Orthodoxy and education. The picture was partly wish-fulfilment and partly accurate, but both parts, the myths and the reality, contributed to the vitality of Imperial Russian culture.

They did so for material reasons. From the end of the eighteenth century Ukrainians and Russians came into much closer contact with one another. Russia had acquired suzerainty over part of Ukraine in the mid-seventeenth century, but before Catherine the Great her control of this frontier zone was partial. In 1648 the Ukrainian Cossack Bohdan Khmelnytsky had led a rebellion against Poland which brought into Russian hands, in due course, Kiev and Ukraine east of the Dnieper. Khmelnytsky set up an autonomous military republic under a Hetman. One of his successors, Mazepa, was bold enough in 1708 to join Charles XII of Sweden in making war on Russia. The allies were defeated at the battle of Poltava in 1709, but the Hetmanate survived in attenuated form. Although Peter the Great had ambitions which turned on the southern lands, and although he captured Azov and fought on the Prut, he won his principal victories in the north and founded his new capital, St. Petersburg, on the Gulf of Finland. As the eighteenth century continued, however, the Russian Empire's geographical orientation altered. One Hryhorii Vinsky wrote that around 1770 Ukrainians knew no foreigners apart from Poles and Greeks,[12] but times were already changing. In the first half of Catherine the Great's reign, Count Nikita Panin was still able to advocate a "northern system" of alliances, but Catherine chose another path.[13] Russia began concentrating on the Black Sea rather than the Baltic. In 1768 the empress embarked upon the first of two major wars with Turkey; in

1772 she participated in the first partition of Poland; in 1783 she annexed the Crimea. Behind the lines, she abolished the Ukrainian Hetmanate in 1764 and the Zaporozhian Cossacks in 1775. In 1793, in the second partition of Poland, she acquired most of Ukraine west of the Dnieper. If it could almost be said, in the economic sphere, that "in the sixteenth century there was no Russian isthmus... playing a connecting role and bringing large exchange movements to the Mediterranean,"[14] by 1800 this was rapidly ceasing to be so. Trade-routes were changing.[15] Odessa had ten inhabitants in 1793, 25,000 in 1814, and by 1863 had become the third city of the empire.[16] The central government devoted itself to the settlement and exploitation of the newly acquired southern lands.[17] Catherine the Great went to see them in 1787.[18] Her closest adviser, Prince Grigorii Potemkin, dreamed of carving out an independent southern principality for himself.[19] Russia was now a southern as well as a northern power.

Re-orientation brought problems of two kinds—those which would have arisen from any sort of imperial expansion, and those which turned on the particular character of the southern and south-western lands. The former included the effects of expansion on the international diplomatic balance and the need to integrate the newly acquired territories into the social and administrative structures of the empire. These problems were hard to solve. Before the end of the eighteenth century, Britain was already alarmed by the advance of the Russian bear,[20] as was Kaunitz.[21] In the nineteenth century many of Russia's difficulties in the diplomatic arena sprang from her eighteenth-century acquisition of a common frontier with Austria and her desire to make the most use of her southern coastline. Within the empire's borders, meanwhile, the tsars needed civil servants to bring together their diverse possessions. They found it hard to produce them. "It is very difficult," wrote the Curator of Belorussian schools in 1832, "to attract hither, to the most important positions, capable and reliable Russians."[22] Although Russia's bureaucracy expanded greatly in the first half of the nineteenth century, provincial administration gained little in efficiency.[23]

The specific problems posed by expansion to the south and west were those thrown up by Poles, Jews and Ukrainians. The Poles, radically different from the Russians in both the nature and the

pitch of their cultural development, showed their obduracy in the risings of 1830–1 and 1863–4. They were the least amenable of the empire's subject peoples. Jews had been largely the Poles' concern before the eighteenth-century partitions, but when Russia acquired Belorussia and Western Ukraine, they passed into the hands of St. Petersburg. Although Catherine the Great's attempts to legislate on the Jewish question do not seem to have been motivated by hostility toward Jews,[24] the Jewish problem became increasingly complex in the nineteenth century. The pogroms of 1881 and later brought into the open tensions and prejudices which had been growing for decades.

Ukrainians were different from Poles and Jews. They were less obviously distinct from the Russians in culture, and less militant (than the Poles, at least) in their resistance to encroachment. Some Ukrainians, admittedly, still looked backward in time and longed for autonomy after the Hetmanate had been abolished. Others, paradoxically, first acquired a sense of Ukrainian identity after the Russians had strengthened their hold on the south. This second group gave new shape to ideas brought from the north. "One nationalism," as a recent observer said of another period, "furthers other nationalisms."[25] These Ukrainian responses to the political developments of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries play only a small part in this book. The book deals with Ukrainians of a third sort—those who threw in their lot almost entirely with the Russians. While they did not materially alter the course of politics in the north, they modified the Russians' understanding of what it meant to be Russian by preventing them from becoming wholly dependent on contemporary western European culture. Ukrainian culture derived in part from the West, but by the late eighteenth century it looked more "native" and more "Slavic" than the culture of educated society in the empire's capitals. While the integration of the empire meant the loss of Ukrainian institutions and social forms, it provided Ukrainians with new outlets. Many travelled north to take advantage of them, encouraged by the central government. Once in St. Petersburg, Ukrainians showed in a variety of ways how an understanding of the south could contribute to the complexion of the empire as a whole. In politics, while not separatist, they had a better understanding than their Russian contemporaries of the problems of imperial diversity. They founded

journals containing information about the south. In fiction and belles-lettres they introduced subject-matter which differed from that provided by western models. They constituted Russia's introduction to the wider Slavic "awakening" which was a feature of the early nineteenth century. They played a substantial part in the debates about Russian national identity which dominated intellectual life in the decades after the Napoleonic Wars. Because they had not been brought up in the western-oriented atmosphere of St. Petersburg, they tended to be "more Russian than the Russians." They stood for the interior of the empire, an interior only just being illuminated by light from Peter the Great's window on Europe. The cultural flowering of early nineteenth-century Russia is usually ascribed to the effect of the French wars and to new philosophical and literary influences from western Europe,[26] but political changes in the outlying parts of the empire also played a part. When Romanticism arrived in Russia, the politics and culture of the capitals had already acquired a Ukrainian dimension on which Russian Romantics could build.

This book is open-ended in time and space. Ukrainians outside Ukraine could be pursued much further afield. There were influential Ukrainians in Russia before 1750, and there were geographical areas of Ukrainian impact between 1750 and 1850 which I make no attempt to cover. Russian literature drew on Ukrainian at least as early as the first half of the seventeenth century.[27] Ukrainian churchmen dominated the Russian church from the mid-seventeenth century until the accession of Catherine the Great.[28] A "Ukrainian theme" appeared in Polish as well as in Russian literature in the first half of the nineteenth century.[29] I touch on some of these things, but concentrate on the way in which Ukrainians from the former Hetmanate expressed their Ukrainian identity in the capitals of the Russian Empire. The late eighteenth-century combination of political change in central Ukraine and cultural impact in Russia brings the Ukrainian-Russian relationship sharply into focus. Ukrainians from the lands east of the Hetmanate appear in relatively large numbers, and one or two Ukrainians from beyond the Carpathian mountains make their presence felt; but Ukraine west of the Dnieper is represented mainly by a Pole (Chodakowski), and Eastern Galicia barely enters the discussion. This is not a history of Ukraine

between 1750 and 1850, but an attempt to shed light on the Russian Empire's early nineteenth-century cultural diversity.

Terminological and historiographical problems bedevil the study of Ukrainian-Russian relations. To take one example of a terminological difficulty, mid-nineteenth-century Ukrainian intellectuals sometimes used the words *Iuzhnaia Rus'*, "Southern Rus' ", to describe their homeland.[30] The adjective derived from *Iuzhnaia Rus'*, *iuzhno-russkii*, probably has to be translated as "south Russian"; yet Ukrainians who called themselves "south Russians" in the nineteenth century did not mean to indicate that their local culture was a provincial version of Russian culture. On the contrary, they were taking pride in a cultural inheritance which could be presented as more Ukrainian than Russian. Rus', after all, was the name of a medieval east European country whose principal city had been Kiev. Although it existed at a time when the differences between the various east Slavic peoples were much less clearely marked than they were to become, its strength lay in the southern part of what was later known as the Russian Empire, and its legacy could therefore be said to belong less to Russia than to Ukraine. So when a nineteenth-century Ukrainian spoke of *Iuzhnaia Rus'*, he was speaking of the southern part of an entity which had not always been led by Moscow and St. Petersburg. He was very far from conceding Ukrainian dependence on the Russians.[31] In fact, the term *Iuzhnaia Rus'* bore many of the same assertive connotations as its successor, "Ukraine," which became Ukrainians' term for their homeland only towards the end of the nineteenth century.[32] Ukrainians who spoke of *Iuzhnaia Rus'* were not admitting that they were southern reflections of a northern image. They were claiming full citizenship in a commonwealth which, in the medieval period, they could be said to have directed.

Explaining the connotations of *Iuzhnaia Rus'* is only one of the problems confronting the historian of Ukrainian-Russian interaction. Others include whether to write "Ukraine" or "the Ukraine," and how to decide between (for example) "Dmytro Troshchynsky" (transliterated from Ukrainian) and "Dmitrii Troshchinsky" (transliterated from Russian), when the individual in question was a Ukrainian working in Russia and writing in Russian. I use the more assertive form in the first instance ("Ukraine"), and give Ukrainian names in Ukrainian form even when the possessors

of them considered themselves to be Russian (except in the notes and bibliography, where authors are translitered from the language in which they were writing). More important than the problems posed by these technicalities, however, is the need to rescue the views of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Ukrainians from the various explanatory schemes into which they have been fitted by scholars. In 1917 Lenin spoke of the "damned tsarist past" which had separated Russians and Ukrainians;[33] historians have contributed to this separation both before and since the Russian Revolution.

Leading Ukrainians of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries received a bad press in the period immediately following their death. Ukrainian historians from the mid-nineteenth century to about 1930 were mainly populists.[34] They found it difficult, as admirers of the common people, to approve of the gentry. In their opinion the gentry had undermined the democratic Hetmanate of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. "After the expulsion from Little Russia of the old Polonized upper classes," wrote Mykola Kostomarov, "clans came forward literally (*faktícheski*) from the heart of the people, and strove to form, in a certain sense, an upper class, marking themselves off in lifestyle and needs from the level of the common people. . . . " In Kostomarov's view these clans of the eighteenth-century Hetmanate betrayed the egalitarian ideals of Bohdan Khmelnytsky's military republic.[35] Panteleimon Kulish, Kostomarov's contemporary, inveighed against Troshchynsky, one of the Ukrainian politicians active in St. Petersburg (who is considered in detail in Chapter Four). "It is said," wrote Kulish,

> that the old man Troshchynsky was not without love for his native land. . . . Nevertheless he was a man of the eighteenth century and a lord (*barin*) based on the French models of the Russian lords. . . . It was too early for a serious view to be formed about the tillers of the soil (*khleboroby*) at a time when the state-system common to the whole of Europe was so firmly established, and practically no one had even hinted at the principles of society (*ob osbshchestvennom nachale*) in history and in the life of the state. . . . [36]

Kulish seems to have been saying that although Troshchynsky could not have known any better, he could not, as an aristocrat, have been committed to his native land.

Only Mykhailo Maksymovych, of mid-nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians, approved of the gentry produced by the Hetmanate and considered that, in their Russian activities, they did Ukraine good service.[37] But Maksymovych was the exception who proved the rule, for he was slightly older than Kostomarov and Kulish, more "Russified" and less populist. Oleksander Lazarevsky, the greatest of the nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians, was younger and more outspokenly populist. He disapproved of Mazepa for perverting the supposedly open Ukrainian social order. "There is no doubt," he wrote, "that if there had not been the restraining power of the Russian government, then Mazepa [in the revolt of 1708–9] would have made out of Little Russia a little Poland (*iz Malorossii . . . malenkuiu Polshu*), with all its splendour for the *pany* and all its hardships for the *muzhiki*."[38] If Mazepa came in for abuse, then the social order he represented came in for more. Paradoxically, Lazarevsky expended much energy on the study of Ukrainian gentry families in the eighteenth century.[39] Studying them, he felt, was "possibly . . . a necessary precondition for the study of the internal life of Little Russia in the period of the Hetmanate."[40] The local ruling class, he argued, had "such extensive influence on the economic life of the people" that only by becoming fully acquainted with the lives of separate individuals could the historian get a grasp of what really concerned him, the situation on the ground.[41] In other words, Lazarevsky looked at the Ukrainian gentry reluctantly, and with an ulterior motive. Pursuing his populist goal, he asserted that his *magnum opus* would "provide certain materials for the study of the life of the people, which in the histories of Little Russia written to date is so strongly overlaid by the narration of the events of external history."[42] Even Mykhailo Hrushevsky felt that Lazarevsky went too far in his avoidance of political history and emphasis on "the democratic element in Ukrainian life."[43]

In the populist context established by Kostomarov, Kulish and Lazarevsky, the eighteenth-century Ukrainian gentry were not likely to be well treated. A student of "The Little Russian Gentry and its Fate" argued that the Ukrainian "revolutionaries" of 1648, for all their idealism, never really cast off the Polish aristocratic influence, strove throughout the eighteenth century to establish themselves as an upper class, and greeted the introduction of the Russian ranking

system with enthusiasm, because through it they finally achieved their goal.[44] Shortly afterward another scholar confirmed this impression in much more detail,[45] and Lazarevsky confirmed the confirmation while finding its presentation a little simplistic.[46] Venedikt Miakotin, meanwhile, studied the declining fortunes of the eighteenth-century Ukrainian peasantry—victims, in the populist view, of the rise of the gentry.[47] Hrushevsky's celebrated critique of the traditional presentation of "Russian" history was explicitly populist in approach.[48] Hrushevsky felt that the predominance of the Russians in historical writing about the Eastern Slavs derived from historians' concentration on state institutions at the expense of the people. Since, for long periods of its history, Ukraine lacked a state, it received less than its fair share of attention. Hrushevsky wanted "to present the history of statecraft in its proper place, in relation to the other historical factors."[49] The journal *Ukraina*, which he dominated in the 1920s, pursued this objective.[50]

In the populist context, Ukrainian gentry who threw in their lot with the Russians—the Ukrainians in this book—came off badly. They have fared better at the hands of Ukrainian historians in the West, who have discerned among them a continuing loyalty to Ukrainian national tradition. Lazarevsky felt that Ukrainians' crusading spirit, exemplified by Khmelnytsky's revolt against Poland, became perverted by the attractions of life within the Russian orbit. Oleksander Ohloblyn published a book of biographical essays which showed that, at the time when Ukraine was being integrated into the Russian Empire, there were Ukrainians who strove to keep alight the flame of independence, providing a link with the Ukrainian nationalists of the mid- and late-nineteenth century.[51] More moderate than Ohloblyn, Ivan L. Rudnytsky saw the period preceding the coming of Shevchenko as a "sort of prolonged epilogue to the Cossack era," but nevertheless claimed that "the aristocratic period [of Ukrainian history] . . . preserved the continuity of development."[52] Elsewhere he drew attention to the observations of Johann Georg Kohl, a German traveller to Ukraine in the late 1830s who perceived Ukrainian-Russian hostility "before the emergence of Ukrainian nationalism as an organized movement."[53] Two doctoral dissertations have done much to illuminate the history of Ukraine between the second half of the eighteenth century and the

appearance of the federalist Cyrillo-Methodian Society in the mid-1840s. Their effect has been to clarify the relationship between the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century period of autonomy and the nineteenth-century nationalist movement.[54] That a relationship existed cannot be denied. Modern Ukrainian nationalism was not a virgin birth. Taras Shevchenko's historical imagination drew on a peasant rising which took place in Western Ukraine in the eighteenth century and on the gentry chroniclers who were writing in Eastern Ukraine at that time.[55] His first published work, *Kobzar*, was sponsored by a gentry family who might have been expected to look backward rather than forward.[56] Ukrainian proto-nationalists, therefore, can be found even in the dark days of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and in the next chapter I discuss some aspects of Ukrainian resistance to Russian expansion. But my central theme is still Ukrainians in Russia and the argument that, without being Ukrainian nationalists, they nevertheless expressed their Ukrainian identity and evoked a response to it. There are ways of resurrecting early nineteenth-century Ukrainians without arguing that some of them were nationalists *avant la lettre*.

The points of view exemplified by the work of Lazarevsky and Ohloblyn both sprang from a rather narrowly Ukrainian historical perspective. Ohloblyn, Kohut and Pelech all admitted that Ukrainians' impact outside Ukraine constituted a historical lacuna.[57] Populist Ukrainian historians might not have looked down on the gentry of the Hetmanate had they considered their activities in Russia. Troshchynsky, for example, whom Kulish called "a lord based on the French models of the Russian lords," looked almost like a demagogue to the Russian churchman Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, who referred to his "bawling ministry" of 1814–17.[58] In the Russian context Ukrainian gentry were not of the highest social standing. In Russia, in a way, Ukrainians fulfilled the very "populist" role which late nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians admired. It is not surprising that M. M. Shtrange's controversial book, *Demokraticheskaia intelligentsiia Rossii v XVIII veke*, is full of references to Ukrainians.[59] However aristocratic they appeared to be by comparison with other Ukrainians, Ukrainians in Russia were outsiders struggling to make a mark. They made that mark, in many cases, by bearing clear witness to their place of origin.

One western book has dealt with much of the material concerning the Ukrainian impact upon Russian literary culture. As a reviewer pointed out, George S. N. Luckyj's *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine: 1798–1847* (Munich, 1971), "is at least as important a contribution to Russian literature as to Ukrainian."[60] Luckyj's principal interest, nevertheless, was in Ukrainian writers' attitudes and responses to Ukraine, rather than in the contribution they were making to the debate about native versus western culture in Russia. Luckyj pointed out that "the cultural invasion of Russia by the Ukraine was on a grand scale," but concerned himself with the consequent "impoverishment" of Ukraine rather than with the Ukrainian "revitalization" of Russia.[61] The present book sets the same phenomena in the Russian rather than the Ukrainian historical perspective.

Soviet historians ought in theory to be less troubled by the Ukrainian-Russian dichotomy than either their populist predecessors or Ukrainians writing in the West. Marxism places class allegiances before national allegiances; and the 1977 Soviet Constitution asserted that "a new historical community of people" had emerged on Soviet soil, a community which had, as it were, abolished the distinction between Greek and Jew and made all its citizens internationalists.[62] Marxist and "internationalist" approaches, however, have drawbacks. Where other historians perhaps pay too much attention to national differences, Soviet historians tend to pay too little. Marxists subordinate culture to patterns of economic development, and Marxist "internationalists" concentrate on cultural similarities rather than cultural differences. For these reasons the historical phenomenon of Ukrainian-Russian cultural interaction receives insufficient attention.

Even before Hrushevsky fell from grace, Ukrainian history was being subjected to Marxist analysis.[63] After the leading Ukrainian Marxist historian, Matvii Iavorsky, was himself discovered to be insufficiently Marxist, and after Hrushevsky had been indicted in his own journal in 1932, the Marxist approach to Ukrainian history became firmly entrenched.[64] The individuality of Ukrainian culture became lost in discussions of socio-economic determining factors.[65] There has been some good work since the war on the social and economic history of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Ukraine, but as a result "Ukrainian political and intellectual history of the

XIXth century remains a very neglected field in Soviet historiography."[66]

On the relatively rare occasions when Soviet historians rise above consideration of the socio-economic base to consideration of political and cultural superstructure, the framework they employ for the discussion of Ukrainian-Russian relations gives them little room to talk about nuances of interaction. Their framework rests on commitment to two ideas: medieval eastern Slavic unity and the restoration of that unity from the seventeenth century onward. So, according to a recent synoptic account, the eastern Slavs retained a sense of oneness even when Kievan Rus' was breaking up.[67] The 1654 Treaty of Pereiaslav marked the "reunification" of Russia and Ukraine.[68] There is some justification for these arguments. When, in the sixteenth century, the Holy Roman Empire, Venice and the Greeks were pressing Russia to demand Constantinople in return for support against the Turks, the Tsars asked for no more than the territory which had once belonged to Kiev. " 'Moscow the Second Kiev'," writes a modern scholar, "not 'Moscow the Third Rome' was the hall-mark of their foreign policy."[69] The Russians seem to have believed, justifiably or not, that Kiev was part of their patrimony. Many Ukrainians, furthermore, as this book testifies, were prepared to accept Russian suzerainty. But the fact that Russians and Ukrainians have had things in common does not justify the contemporary Soviet assertion of the two peoples' "indestructible brotherhood" or substantiate the view that a "new community of people" has emerged on Soviet soil. These have been the chief themes of Soviet writing about Ukrainian-Russian relations, but by the time of Khmelnytsky's revolt Ukrainian culture had been markedly different from Russian from centuries, and it remained different in many respects thereafter. Ukrainians and Russians had much in common, but also much which divided them. Their relations are more complicated than Soviet scholarship tends to allow.

At least Soviet scholars pay more attention to Ukrainian-Russian relations than their populist predecessors or Ukrainians in the West. Although written in a spirit of undue camaraderie, essays and volumes of essays appear from time to time which provide useful quarries of information.[70] The vitality of Ukrainian culture is not denied,[71] and even the influence of Ukrainian culture is admitted in

detail.[72] But it is not given due weight. "Bourgeois nationalist" historiography is attacked.[73] More attention seems to be paid to the influence of north on south than to the part played by Ukraine in Russian affairs.[74] There is room, therefore, for discussion of Ukrainians in Russia between the abolition of the Hetmanate and the beginnings of modern Ukrainian nationalism in the mid-1840s. K. V. Kharlampovych's pioneering study of Ukrainian influence on Russian church life before 1762 deserves a sequel.[75] Subsequently, few scholars have addressed themselves explicitly to the problem of Ukraine's importance in Russian culture.[76] Populist, Soviet and émigré writers have all had reasons for avoiding the issue or playing it down. The Ukrainians who appear in this book do not fit easily into any political category. They were neither Ukrainian nationalists nor Russians by another name. Most of them, perhaps, would have agreed with the post-revolutionary Ukrainian émigré, N. M. Mohyliansky: "I do not attach separatist aspirations to the concept 'Ukraine,' but neither do I associate it with 'treason'—in the opinion of many, an inescapable feature of Ukrainianism."[77] Conveying the outlook and impact of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Ukrainians poses problems. The present attempt to overcome these problems will be lucky to earn the sort of praise accorded a Ukrainian historian by a Ukrainian censor in 1839: "The author expounds events simply, without sophistry. He expounds them like a historian, not like a speculative philosopher who often subordinates things and people to his *a priori* conviction."[78]

Chapter Two

The Convergence of Ukraine and Russia

The End of the Hetmanate

The political entity which emerged in central Ukraine in the mid-seventeenth century posed problems for the Russians throughout the period of its autonomy. After Bohdan Khmelnytsky's revolt against Poland, the constitutional relationship between Russia and the Hetmanate remained unclear.[1] Mazepa's revolt against Peter the Great in 1708–9 marked the high point, but not the end, of trouble in the south. Pylyp Orlyk continued Mazepa's defiance abroad.[2] Pavlo Polubotok held out against central government interference in Ukrainian affairs in 1722–3.[3] After approaching Ukrainian autonomy with various degrees of flexibility and hostility, Russia moved decisively against it in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Khmelnytsky's military republic was divided geographically into ten "regiments" (*polky*), each governed by a "colonel" (*polkovnyk*). Six principal officers surrounding the Hetman constituted the *heneralna starshyna*, and equivalent officers within a regiment made up the *polkova starshyna*. Below regimental colonel came the "centurion" (*sotnyk*) with responsibility for a smaller geographical area, the *sotnia* or "hundred"; within each *sotnia* part of the Cossack population formed a *kurin* commanded

by a *kurinnyi otaman*. This hierarchical structure derived from the organization of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, which had its origins in the sixteenth century and provided the model for both the military and the civil infrastructure of the Hetmanate.[4] Distinctive laws and social relations went hand in hand with the unique Ukrainian political system.[5]

The Hetmanate came to be administered by a tightly knit ruling group. The men who filled the major offices formed a Ukrainian gentry class, which replaced the Poles who had been expelled in the mid-seventeenth century.[6] The three principal posts—*hetman*, *polkovnyk* and *sotnyk*—were elective, but the first two, few in number, rapidly fell prey to corrupt practices. Lażarevsky wrote a long essay describing the gradual corruption of the third.[7] He showed that as early as the time of Peter the Great some *sotnyky* were appointed from the centre rather than elected, and the independence of local control which they displayed in the exercise of their authority tended to be handed on to their theoretically more responsible successors. The central government made use of representatives of the upper echelons of Ukrainian society in its gradual encroachment upon the separate status of the Hetmanate. The last two Hetmans, Danylo Apostol (1727–34) and Kyrylo Rozumovsky (1750–64), were both, in effect, Russian appointees. The second of the two owed his standing at court to his elder brother's morganatic marriage to the Empress Elizabeth.[8] Russia ruled the Hetmanate more or less directly between 1734 and 1750, and continuously from 1764 through Governor-General P. A. Rumiantsev. In the 1730s Anna Ioannovna undermined Ukrainian customs by stealth.[9] Full-scale integration into the Russian system began in the years following 1764, when Rozumovsky was compelled to resign the office of Hetman. In that year Catherine the Great appointed Prince A. A. Viazemsky Imperial Procurator-General. In giving him instructions, she made clear her intentions with regard to the outlying regions of the empire:

> Little Russia, Livonia and Finland are provinces governed by privileges confirmed to them. To destroy these by abolishing them all at once would be highly improper. To call them foreign, however, and to deal with them on this basis is more than a mistake, and can accurately be called stupidity. These provinces, and Smolensk too,

> must be brought by the smoothest means to the point where they Russianize and stop looking like wolves at the forest. The way of achieving this is very simple, if sensible men are chosen as rulers in these provinces; when there is no Hetman in Little Russia, then we must try to ensure that the age and the name of the hetmans disappear, not only that one person or another be elevated to this dignity.[10]

In the last sentence Catherine was announcing her intention of going further than her predecessors and no longer working through the existing southern system. It was not a matter, in the second half of the eighteenth century, of merely preventing trouble on the peripheries of the empire, but of making them work for the benefit of the whole.

This was made particularly clear in the instructions given P. A. Rumiantsev on his appointment as Governor-General of Little Russia. These stated that Ukraine was large and fruitful, but that "until now Russia has had very little benefit and revenue from this people, and in the time of the last Hetman's administration almost none at all."[11] Exploitation, not merely keeping the peace, was clearly to be a priority of the new regime. The problems with which Rumiantsev would have to deal were well described:

> ...the many disorders which have taken root there, the disorganization, the incompatible mixing of military and civil administration—the results of various foreign laws' and rights' lack of clarity; endless red tape and constraints in justice and punishment; the arbitrary legitimization of certain imaginary privileges and freedoms, and the frequent large-scale putting to harmful use of real privileges and freedoms—highly damaging both to landowners and even to the subject people; movements from place to place; a lazy attitude toward agriculture and to other useful endeavours, deep-seated in almost all the people, and an equally noticeable inner hatred on their part of things Great Russian....[12]

These were the problems which Rumiantsev was instructed to eradicate. He was told in detail how to set about it: to draw up detailed maps, to define exactly the power of the clergy, encouraging Orthodoxy while preventing clerical arrogation of secular power: to make provisions for the recording of births, marriages and deaths in order to discover the size of the population and the government's tax expectation; to prevent peasant

movemement from place to place, sort out the confusion between civil and military administrations, foster the economy, extend internal river communications and improve the roads, introduce town policy, eliminate bribery from the processes of justice, and establish good border relations with Poland and Turkey.[13] This plan of campaign summarized the problems that had faced central government in the south throughout the period of the Hetmanate. Catherine urged Rumiantsev to combine determination with subtlety, to use both "wolf's teeth and fox's tail,"[14] but the resolution of the centre was now clearly much greater than in the past, and the consequences of that resolution were apparent in Rumiantsev's many concrete achievements.

Between 1764 and the late 1780s Rumiantsev completed the greater part of the integration of the former Hetmanate into the Russian system.[15] His period of office fell roughly into two halves, divided by the introduction in 1781–2 of local government institutions on the lines of the Imperial reform of 1775. From that date, when three *namestnichestva* (provinces or vicegerencies) replaced the ten "regiments" of old, the distinctive titles and structures of the Hetmanate disappeared. A Ukrainian who later played a large part in the foundation of Kharkiv University recalled that in 1782 his father returned home from Kiev in the new uniform of a Russian official.[16] At every level, from the most superficial to the most fundamental, the life of the Hetmanate was transformed. Rumiantsev had called for a "General Description" of the lands in his charge in 1765.[17] He devoted the rest of his time as Governor—when he was not commanding armies in the field—to acting upon the situation with which he was faced. His principal achievement lay in the field of social integration. The Ukrainian *starshyna* became Russian *dvoriane* (gentry). Ukrainian peasants became Russian serfs, Ukrainian Cossacks Russian regular troops.[18] Reorganizing the Hetmanate into *namestnichestva* was the most striking outward expression of policies which struck deep into the heart of Ukrainian society. After Rumiantsev, it remained only to work on the detail of the infrastructure, providing schools, establishing postal networks—things which Rumiantsev began to do but which were carried much further in the nineteenth century. Rumiantsev brought the Hetmanate within the pale of the empire and made it possible for Ukrainians to think of themselves as

citizens of a wider world. They soon began to do so.

With the accession of Paul in 1796 it appeared that the changes of the last thirty years were going to be undone, for the three *namestnichestva* of the early 1780s were united into a single province with 20 districts, to be administered along the lines of the former Hetmanate.[19] Ukrainians at court were powerful under Paul, at least until Oleksander Bezborodko's death in 1799, and its seems likely that, having been subordinate to other interest groups under Catherine, they were now flexing their muscles. Bezborodko's relatives, Mykhailo Myklashevsky and Iakiv Bakurynsky, held high administrative office in the south, and Dmytro Troshchynsky, at the centre, expressed his views on the relationship between local governors and the central authority.[20] Perhaps the Ukrainians were hoping to soften the changes carried out by their former patron, Rumiantsev; but if so, their hopes were dashed in the next reign. It was not in the administration of their homeland that they were to make their biggest mark. Under Alexander I and Nicholas I, when Ukraine was governed in turn by A. B. Kurakin (1802–8), Ia. I. Lobanov-Rostovsky (1808–16), and N. G. Repnin (1816–34), the process of integration continued. The single large province which had existed under Paul was divided into two (Poltava and Chernihiv) in October 1801, and Kurakin, appointed Governor-General of the two provinces in February 1802, entered on a new period of reform.[21] His was "the epoch of building in Little Russia,"[22] the period, for example, when Poltava took on the physical appearance it has retained ever since. While showing this new concern for the infrastructure, Kurakin continued to tread the paths already marked out by Rumiantsev. Where Rumiantsev had initiated the "General Description," Kurakin attempted to clear up problems of landownership by persuading the Tsar to order a cadastral survey.[23] In correspondence with his brother he discussed among other things an explanatory edict dealing with the still vexed question of Ukrainian landlord-peasant relationships.[24] The transition from autonomy to full integration was continuing. The Ukrainian ranking system was finally dovetailed with that of Russia in 1835. By the 1840s, "With the abolition of Ukrainian common law and the Lithuanian Statute, the last vestiges of Ukrainian autonomy had been obliterated."[25]

The Ukrainian Response to Integration

Not all Ukrainians acquiesced in the loss of their special status. The gentry who established a monopoly of the offices of the Hetmanate in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had a vested interest in the maintenance of their privileged position. Some of them defended that interest as long as possible. When they lost their autonomy, they cherished its memory. Their outlook was conservative, but they provided part of the inspiration on which later Ukrainian nationalists drew. They showed an independence of mind which some Ukrainians were to employ in making a mark on Russia.

After Mazepa, Orlyk and Polubotok, Ukrainian autonomism next reached a climax just before the abolition of the Hetmanate. At a meeting of Ukrainian nobles held in Hlukhiv in September 1763, a speaker drew attention to the way in which local institutions had degenerated and local freedoms had vanished. Things had been much better, he said, in the days of Polish suzerainty and at the time of Khmelnytsky's agreement with Russia. He called for the restoration of the Hetmanate's civil infrastructure and the elimination of the contemporary dominance of the military.[26] His audience appeared to agree with him, for they drew up a lengthy "Petition on the restoration of various ancient rights."[27] Resting their case on what they described as Khmelnytsky's "voluntary submission" to Russia, they complained about foreign settlement in Ukraine, the aggressive behaviour of Russian troops billeted on them, and Russian intervention in Ukrainian ecclesiastical appointments; they described their special trading rights, defined the status of the Ukrainian Cossacks, and proposed the foundation of universities at Kiev and Baturyn. They were particularly concerned by the extension to Ukraine of the Table of Ranks, introduced in Russia in 1722. Since there was no official way of equating Ukrainian with Russian ranks, Ukrainians outside the new ranking system tended to be looked down upon by the central authorities.

These complaints came to nothing. Although they were submitted to the Empress in the name of Hetman Rozumovsky, Rozumovsky's principal assistant, the Russian Grigorii Teplov, had already vilified the Ukrainian gentry in a subsequently celebrated memorandum.[28]

Teplov made much of the way in which the gentry capitalized on the complexity of the laws which operated in Ukraine. Because they alone understood them, they were able to interpret them to their own advantage. The other orders could not resist them. The peasants were illiterate, and the Cossacks, the middle order, were remote from the centres of authority in the towns and demoralized by their main means of support, the distilling of strong drink. Teplov's analysis was much more likely to appeal to the central government than the petition submitted in the name of Rozumovsky. Rozumovsky himself alienated the Ukrainian gentry when he proposed that the office of Hetman be made hereditary in his family, for free election of the Hetman was one of the rights which the nobles had claimed in their petition.[29] Ukrainian nobles were becoming still more thrown in upon themselves. Vasyl Myrovych did their cause no good in July 1764. In order to retrieve estates which his grandfather had lost for supporting Mazepa, he attempted to overthrow Catherine the Great by freeing Ivan VI from the Schlüsselburg. The attempt was a fiasco, but by giving rise to the first legal execution in Russia for more than twenty years[30] it focused attention, among other things, on the obstreperous character of the Ukrainian gentry. It played a part in the abolition of the Hetmanate a few months later.[31]

The loss of their autonomy failed to eliminate the Ukrainian nobles' obduracy. At Catherine the Great's Legislative Commission of 1767–8 they found a spokesman in Hryhorii Poletyka, the outstanding Ukrainian autonomist of his generation. Poletyka's views were very like those expressed at the Hlukhiv council in 1763. He was anxious to regain for Ukrainian nobles the status which he felt they had enjoyed in the days of Polish rule. Religion explained the break with Poland. In other respects, in Poletyka's view, the period before Khmelnytsky's rising was a golden age.[32] Other Ukrainian leaders wanted merely to revive the pre-1764 Hetmanate, but Poletyka wanted to go back much further.[33]

After the dissolution of the Legislative Commission, Ukrainians had few opportunities for the reasonable expression of their grievances. In 1810 Poletyka's son relished the fleeting prospect of a new commission.[34] But the lack of a public forum did not bring an end to Ukrainians' recalcitrance. They found other ways of voicing their discontent. Although a thousand Ukrainian Cossacks fought

against Pugachev in 1773–4, they did so reluctantly.[35] The shadowy Horkusha indulged in banditry in the 1780s.[36] Vasyl Kapnist wrote an "Ode on Slavery" which seems to have been inspired either by the decree of 1783 which ended the free movement of Ukrainian peasants, or, more generally, by the Russian abolition of Ukrainian autonomy.[37] Later, in 1788, Kapnist came to St. Petersburg with a plan for perpetuating the separate military identity of the Cossacks.[38] In 1791 he probably went to Berlin in an attempt to get Prussian support for a revolt against Russia.[39] Kapnist's ideas, and Ukrainian autonomist ideas in general, bore some relation to the philosophy of the American Revolution.[40] Ukrainians were not above entertaining subversive ideas from France, at least according to the Soviet historian who studied the influence of the French Revolution on Ukraine.[41] Ukrainians began to use their native language for literary purposes in the 1790s.[42] In 1798, according to the later memoirs of Mykola Markevych, the Skoropadsky family was placed under arrest on suspicion of planning to resurrect the Hetmancy. Only the influence of V. P. Kochubei saved its members from the consequences of the tsar's displeasure.[43] Two years later V. P. Kochubei warned the governor of Ukraine, Mykhailo Myklashevsky, that "the whole of Starodub Lithuania," the northern part of Ukraine, was complaining about him.[44] In the same year P. V. Zavadovsky, who had recently fallen from favour at court, was placed under surveillance in his north Ukrainian estate of Lialychi.[45] In 1804 a member of the Kochubei family who was Marshal of Nobility in the province of Poltava urged the closer integration of Russia and Ukraine; he feared that nationalist intrigues going on around him might be successful.[46] A. B. Kurakin, governor of Ukraine between 1802 and 1808, had constant difficulty with the local gentry. After an initial honeymoon period he complained frequently of their backward-looking stubbornness.[47] D. P. Troshchynsky, a Ukrainian employed in St. Petersburg, once made peace between the Russian governor and his Ukrainian charges. Later, when he was living in Ukraine, Troshchynsky himself fell out out with Kurakin's successor.[48] Napoleon, upon invading Russia in 1812, found favour with a number of Ukrainians. The Orthodox Bishop of Mogilev in Belorussia, who was Ukrainian, recognized French authority.[49] Mykola Kapnist, brother of the poet, declared that he would go

over to Napoleon if the French invaded Ukraine.[50] Napoleon commissioned Charles-Louis Lesur to write a sympathetic history of the Cossacks.[51] The Ukrainian gentry remained hard to handle after the Napoleonic wars. The last Hetman's son, shortly before returning to live in Ukraine, told his daughter that her husband, the new Ukrainian governor, would have great difficulty establishing order and justice in that part of Ukraine where the Rozumovsky estates were situated.[52] O. I. Mykhailovsky-Danilevsky refused to visit Troshchynsky's estate in 1824 because he thought it "a focal point for liberals."[53] Confirmation of his view appeared to be provided the following year, for the Decembrist Muravev-Apostol brothers were with Troshchynsky when news arrived of the death of the tsar.[54] V. P. Kochubei's many southern relatives often irritated the local governor in the 1820s and 1830s.[55] Ukrainian nobles were still agitating for full recognition by the Russian Senate in 1828.[56] When, after visiting Ukraine in 1838, Johann Georg Kohl wrote that "Such is the aversion of the people of Little to those of Great Russia, that it may fairly be described as a national hatred,"[57] he was exaggerating, but on the basis of a modicum of truth.

The two longest-serving Russian governors of Ukraine, P. A. Rumiantsev and N. G. Repnin, seemed in the course of their periods in office to become more sympathetic to Ukrainians. Both, significantly enough, had connections with the south before being appointed governors. A. B. Kurakin considered it wrong to make a native the governor of Ukraine,[58] and perhaps the evidence of Rumiantsev and Repnin does something to confirm his doubts. Rumiantsev's father had been Ukrainian governor in the late 1730s and Rumiantsev himself had had a Ukrainian tutor at that time.[59] Repnin married a Rozumovsky, grand-daughter of the last Hetman, at Baturyn in Ukraine in November 1802.[60] He was thus related by marriage to V. P. Kochubei, Minister of the Interior in St. Petersburg, and the two discussed Ukrainian affairs in their correspondence of the 1820s and 1830s.[61] Rumiantsev seems to have endeared himself to Ukrainian historians, Repnin to his Ukrainian charges.[62] Repnin participated in the writing of one of the first scholarly histories of Ukraine, published by Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky in Moscow in 1822.[63] His associates included a number of potential Ukrainian autonomists.[64] He became a defender of Cossack land-holding rights.[65] He may even have left office in

1834 because the government mistrusted the ease and alacrity with which he raised Cossack troops to fight the Poles in 1831.[66] Rumiantsev and Repnin, therefore, provided examples of Russians who became relatively sympathetic toward Ukraine.

They defended Ukraine, however, not in order to revive its former glory, but in order that the central government might make the most of what it had to offer the empire as a whole. When Repnin called the Cossacks to arms in 1831, he showed statesmanship rather than a desire to challenge the central authorities. "This people," he wrote, "have retained . . . their ancient hatred of the Poles," and were glad of a chance to fight.[67] It was politic to make use of them, he implied, and indeed to offer them a *quid pro quo* in the form of tax relief, at a time when the Poles were much the greatest threat to the internal unity of the empire. Repnin was pointing out to the central authorities their own best interests.[68] That he was being statesmanlike was confirmed by the fact that even Kochubei agreed with his Cossack policy. Kochubei's attitude to the land from which he came was at least ambivalent, and as head of the State Council he was bound to be circumspect, but he found ridiculous the idea that rebellion might spread from Poland to Ukraine. When, he asked, had this region entertained liberal sympathies? The Ukrainian gentry still had to be treated with care, but the bulk of the population was entirely loyal. "We must use these people, not ruin them."[69]

In an earlier crisis, again to do with Poland, Rumiantsev showed far greater caution than Repnin in 1831. The Orthodox peasantry of Western Ukraine rose against their Polish masters in 1768. Rumiantsev could have profited from the rebellion. He could have become a second Khmelnytsky, the leader of the crusade against the Poles. But as the editor of his correspondence on the subject pointed out—almost in despair—"There is something incomprehensible, something fatalistic (*fatalnoe*) in the lot of the unfortunate Ukrainian people and its last rising. Because of the strange course of the political game the pacifiers of this rising . . . are Russian generals and Russian troops."[70] Rumiantsev intervened on behalf of the Polish authorities because at that time (although not for much longer) Russia was supporting Poland. Catherine the Great had issued a manifesto rejecting the peasant rising,[71] and her principal southern governor acted in accordance with it. Although later in his

career Rumiantsev acted more independently of the centre,[72] in 1768 he showed that fundamentally he was an executor of the Imperial will. A governor with sympathy for the region in his charge, he by no means fell under Ukrainian sway.

Two governors, then, who might have moderated the course of Ukrainian integration, who were respected by Ukrainians and Ukrainian historians, were very far from encouraging separatism in the south. Had Nicholas I doubted Repnin's loyalty, he would have been unlikely to retain him as governor in the south after the conviction and exile of his brother, the Decembrist S. G. Volkonsky.[73] Though, as Troshchynsky's correspondence made clear,[74] the aftermath of the conviction was a difficult time for Repnin, he weathered the storm.

The Ukrainian gentry, meanwhile, became less recalcitrant as the memory of the old order receded and the possibilities of the new integrated system became more apparent. With the migration of the most gifted and the most perceptive of their number to St. Petersburg—the Ukrainian group at court who will be considered in Chapter Four—they were at best a divided estate. Given that their interests in Ukraine itself often ran counter to those of the Cossacks and the peasantry, their chances of leading determined opposition became still more remote.

In a speech at the gentry elections in Chernihiv in 1823, Repnin made clear to the assembled company the policy which they should now be pursuing. He expatiated upon the services Ukrainians had done the empire as a whole since the seventeenth century, pointed out that at present, too, there were distinguished Ukrainian churchmen, soldiers and government ministers, and concluded by recommending the company to fill their elective offices with men worthy of those he had been describing. He claimed that since entering upon the southern governorship he had dedicated himself utterly to the interests of those in his charge and dared to consider himself their brother—and it was this policy of responsible acceptance of the Imperial system which he was advising them to pursue.[75] No more proof could be needed of Repnin's loyalty to the central government; and many of those to whom he was speaking were in sympathy with his views.

Troshchynsky's right-hand man at the Ministry of Justice in 1815–16, the Ukrainian Ivan Martos, spoke interestingly of the old

world of the Hetmanate in a letter of 1824 written in Kiev. Having declared to his correspondent that he was going to relate "a curious anecdote about Skovoroda," the eighteenth-century Ukrainian philosopher who had died only thirty years before, he continued, "Consequently I ask you to convey yourself in thought to the former little Russia, when the *polkovnyk* represented there, in a certain sense, a little tsar. . . . "[76] Those days, Martos implied, had gone; the authority of the *polkovnyky* was no more; and even to remember what the old order had been like required a mental effort. Many Ukrainians felt this way. They were nostalgic for the old days, but realized that they could not bring them back. By the mid-nineteenth century the Hetmanate had receded so far into the past that one memoirist felt the need to describe its command structure at length. He seems to have realized that his younger readers would be unfamiliar with what had become a historical curiosity.[77] Another family historian, writing in the early 1840s, showed the ambivalence with which Ukrainians regarded their past. On the one hand he asserted that Ukrainians had been Russian for 176 years (presumably since the Andrusovo armistice of 1667, a vital stage in the Russo-Polish battle for Ukraine). "Our one thought," he wrote, "our one happiness, is to be completely Russian, and in the name of the kind Tsar . . . to fall upon the enemies of Russia."[78] On the other hand, this author approved of his grandfather's pride in the family's aristocratic Polish origins, and of the way in which those origins provided the basis for the family's attainment of Russian gentry status.[79] Ukrainians, then, accepted the Russian system without forgetting their own distinctive history. The physical manifestations of Ukrainian autonomy gradually disappeared, but literary nostalgia took over. Mazepa's capital Baturyn, destroyed in 1709 and brought back into use by Hetman Rozumovsky, fell once more into decay in the early nineteenth century;[80] but by then the poet Ivan Kotliarevsky was fostering the memory of the Zaporozhian Cossacks by describing their tribulations in metaphorical verse.[81]

Generally Ukrainians had few complaints about integration with Russia because they benefited from it. The antiquarian Adriian Chepa, who served under P. A. Rumiantsev throughout the period of integration but remained committed to Ukrainian traditions, described with some cynicism the attitude of the Ukrainian gentry to the loss of their distinctive social order. He pointed out that until

Peter's "emancipation of the Russian nobility," in 1762, Ukrainian nobles were more powerful than their Russian equivalents. Initially, therefore, many of them (particularly those from Starodub and Nizhyn) resisted attempts to turn them into Russians. But after the decree of 1762 and Catherine the Great's Charter of the Nobility (promulgated in 1785), Russian noble status became more attractive. Ukrainians consequently "began boldly to enter Russian service, abandoned Tatar and Polish dress, began to speak, sing and dance to the Russian tune. . . . "[82] Chepa correctly described the late eighteenth-century trend. Looking back from the standpoint of the 1850s, Mykhailo Lazarevsky, the historian's father, observed that Ukrainians who rejected the Russians' ranking system "bitterly repented their lack of foresight."[83] If Ukrainians could obtain the status of Russian nobles, they were wise to take it. They were aware of the fact, and agitated for years to establish their full entitlement.[84] If they seemed obdurate in the early nineteenth century it was not because they were resisting Russian rule, but because they wanted to maximize its advantages.

For all the recalcitrance which it is possible to distinguish among Ukrainians in the two generations following the abolition of the Hetmanate, there were many respects in which they were surprisingly peaceable. East of the Hetmanate, integration proceeded almost without a murmur.[85] Even the instructions given Ukrainian delegates to the Legislative Commission of 1767 have been presented in an integrationist light.[86] Despite a few manifestations of Ukrainian support for Napoleon in 1812, Ukrainians played a significant part in the military resistance to the French invasion.[87] Most remarkably, few Ukrainians showed local fervour at the time of the Decembrist uprising of 1825. "We cannot speak of 'Ukrainian Decembrists': we have the right to speak only of Decembrists in Ukraine."[88] The history and character of Ukraine set many Decembrists thinking about freedom, but few of them converted their thoughts into action on behalf of Ukraine.[89] A Ukrainian who was prominent in the Society of United Slavs, Ivan Horbachevsky, did not include Ukrainians among the Slavic peoples whom the society planned to federate.[90] The Russian authorities were alive to the possibility of unrest in the former Hetmanate, but they found only a little—some of it of their own imagining.[91] The friendship between the Muravev-Apostol brothers

and Dmytro Troshchynsky may show that there were more connections than met the eye between Decembrists and Ukrainian traditionalists; but for the most part Decembrism seems to have been unable to capitalize upon specifically Ukrainian discontent.[92] Perhaps, by the 1820s, these discontents were receding.

By the late seventeenth century Ukrainians had begun to write history. Their works reflected the diversity and the changing character of Ukrainian society. In the 1670s the Kiev Academy produced the first printed Russian history book, the *Sinopsis,* which concentrated on medieval Rus' and justified the "reunion" of Russia and Ukraine.[93] The "Synopsis" became Russia's chief history primer.[94] Early in the eighteenth century Ukrainian gentry reacted to it by writing chronicles of the seventeenth-century Cossack wars. They were trying to establish their claim to primacy in Ukrainian life. The clerically produced *Sinopsis* went back too far to give the gentry's achievements due weight.[95] After the abolition of the Hetmanate, Ukrainians began to look again at their history. Their historical output went to extremes. An anonymous author produced a fierce defence of Ukrainian autonomy, while many of his contemporaries lapsed into antiquarianism. Outrage and nostalgia went hand in hand. Much ink has been spilled on attempts at identifying the author of the autonomist *Istoriia Rusov*, but perhaps not enough on setting it in context. Whether Hryhorii Poletyka or Oleksander Bezborodko vented his spleen on paper, most Ukrainian historians of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were even-tempered. They seem to have been moved not by bitterness, but simply by the desire to record a past society. It seems unlikely, in fact, that the Poletyka family produced the *Istoriia Rusov.* That indefatigable collector of manuscripts, Count N. P. Rumiantsev, first inquired about documents in the family's possession in 1812.[96] In the summer of 1825, after meeting Vasyl Poletyka at a fair in Ukraine, he satisfied himself that the stories of the Poletyka collection were an "empty rumour";[97] yet the first reference to the *Istoriia Rusov* dates from later that year.[98] Perhaps Poletyka deceived Rumiantsev, or perhaps he had already parted with the *Istoriia.* The likelier hypothesis, however, is that the work was produced by Bezborodko or by someone in his circle.[99] If so, it was produced in the north, by a Ukrainian in Russian service—by someone who could subordinate his private feelings, however

intense, to the making of a career in the Imperial administration. Works of history written in Ukraine tended not to display great strength of feeling. The German traveller Kohl asserted that Ukrainian histories sometimes remained unpublished for political reasons;[100] but at least two of them remained in manuscript simply for lack of funds.[101] Historical writing about Ukraine, to which I return in Chapter Seven, enjoyed a vogue in early nineteenth-century Russia. Its interest, however, lay not so much in the fact that it was politically contentious, but in its capacity to enlarge the cultural perspectives of an empire within which Russians and Ukrainians usually worked in harmony.

The many collectors of data on the Ukrainian past exemplified what was perhaps the principal feature of Ukrainian "resistance" to integration: nostalgia, but not militancy. A feeling for Ukrainian traditions certainly survived. Certainly, too, it provided part of the foundation on which later Ukrainian nationalists built. The Russian traveller I. M. Dolgorukov, upon visiting Kiev in 1817, was wrong to paint such an abject picture of Ukraine as he did.[102] On the one hand, many Ukrainians preserved the memory of the Hetmanate. On the other, "re-nationalization" was already under way. The introduction of a university at Kharkiv was beginning to provide Ukrainians with new opportunities for thinking about their identity.[103] For the moment, however—and in this respect Dolgorukov unwittingly sensed a truth—Ukrainians' chief strength lay outside Ukraine. In 1817 their prime outlet was neither in nostalgia nor a new Romantic nationalism. They were impressing themselves upon the north. Dolgorukov was too gloomy even about Ukrainians in Ukraine; he could have been positively enthusiastic about the mark they were making in Russia.

Ukrainians and Poles

The reason why the Ukrainian cultural contribution was accepted and even welcomed in Russia, and perhaps why it was offered so freely, had to do with a greater challenge facing the empire in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the problem of integrating the Poles. By comparison with trying to make the Poles good Russian subjects, converting Ukrainians to the Imperial point of view was easy. The Hetmanate had been more or less in Russian hands since the mid-seventeenth century, but Russia's share of Poland became hers in the partitions which began in 1772. While the central authority had had long experience of coping with and making use of Ukrainians, despite the fact that full integration took place only in the 1780s, the problem of Poland was less familiar. Insofar as Russians knew Poland, they knew her as a major military adversary (which she had been in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), and as the subverter of the Orthodox religion (which she continued to be, through the medium of the Uniate Church, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries). Neither of these descriptions applied to the Ukrainian Hetmanate (with the exception, on the military front, of Mazepa's revolt). Whatever indications the Hetmanate gave of continuing recalcitrance, it tended over the years to become increasingly a part of the empire; the Poles—to look ahead into the nineteenth century—tended to be much less amenable and to remain culturally far more distinct. There seems to have been a cultural threshold above which, in the Ukrainian case, integration was not only possible but beneficial for the empire, but below which, in the Polish case, it was impossible and damaging. Thus Prince Adam Czartoryski, to take a famous example, was brought to the Russian court but became disillusioned and played a significant part in the Polish rising of 1830–1, while the Ukrainians Oleksander Bezborodko and Viktor Kochubei adapted themselves successfully to the atmosphere of Russian high politics.

The comparison between Poland and Ukraine is appropriate because the two areas were closely interrelated. Repnin based his case for the raising of Cossack troops in 1831 on the fact that they would display their ancient hatred of the Poles. By accepting Ukrainians the central government was gaining an ally in the

struggle to integrate the Poles into the empire. From a Ukrainian point of view, St. Petersburg was likely to prove a much less hard taskmaster than the Poles had ever been. Russians and Ukrainians, whatever their antipathy to each other, were united in their attitudes toward their western neighbours.

The Russian authorities, admittedly, were not always convinced that Ukrainians were likely to be loyal where Poles were not. Repnin, after all, had to argue his case for raising Cossack troops against the Poles in 1831; that it was a sound move was not immediately apparent to the centre. A century earlier, when the effective integration of the Hetmanate into the Russian system was only just beginning, the Empress Anna had instructed the Governor of Ukraine to encourage marriages between Ukrainians and Russians, not between Ukrainians and "men of Smolensk, Poles and others living abroad."[104] Clearly she suspected that Ukrainians and Poles were much closer to one another than to St. Petersburg.

There is evidence from the early nineteenth century, moreover, which tends to confirm Anna's suspicions. At least two Ukrainians living in St. Petersburg were notably sympathetic, on ocasion, toward the Poles. Vasyl Anastasevych, famous largely as a bibliographer,[105] was described by a contemporary as possessing a "mania for everything Polish,"[106] and devoted himself throughout his career to improving the Russians' knowledge of the Poles. Almost as soon as he left the Kiev Academy, in the mid-1790s, he translated a radical play from Polish; from 1803 to 1817 he served as secretary to Czartoryski, who was then Curator of the Vilnius educational district; in 1809 he got into serious trouble for translating (and making more radical) the Polish writer Strojnowski's book on the relations between landowner and peasant; and in 1811–12 his journal *Ulei* contained much Polish material.[107] Anastasevych, then, though Ukrainian, was a principal interpreter of the Poles to the Russians.

His ultimate superior when he worked for Czartoryski was the minister of education, Petro Zavadovsky, another Ukrainian who at least once found it hard to feel hostility toward the Poles. In 1805 a debate was raging about the language of instruction to be used in the new Kiev gymnasium—Russian or Polish. Zavadovsky was in favour of Polish, since Kiev was the capital of a province on the right bank of the Dnieper where most of the inhabitants were

Polish-speaking, and since a large sum of money had been collected for the gymnasium by Polish gentry. This was opposed not only by Kochubei, minister of internal affairs, but even, at this early stage in his career, by Czartoryski. Zavadovsky stood much closer to the cultural centre-ground between Russians and Poles than either of these two. He was prepared to create a class for the teaching of Russian, because it would clearly be useful for pupils to know both languages, but basically he thought that "the Russian and Polish languages are so close to each other that there is practically no need for pupils to acquire sciences [*sc.* specifically] in one language or the other. . . ."[108]

This was not, however, a view of the two languages which would have been held by many contemporaries. Perhaps because he came from the extreme north of Ukraine where the boundaries between the different sorts of Slav were imperfectly defined, and because he had been educated in part at a Polish-sponsored Jesuit seminary in Orsha, Zavadovsky was exceptional. Adam Topolnicki, a Galician who had studied in Lviv, Vilnius, and Kiev, did not feel at home in Russia, and gave an inadequate grasp of Russian as his reason for wanting to leave the St. Petersburg teachers' seminary in 1790.[109] Metropolitan Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, a noted intellectual who could remember a good deal of Ukrainian from his youth in the south and was interested in learning modern Polish, found it hard.[110] Those like Zavadovsky who could span the cultural divide were few.

Neither Zavadovsky nor Anastasevych, moreover, was constant in his pursuit of a cultural balance between Ukrainians and Poles, for both frequently showed a "Ukrainian" orientation. This aspect of their behaviour will be discussed in more detail below.[111] Anastasevych argued that the *Slovo o polku Igoreve* was written in Ukrainian; wrote to a Polish collector of West Ukrainian folksongs that "It is necessary to be Ukrainian to sense the 'salt' of Ukrainian songs"; tried repeatedly to secure the publication of Berlynsky's *Istoriia Malorossii*; and as late as 1838–9 was corresponding with Sreznevsky, one of the most important of the younger students of Ukrainian folklore, on subjects of interest to them both.[112] If, then, Zavadovsky and Anastasevych provide some support for the Empress Anna's suspicions that Ukrainians and Poles were close to each other, ultimately their allegiance was to Ukraine.

Perhaps Ukrainians' hostility to Poles lay dormant in the eighteenth century, when the Poles were no longer threatening the left bank of the Dnieper and border disputes had moved westward with the change in the balance of power between Russia and Poland.[113] Since Ukrainian trade routes lay through Poland until the development of the Black Sea ports[114] and since Ukrainians drew their educational inspiration from Poland,[115] the relationship between the two areas was hardly one of unremitting antagonism. But when the Russian government injected new life into a potentially volatile region by adopting a policy of partitioning Poland, the memories of former Polish-Ukrainian rivalries were revived and Ukrainians began to relish the thought of profiting from the final dismemberment of their old adversary.

Two examples from the first half of the nineteenth century illustrate the attitudes of Poles and Ukrainians toward each other, and of Russians toward them both, in the period after the partitions. In 1821 the Ukrainian director of Vitebsk gymnasium asked the ministry of education to transfer him to the directorship of Minsk gymnasium, and was duly granted his request. The appointment incensed Czartoryski, Curator of the Vilnius educational district (which had charge of both gymnasia concerned). Czartoryski argued that the new director, apart from having been appointed from the centre instead of by the General Council of Vilnius University, "has never been in these provinces in any capacity," "does not know Polish" (the language of instruction in Minsk but not in Vitebsk), and wanted the new job simply in order to improve his pension prospects. He was already entitled to a full pension, but on retirement from Vitebsk he would receive it only in assignats, whereas after a year at Minsk he would be entitled to receive it in silver. Czartoryski was overruled, and in 1824 the Director, Konarovsky-Sokhovych, duly received a pension of 800 rubles in silver.[116]

The affair showed that although the Vilnius educational district included both Polish and non-Polish provinces—for Minsk and Vitebsk were both part of it—the Polish Curator was particularly concerned to defend the Polish provinces. It showed that education in Poland was secured on richer endowments than education in Russia, which was an indication of the strength of the Polish educational tradition and perhaps accounted for its past influence

(not least on Ukraine).[117] Finally, the affair showed that the central Russian government would back a Ukrainian against the possibility of a Pole in an area where it was primarily concerned with political loyalty. St. Petersburg, on this analysis, considered Ukraine a better security risk than Poland.

The second example seems to confirm this interpretation. It shows the 1821 process in reverse: Ukrainian reluctance to take on Poles in 1843. In 1839 the central government issued a decree to the effect that Polish teachers in Polish provinces be transferred to other, Russian, educational districts, and that their places be filled by Russians. Many Poles came to Left-Bank Ukraine, and the Honorary Curator of Chernihiv gymnasium complained to the Curator of his educational district, who passed on the complaint to the centre.[118] A Pole "can teach science, language; but will he inspire, will he heat the soul of a youth with the warmth of national pride, of love for our Fatherland . . . ?"[119] The Chernihiv Curator was already hearing Russian spoken with Polish stresses and Polish constructions; and the problem was not simply one of Polish teachers, for Polish pupils, too, now that they were being taught by Russians at home, were following their native teachers from the right to the left bank of the Dnieper. The ministry of education asked the Curator of the Kiev educational district to be patient, explaining that while the situation was unpleasant, it was temporary.[120] Clearly the central government was not afraid that Poles might subvert Ukraine; on the contrary, it expected Ukraine to play its part in converting the Poles to right ways of thinking.

These two examples give some indication of the relative trustworthiness of Left-Bank Ukraine and Poland in the eyes of the central authorities. They bring out, too, the way in which the areas were in direct conflict with each other in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, now that they were both part of the Russian empire. In the time of the Hetmanate, when Poles and Left-Bank Ukrainians had been under separate administrative systems, their rivalry had to a degree lain fallow.

More evidence can be adduced to make clearer both the relative trustworthiness of the two areas in Russian eyes, and the rivalry between them. The way in which information about them was received in Russia gives an indication of Russian attitudes. Many Russians travelled to Ukraine in the years after integration and

wrote enthusiastic accounts of their discoveries, singing the praises of this "Russian Italy" where peasant life differed sharply from Russian peasant life, and was closer, perhaps, to a Slavonic "state of nature."[121] The government encouraged the collection of information about the Ukrainian provinces and ordered descriptions of them.[122] Catherine the Great made her celebrated journey to the Crimea in 1787. But when an author who had previously published a romantic account of his southern experiences tried to publish the narrative of a "Journey to Warsaw," the censor was reluctant to pass it without permission from a higher authority, "for until now there has not been a single official article in Russian about the reason for the Senator's journey to Warsaw, and not even about the political institutions of the Kingdom of Poland which he describes. . . ."[123] To enthuse about Ukraine seems to have been acceptable, but to write about Poland was dubious, and Nicholas I refused to let the book appear.[124]

Nicholas I's atittudes toward Poland and Ukraine, though no doubt not consciously set off against each other, indicate that he thought the former dangerous and the latter acceptable. Unlike his brother Alexander I, who was ambivalent on the subject,[125] Nicholas was committed to the eradication of Polish separatism. Even before the great revolt of 1830–1, he was subtly trying to undermine the constitution of Poland.[126] As a result of the revolt, he conducted checks on the loyalty of Poles as insignificant as singers in the court choir.[127] It is interesting that recruitment of singers from Left-Bank Ukraine was at this time proceeding as vigorously as ever.[128] One of the tsar's measures after the revolt, moving Polish teachers into Russia in 1839, has already been mentioned. There were many other measures designed to integrate the Poles into the Russian system. Not only teachers but Polish pupils were deliberately brought into Russia, to receive higher education.[129] One Curator of an educational district thought they ought to come at an earlier age and study in Russian gymnasia, or else they would enter the universities "being in a certain way satiated with the rules and opinions of their nation, so damaging for the general well-being."[130] Poles were anyway virtually obliged to come to Russia for higher education after the rising of 1830, because one of its direct results was the closure of their own university at Vilnius. On this occasion Ukraine benefited materially from Poland's loss, for the books from

the library at Vilnius were transferred to the universities of Kiev and Kharkiv;[131] a specific instance, perhaps, of the way in which Ukraine was considered "safe" by the central authorities, whereas Poland was seen as seditious.

The events which lay behind the writing of N. G. Ustrialov's *Kratkaia russkaia istoriia*, which appeared in 1839, illustrated perfectly the government's concern for the integration of Poland in the 1830s. This was precisely the period, as will be shown in Chapters Six and Seven, when the Ukrainian theme was appearing frequently in Russian literature, and when Ukraine was playing a large part in Russian thinking about the nature of the Slavic identity. It was as if Ukraine was being accepted, and indeed made much of, in order to attack the Poles. The rivalry between Ukrainians and Poles which in the seventeenth century had been local, finding its expression mainly on the right bank of the Dnieper, now had a much broader significance and was helping to determine the lines of a wide-ranging debate about Russian nationality.

Ustrialov's textbook, which was adopted for use in the schools of the empire, has often been cited as "highly representative" of Nicholas I's philosophy of Official Nationality, and its connection with the contemporary desire to integrate the western provinces into the empire has been acknowledged.[132] But it has not been sufficiently emphasized that it was adopted as a textbook as a result of a specific request from integrators in the western provinces for a book to use in the schools, and that the government went to great lengths looking for such a book over a period of six years. In 1834 the honorary inspector of the schools of Grodno distsrict wrote to the ministry of education asking for a book from which the history of the western provinces could be taught. He was concerned, he wrote, for "the restoration, dissemination and establishment in the western provinces of a [notion of] nationality (*narodnost*) closely tied to general Russian nationality."[133] This was the beginning of the process which led to the eventual official adoption of Ustrialov's book. M. P. Pogodin was originally invited to write the necessary work, and replied that he would write a general Russian history, demonstrating in the wider context that "this land [the western provinces] has been our property from time immemorial, an essential part of Russia." He waxed eloquent in his letter on the

subject of Poland, and declared himself ready to do battle "in the face of all Europe" with the Polish historians Joachim Lelewel, Julian Niemcewicz and Czartoryski. At the time of the Polish rising three years before, foreign newspapers' sympathy with the Poles had tried him beyond endurance, and now he intended to set the records straight.[134] In the event Pogodin was unable to meet the minister of education's stringent requirements. The minister, S. S. Uvarov, felt that the theme of the historical integrity of Russia had not been sufficiently brought out.[135] In 1836 the net was cast wider and a new historian sought, a man capable of conveying adequately that "the Russian lands, united by holy bonds of nationality, always constituted a single whole. . . ."[136] Ustrialov ultimately met the government's requirements.[137]

The trouble taken by the government in this academic matter reflected the trouble it was taking over Poland in general in the 1830s. Ukraine, Orthodox and non-militant, looked virtuous by comparison. Literary and intellectual concerns of Ukrainian origin found a ready audience because, while also springing from the empire's frontier zone, they tended to support rather than to attack the idea of empire.

Direct conflict between Ukrainians and Poles did not disappear in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The memory of earlier enmity received constant reinforcement. In religion Konysky led the eighteenth-century battle against the Polish Uniate Church, and was honoured for it by the Ukrainian journalist Vasyl Ruban and the Ukrainian historian Mykola Bantysh-Kamensky.[138] In education the question whether Russian or Polish was to be the language of instruction in Kiev was only part of a continuing battle between Polish and Ukrainian educators in Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine. In late 1812 the director of the Kiev gymnasium wrote to the ministry of education asking for a new Schools Visitor who could counterbalance "the harmful bias . . . in favour of Krzemieniec in this province." Krzemieniec was Tadeusz Czacki's Polish gymnasium in Western Ukraine, and the Kiev director knew that "a new storm of displeasure" would descend upon him "from the West" for making his request.[139]

In the intellectual sphere some Ukrainians deliberately cultivated their rivalry with the Poles, as if anxious to confirm the government in its apparent view that Ukrainians were virtuous whereas Poles

were seditious. In 1857 M. O. Maksymovych wrote a review of an article by the Polish hisotrian M. Grabowski, in which he rejected the author's attempt "to place the olive-branch of peace on the grave of the long played-out Polish-Ukrainian past (*davno otzhitoi stariny polsko-ukrainskoi*)."[140] Maksymovych was not to be placated. He would not accept the past influence of Poland on Ukraine, and minimized the periods when it could have been operative. For Maksymovych, Poland was still something to be angry about.[141] His attitude illustrated why Ukrainians were of service to Russia. When looking for an identity appropriate to the newly enlarged empire, early nineteenth-century Russia had to find one which overcame the problem of Poland. Ukrainians, in earlier conflicts with Poland, had thought about what it meant to be "Orthodox Slavic." They were thus able to play a substantial part in the creation of an atmosphere whose governmental expression was the doctrine of Official Nationality.

Ukraine's importance, furthermore, went beyond the domestic context. In the mid-nineteenth century the achievement of Slavic solidarity became important not only within the Russian Empire, but in an international ideological context. Ukrainians who played a significant part in this extension of thinking about the Slavs confirm the notion of a link between the integration of the south into the Russian Empire and the reassessment of Russia's cultural priorities. Andrii Storozhenko, whose review of Gogol's *Vechera* will be discussed in Chapter Six,[142] wrote later about the broad contemporary rivalry between "Latins, Germans, and Slavs."[143] Ivan Kulzhynsky, author of an influential essay on Ukrainian poetry,[144] produced a slight work in 1840 entitled *On the Significance of Russia in the Family of European Nations*, in which he expressed enthusiasm for the distinctive character of Russian nationality and gave voice to something like the notion of "Holy Russia."[145] Some space will be devoted, in Chapter Eight, to consideration of P. I. Köppen, Osyp Bodiansky and I. I. Sreznevsky, who spent their youth in Ukraine, travelled to other Slavic parts of of Eastern Europe, made comparisons, and laid the intellectual foundations for pan-slavism; they too, like Storozhenko and Kulzhynsky, lend credence to the idea that Ukrainians contributed not only to the redefinition of Russian national identity, but also to the reorientation of Russia's links with the world at large. Ukrainians,

therefore, counteracted Poles and directed the Russians' attention to other parts of the Slavic world. In these respects they benefited the north, and showed that, in the first half of the nineteenth century, more things united Russians and Ukrainians than divided them.

Chapter Three

The Great North Road

Ukrainian Education

While Ukrainians stayed in Ukraine, only those Russians who dealt with the south had to pay them much attention. But as the days of the Hetmanate drew to a close, an increasing number of Ukrainians migrated northward. In 1786 Opanas Shafonsky offered an explanation of these departures in his magisterial survey of the province of Chernihiv:

> Forty years or so ago [he wrote], when Little Russians looked for service nowhere but in Little Russia itself, the children of the gentry and of the most respected members of the community used to study Russian at home and then enter the Latin schools. There, for ten years and more, they studied Latin, the difficult and complex art of versification, oratory and philosophy, and having already achieved manhood entered the civil service, beginning in the former General Military Chancery and then working as chancery officials in the Little Russian College. They did not consider this in any way shameful or base, but used to prepare themselves with pleasure for the fulfilment of various functions. Now, because of the continuing absence of adequate gymnasia and universities [in Ukraine], gentry with sufficient means keep foreigners as teachers, but the others send their children to schools in Moscow, St. Petersburg and other places or to the various cadet corps, and some even send them abroad, so

> that already in the Little Russian schools it is practically only the sons of priests and other clerical children who study.[1]

According to Shafonsky, the teaching on offer in Ukraine's "Latin schools," run by the clergy, was

> extremely feeble and inadequate. The poor circumstances of the teachers, and as a result the shortage both of good teachers and of books—these are the reasons why science and enlightenment are to this day in a very undeveloped and poor condition in this region.[2]

Shafonsky himself had experienced the enlightenment of Western Europe, and he wanted its benefits to reach his homeland. He had not received much of his own education in Ukraine. Born in 1740, he was sent abroad by his father at the age of sixteen and took doctorates at the universities of Halle, Leiden and Strasbourg. On returning to Russia he practiced medicine—first near Tsaritsyn, then in the army at the beginning of Catherine the Great's first Turkish war, and finally in Moscow in the 1770s, where he wrote a celebrated description of the great plague of 1770–2. With the radical reorganization of Ukrainian local government in the early 1780s, he returned to the south and occupied himself with writing and local service until his death in 1811.[3] Committed to improving the lot of Ukrainians, he believed that Imperial integration offered them the best prospects.[4] He practiced what he preached, resigning from service in 1796 when Paul reintroduced some of the old Ukrainian forms.[5] He supported the secular schools introduced by Catherine's Schools Commission.[6] In the long run, his thinking was undoubtedly correct. The university founded at Kharkiv early in the nineteenth century did much for the development of Ukraine. Given that the central government was considering the creation of a university at Chernihiv in 1786,[7] Shafonsky did well to make a case for educational reform. The gentry of the Hetmanate, after all, had called for universities in the early 1760s.[8] But despite his foresight—or because of it—Shafonsky failed to give existing Ukrainian education due weight. It may have lagged behind education available in the West, but it was a long way ahead of most of the education available in Russia.

Andrii Storozhenko, writing in the 1830s, explained Ukrainian migration differently. For him it arose out of ambition, not out of educational backwardness. Storozhenko criticized Gogol's assertion

(in *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki*) that literacy was unusual in Baturyn in the mid-eighteenth century:

> It is not difficult to decide when literacy was greater in Little Russia (not only in Baturyn), whether in the time of the Hetman or now, if you take into consideration that in those days Little Russians, possessing a means of acquiring honours and property in their homeland, sought these in small numbers in St. Petersburg and in the other regions of Russia; and that now, on the other hand, poverty and a feeling of personal worth compel a large part (as we say) of my poor fellow-countrymen to seek bread in the capital, and when they have become independent, honours as well. Therefore I think everyone will agree that there was a higher degree of literacy in our region under the Hetmans than at the present time, when literate Ukrainians have been scattered throughout the entire expanse of the Russian State.[9]

For Storozhenko, then, "poverty and a feeling of personal worth," explained Ukrainians' migration. Ukrainian education was not at fault. Having lost the opportunity to become Companions of the Standard in Hlukhiv, Ukrainians sought outlets for their talents throughout the length and breadth of the empire.

Storozhenko was nearer the mark than Shafonsky. The central government was quick to capitalize on Ukrainians' natural inclinations to move, for their educational background could be put to good use. Whereas Shafonsky argued that Ukrainians migrated because their educational opportunities at home were slim, often they were given the chance to move for precisely the opposite reason—because their education was superior. As the empire expanded and its administration grew, the authorities needed more civil servants; owing to its strong educational tradition, Ukraine was able to provide them. Petro Zavadovsky, head of Catherine the Great's Schools Commission and himself Ukrainian, wrote identical letters to the Bishop of Chernihiv and the Metropolitan of Kiev in 1789, in which he made it clear why Ukrainian students appealed to St. Petersburg:

> Of all the men sent to the Commission for the Establishment of Schools to fulfil teachers' duties, at various times and from various spiritual seminaries, the best, the most capable, and in particular the most upstanding have always been those who studied in the Chernihiv spiritual seminary/the Kiev Spiritual Academy. . . .[10]

In 1823 the Rector of the Kharkiv Collegium, Andrii Prokopovych, wrote to a former Chancellor of the empire, N. P. Rumiantsev, describing the service careers of his sons (who had studied in Kharkiv). Rumiantsev replied that he valued the Collegium partly "because of the observation which I made in the course of my service that a large proportion of the outstanding ministerial officials are products of this institution."[11] Ukrainians, then, were of use to the Russians. The various routes which they took from south to north will be described in the next section, and their activities in Russia will occupy the remainder of the book; but first, I shall look at the principal reason for their usefulness.

The Ukrainian educational spectrum was broader than any to be found within the Russian Empire before the widespread introduction of state-run secular schools in the 1780s. Ukrainian parents set great store by learning. V. T. Narizhny's *Bursak* could read, write and sing all eight tones of the Orthodox plainchant before he was twelve.[12] Ievhen Hrebinka deplored the way in which, in the 1840s, a man was considered educated at seventeen. In the old days, he said, parents who noticed in their son an aptitude for learning sent him to the Kiev Academy. There he studied until well past seventeen, only to be sent on to Lviv after a week's rest at home, and after that to Königsberg, Leipzig and beyond.[13] The roots of education ran deep in Ukrainian soil. The parish clergy, though far from sophisticated, seem not to have been in quite such a depressed condition as they were elsewhere in the empire.[14] Illia Tymkovsky, later a major figure in the establishment of Kharkiv University, described how village life in Ukraine in the 1770s and 1780s centred on the church, and how his early instruction was based on textbooks brought from a monastery on the right bank of the Dnieper.[15] Parish schools proliferated. According to one calculation, there were 866 schools in seven of the ten regiments of the Hetmanate in the 1740s—in other words, in more than 80 per cent of the centres of population in those areas.[16] The Governor of Ukraine was making use of local schools to increase the literacy of Cossack children in 1767.[17] They seem to have flourished until the Ukrainian peasantry's right of movement was curtailed in the early 1780s; thereafter, presumably, peasants were unable to seek out the good ones and they failed for want of support.[18]

The Kiev Academy stood at the summit of the Ukrainian educational order. The largest educational institution in the empire,[19] it led the field because it sprang from more cultivated traditions than those which obtained in the north. It arose in the days of Polish rule, when the Ukrainian Orthodox were defending themselves against the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the Polish-sponsored Uniate Church. Originally, the Orthodox under Polish rule grouped themselves in "brotherhoods."[20] The Kiev Academy, not yet so called, emerged in 1615 from the union of an earlier school founded by the Kiev brotherhood and Kiev's Monastery of the Caves.[21] Although Orthodox, the Academy derived its inspiration from Polish Catholic culture, which was in advance of Russian. The academy owed its greatness in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to Petro Mohyla, who in the 1630s gave it the form it retained.[22]

The Polish affinities of Kievan education were discernible well into the eighteenth century. Latin, the principal subject of study (in itself an indication that the academy owed much to Catholic culture), was long taught from the *De Institutione Grammatica* of Emmanuel Alvarez, which could only have come to Russia from the West via Poland.[23] When, in the 1760s, the reform of the academy's syllabus began in earnest, one of the steps in the process of modernization was to give Polish, as a language, the same status as Russian and Latin[24]—a sure sign that there were still large numbers of Poles studying at the academy, and that it retained its westward orientation. A nineteenth-century writer, discussing why the Nizhyn lycée was founded at Nizhyn and not in the principal city of Ukraine, when it was intended to offer the fruits of enlightenment to Ukraine as a whole, argued that Kiev remained a fundamentally Polish city long after it came into Russian hands.[25] The author of a description of Kiev, writing in 1760, pointed out that the students of the academy often came from Poland.[26] In the early nineteenth century, when the academy was being bypassed by the newly established state schools and its future was under discussion, one of the plans suggested was to turn it into a Polish school on the lines of the Krzemieniec gymnasium in Ukraine.[27]

Theoretically the Kiev Academy trained priests, and this is what it did exclusively after 1819, when its fate was decided and it changed its name to the Kiev Spiritual Seminary. Before then, it

catered for a much larger cross-section of the community. Until about 1780, more than half the students were usually from non-clerical families.[28] The course of study, which at its fullest extent lasted thirteen years, was designed with future priests in mind, for the classes through which the students passed were named after their principal subjects of study and the last was called "Theology," in which a student who completed the course would have spent the last four of his thirteen years. In practice, many students left the academy before reaching the last two classes. Students were concentrated, in fact, in the two classes immediately before the last two, the first of which they could enter directly from the lesser church schools. The picture which emerges, therefore, is more fluid than the formality of the thirteen-year, theologically oriented course suggests. Many students entered the academy for a relatively brief period in the middle of the course, and having taken advantage of the general education it offered, left to continue their education elsewhere or to go into service.[29]

A complaint commonly directed at the Kiev Academy, not least by certain eighteenth-century Ukrainians, was that its curriculum bore little relation to the needs of contemporary society. Shafonsky's views on the teaching available in the Latin schools have already been cited. Concentration on Latin was felt to be a poor preparation for a life of government service. A Ukrainian working in St. Petersburg, Iakiv Halynkovsky, made a savage attack on it early in the nineteenth century.[30] But Latin was not altogether useless in eighteenth-century Europe. It was still an international language of instruction, and made Ukrainians particularly well-qualified to go abroad and continue their studies. It also made it easier, no doubt, for foreigners to come to Kiev.[31] The composer Berezovsky, a product of the Kiev Academy, found Latin useful when he was studying in Bologna in the 1760s and 1770s.[32] The doctor Terekhovsky, who became one of the leading figures in the anti-German movement in Russian medicine in the 1780s,[33] submitted his doctoral thesis in Latin in Strasbourg in 1775.[34] Latin was the language of instruction in the Russian medical schools, where most of the teachers were German. In 1761, for example, the Curator of Moscow University wrote to his Director saying that the Medical Chancery had asked for thirty pupils who knew Latin;[35] not surprisingly, many such requests were

addressed to the Kiev Academy, where everyone knew Latin. Even in its unreformed condition, then, the academy's curriculum was not without relevance to the educational needs of Russia.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, moreover, it was considerably revised and made much more attractive. The principal reformer, Samiilo Myslavsky, served as Rector of the academy in the 1760s and as Metropolitan of Kiev in the 1780s, and in the course of these two periods succeeded in making Kiev a more modern educational centre. In the first period he dropped the old Latin textbook of Alvarez and put Polish on a par with Latin and Russian to meet the needs of the academy's many Polish students. He placed much more emphasis on the teaching of foreign languages, making it clear to students in the upper classes—those marked out for the priesthood—that they would fail to get ecclesiastical preferment if they took little account of the modern elements in the curriculum. Greek had long been taught in Kiev, Hebrew and German for some time, and French since 1753, but only now did the emphasis begin to be placed on them. Myslavsky went much farther in his second period of involvement in the life of the academy. He had spent about fourteen years in the north before returning to Kiev, and was clearly sympathetic toward the central government's policy of extending European enlightenment. In 1783 he appointed a separate teacher of arithmetic, and in 1784 ordered the grammar teacher to teach history and geography as well. He brought in a teacher of Russian language and literature, doubled the provision for the learning of French, and employed a native German teacher. He acted in full accordance with the Holy Synod's decree of 27 December 1785, which stated the desirability of introducing into existing church schools the methods about to be employed in the secular schools.[36] Under the influence of Myslavsky, the teaching staff at the academy changed sharply in the course of the 1780s. Until then, broadly speaking, almost all the teachers had been monks; from then on, more than three-quarters were secular.[37] Illustrative of the change was the appointment of Iakiv Odyntsov as teacher of Russian grammar, drawing, and general history in 1789.[38] Having been sent from the academy to train at the St. Petersburg teachers' seminary, he combined feeling for the south with the benefits of a modern education. The Ukrainian journalist Fedir Tumansky, who worked for the Schools

Commission in St. Petersburg, agitated for Odintsov's release from the teachers' seminary,[39] thereby showing that Myslavsky was not the only Ukrainian who felt that the Kiev Academy should be brought into the modern age. Another Ukrainian journalist working in the capital, Vasyl Anastasevych, showed in his radicalism the effects of the academy's transformation. Irynei Falkovsky, his favourite teacher in Kiev, had completed his education in the Habsburg Empire, and because of the modernity of his interests had been unable to secure a teaching post at the academy until after the coming of Myslavsky.[40] It was to Falkovsky that Anastevych owed many of his forward-looking ideas.[41]

Ukrainians who moved from south to north and became involved in Russian journalism tended to convey in their work the importance of the Kiev Academy. Nearly all the journalists considered in Chapter Five made clear, in St. Petersburg, how much they owed to their *alma mater*; or at least, in the case of the hostile Halynkovsky, they showed how deep an impression it had left upon them. Hryhorii Braiko, the Ukrainian editor of *Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik*, reported the disastrous fire which destroyed the academy library in 1780;[42] Anastasevych reported the second fire of 1811.[43] A eulogy of Myslavsky was one of the last things written by that archetypal Ukrainian journalist in the capital, Vasyl Ruban.[44] Perhaps the most striking example of the way in which Kiev's part in Russian education was being debated in Russia in the eighteenth century was provided by Mikhail Lomonosov's objection to an article on the subject by Hryhorii Poletyka, the defender of Ukrainian rights at the Legislative Commission of 1767–8. Lomonosov felt that the article, entitled *O nachale, vozobnovlenii i rasprostranenii ucheniia i uchilishch v Rossii i o nyneshnem onykh sostoianii,* concentrated too heavily on Kiev at the expense of Moscow.[45] His objections could almost be seen as the reaction of a man from the extreme north to the extravagant claims made by a keen southerner. But since it has been conclusively shown that Lomonosov visited Kiev and took advantage of the opportunities for study which it offered,[46] perhaps subliminally he recognized the claims of the south and was "protesting too much" in his attempt to set them in context.

Within Ukraine, the Kiev Academy was only the most distinguished of a number of educational institutions which in the

late eighteenth century contributed greatly to the provision of educated personnel for the expanding Imperial administration. As the senior church school, it provided a model for the educational activities of the other Ukrainian seminaries, all of which, as we shall see, sent pupils northward to enlarge the cadre of educated Russians. It was the prototype for Ukraine's other great educational centre, the Kharkiv Collegium, which fulfilled in the east the purpose which the Kiev Academy served in the centre and the west.[47] In Kharkiv there was no direct Polish influence. The collegium was founded as the Bilhorod seminary in 1722, after Peter the Great had called for spiritual schools in each eparchy the previous year. The military commander in Ukraine, Prince Mikhail Mikhailovich Golitsyn, transferred the seminary to Kharkiv in 1726 in order that a larger proportion of the secular as well as the church community could benefit from it. In June 1727 it already had more than 400 pupils, and in 1734, having hitherto been known in its Kharkiv period as a "Slav-Greek-Latin school" (on the lines of the institution in Moscow), it assumed the grandiloquent title of collegium. For the remainder of the eighteenth century, and until they both became purely ecclesiastical institutions in the second decade of the nineteenth century, the Kharkiv Collegium was second only to the Kiev Academy among the educational institutions of Ukraine, quickly outdistancing the older Chernihiv Collegium. It had about 700 students at a time. Of its rectors the most distinguished was the last before the early nineteenth-century reform, Andrii Prokopovych, Rumiantsev's correspondent.[48]

Among its teachers the collegium numbered in the 1750s the celebrated Ukrainian philosopher Hryhorii Skovoroda, who had far outshone Myslavsky when they were students together at the Kiev Academy. Kharkiv alumni included at least two Metropolitans of Kiev, a Curator of Kharkiv University, the Empress Elizabeth's secretary, the poet Mykola Hnidych and the historian and journalist Kachenovsky. Kharkiv, like Kiev, catered for far more than the mere training of priests. The patronage of the Golitsyns, bestowed in the 1720s on the understanding that the collegium meet the needs of the whole community, continued to ensure that, however much they would have liked to do so, the clerical authorities were unable to close their doors to the non-clerical ranks. As late as 1802, when secular education was stronger in Russia and the

collegium might perhaps have been forgiven for concentrating rather more on its original ecclesiastical function, A. M. Golitsyn wrote to Kharkiv to remind the authorities why his family allowed its name to be connected with them.[49] No less than Kiev, Kharkiv was training not merely churchmen but servants of the empire as a whole.

The Kiev Academy, the Kharkiv Collegium, the lesser seminaries and the parish schools of Ukraine exemplified the relatively high degree of eighteenth-century Ukrainian culture. They should be seen in perspective. A recent student of the parish clergy in the central dioceses of the empire observed that "most provincial seminaries subjected the youths to a harrowing experience of deprivation, hardship and intellectual abuse."[50] Life was no doubt hard in Kiev too—but less hard, perhaps, than elsewhere. Certainly Kiev and Kharkiv educated more non-clerical children than their counterparts in the north, and made their mark more widely.[51] Despite the fact that the Kiev Academy was modelled on older Western institutions, it was not wholly out of touch either with the eighteenth-century world in general or with its immediate environment. "Analysts who unequivocally declare the programme of the academy "scholastic" are hardly correct.[52] Ukrainian schools had been forward-looking and combative in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[53] In the eighteenth century they continued to produce creative thinkers and to foster local culture. Konysky, Iakiv Kozelsky and Skovoroda stood out among thinkers produced by the eighteenth-century Russian Empire. They were all products of the Kiev Academy and preserved their links with Ukraine. It was long thought possible that Konysky wrote the autonomist *Istoriia Rusov*. Kozelsky returned to serve in Ukraine two years after having published (in St. Petersburg) his *Filosoficheskie predlozheniia*, one of the outstanding works of philosophy to appear in Russia in the second half of the eighteenth century. Skovoroda remained at the end of his life "in speech a pure Little Russian."[54] These thinkers were neither constrained by their Ukrainian upbringing nor forgetful of it. Perhaps their intellectual activities seem too rarefied to say much about the generality of Ukrainian experience. Skovoroda's "passion," however, "was to live in a peasant environment,"[55] whilst Konysky's play *Voskresenie mertvykh* has been interpreted as an allegorical attempt to deplore the way in

which Ukrainian nobles were seizing the lands of rank-and-file Cossacks.[56] Both Skovoroda and Konysky were involved with the Ukrainian world around them. A literary scholar has argued that, in the eighteenth century, poetry written in the Latin schools became less "scholastic" and closer to Ukrainian speech.[57] Although plays in Ukrainian educational establishments were written in Church Slavonic, they contained interludes in the vernacular. In 1794 Opanas Lobysevych asked Konysky for the interludes to *Voskresenie mertvykh* (written fifty years previously). Lobysevych was an enthusiast for the Ukrainian language, and believed his cause could be furthered by material written for the stylized Kievan stage. Clearly that stage was by no means utterly divorced from the life beyond the walls.[58] The Kiev Academy and its offshoots came from the West, but they were not inimical to Ukrainian culture; in some respects they promoted it.

Measuring the extent of non-ecclesiastical enlightenment in eighteenth-century Ukraine poses great problems. A study of thirteen subscription lists to Russian journals published between 1777 and 1799 suggests the presence of "a reservoir of provincial subscribers [not confined to Ukraine] more numerous than other sources had indicated."[59] Going beyond this suggestion is difficult. In the second half of the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth century, primers were being published in Ukraine in large quantities, but after 1720, owing to the tsar's prohibition, only religious books could apear there.[60] Manuscripts like those of the Cossack chroniclers and the traveller Vasyl Hryhorovych-Barsky circulated widely, but were expensive to copy and not always obtainable even by those on the lookout for them.[61] Two studies of the library of the Kharkiv Collegium in the mid-eighteenth century give some indication of the relatively wide range of reading matter available to students,[62] but their author points out elsewhere that libraries in private hands in Ukraine have not, as yet, received enough attention.[63] The comments on Dmytro Troshchynsky's library in the next chapter will do a little, perhaps, to reduce this deficiency; of Petro Zavadovsky's library on his estate of Lialychi we know only that it contained 3,750 volumes.[64] Ukrainians certainly bought books, to judge by the activities of the merchants of Poltava. Hryhorii Paskevych returned from Wrocław in May 1781 with 725 French and German medical books; his colleague

Osyp Pashchenko brought back another 140 six months later.[65] One suspects, from the hints available, that reading went on outside the schools as well as inside them, and that both secular and ecclesiastical works came to hand. The schools alone, however, are enough to illustrate the relative sophistication of eighteenth-century Ukrainian culture, and it was on the schools that the central government drew.

Migration to the Capitals

There were Ukrainians in Russia long before the second half of the eighteenth century. To continue the bookselling theme which ended the previous section, a bookseller from Ukraine set up shop in Moscow in the 1690s with a large and varied assortment of books for sale, the like of which was not to be found in the hands of other booksellers.[66] Even earlier than that, Ukrainians had made their mark on the Russian church. They were protagonists of Patriarch Nikon's mid-seventeenth-century modernization, and executors of Peter the Great's church reform. Peter's ecclesiastical agents, Teofan Prokopovych and Stefan Iavorsky, are probably the best-known Ukrainians in Russian history.[67] Migrant Ukrainians of the late eighteenth century, however, differed from their predecessors in that they were involved in every aspect of government activity, from international negotiations to the smallest details of the civil infrastructure. In earlier days, of course, the influence of churchmen extended beyond the domain of the church, and the church itself played a larger part in the life of the country, so that the influence of a Ukrainian churchman could be extensive; but the secular Ukrainians of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries ultimately made more various impressions on the general cultural complexion of the empire. The pre-revolutionary author of *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na veliko-russkuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn* ended his study in 1762, because under Catherine the Great the laws which already existed about the appointment of Russians to positions of authority in the church began to be rigorously enforced.[68] This ending of a long-lived aspect of Ukrainian pre-eminence was not the end of Ukrainian influence as a whole. As one of the major historians of the Kiev Academy put it, under Catherine the Great "the range of influence of the . . . academy . . . became a great deal broader than before and embraced practically all aspects not only of the ecclesiastical but of the state life of Russia."[69] Ukrainians' influence became harder to trace because it was no longer so heavily concentrated in a single sphere, but the numbers of men involved and the range of their activities were larger, and the cumulative effect of Ukrainian migration was at least as historically significant as in the past.

Ukrainian schools were still flourishing in the late eighteenth century, catering for large numbers of pupils, educating the lay as well as the ecclesiastical community, and adapting their curricula to meet the demands of a new age. Yet by the second decade of the nineteenth century they were no more than church seminaries. The central government introduced a new school system to speed the process of Imperial integration. As Max Okenfuss demonstrated, the secular schools introduced in the 1780s "were the offspring not of educational thought, but of provincial reorganization in the aftermath of southern and western expansion."[70] Catherine the Great could have used the church as the agent of her centralizing schools reform, but for philosophical reasons she chose not to do so.[71] Meanwhile, to staff her expanding administration, she needed men. To obtain them, she removed students from the church schools, thereby accelerating their already inevitable decline. In this respect the Ukrainian seminaries suffered more than their northern counterparts, for they were better able to supply personnel. The Kiev Academy, in other words, declined partly by virtue of its own success. Although it was an institution in which "everything was foreseen and calculated, and nothing omitted that might contribute to its well-being," a contemporary observed truly that "an educational institution flourishes only when it possesses capable directors and capable pupils."[72] Capable pupils were taken away in the second half of the eighteenth century, and morale at the academy sank proportionately.[73]

From the time of Peter the Great the Russian government had been looking almost desperately for trained officials. Often it had found them beyond the confines of the empire—Germans, French, Italians, Englishmen. But even under Peter "special emphasis" had been laid, not surprisingly, on the recruitment of Slavic-speaking foreigners.[74] Just as Serbs made good colonizers of the unsettled parts of Ukraine,[75] and just as Sub-Carpathian Ukrainians were attractive to Russia in the early nineteenth century,[76] so Ukrainians from central Ukraine, who were already subjects of the Russian Empire, were likely to make good servants of St. Petersburg. Beneficiaries of an educational tradition which was in origin non-Russian, they were nevertheless faced with few language problems on entering Russia, and could be expected to blend imperceptibly into the fabric of Russian life.

A study of the St. Petersburg "teachers' seminary" bears out the extent to which central government looked to Ukraine for personnel in the late eighteenth century. It provides one example among many of the way in which Russian institutions of higher education summoned their pupils, above all, from the south. The seminary, or gymnasium as it was otherwise known, existed from 1783 to 1803 to train teachers for Catherine the Great's new schools. After 1803 the seminary was replaced by the St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute, which in turn gave way to St. Petersburg University in 1819; so that it marked the beginning of a long tradition in Russian secular education. Since for most of its life the seminary was in the overall charge of Petro Zavadovsky (in his capacity as head of Catherine's Schools Commission), it was perhaps not particularly surprising that it looked to Ukraine for pupils. Zavadovsky's remarks on the quality of Ukrainian students, quoted earlier in this chapter, reflect a degree of local patriotism; the way in which he made use of Ukrainians in his career in the capital is discussed in the next chapter. But he must have summoned Ukrainian trainers for practical as well as personal reasons, because it cost a lot to get them to St. Petersburg. In March 1790 Samiilo Myslavsky, Metropolitan of Kiev, claimed a rebate from Zavadovsky for the cost of sending twenty-five students from Kiev to St. Petersburg two months previously. He said he had spent 1,206 rubles on items including transport, the purchase of coats, boots and winter headgear, and the expenses of the students en route. He admitted that the figure seemed high, but put it down to high prices in general and the unusual character of the recent winter, in which not enough snow had fallen to make the roads easy.[77] The price was indeed high. The budget of the Schools Commission in the first four years of its existence was thirty thousand rubles a year. In that time the commission spent a total of 27,394 rubles on the upkeep of students at the teachers' seminary.[78] Spending more than a thousand rubles on procuring twenty-five Ukrainian students showed that the centre was keen to have them.[79]

A long document dealing with the careers of students at the teachers' seminary (their appointments on completing the course, their changes of school, their departures into the civil service) concludes with a complete list of the seminarians containing notes on their origins and whereabouts.[80] The list is in five parts, divided

by the students' dates of entry into the seminary: [81]

Date of entry	Total no. of entrants	No. of southerners
1782–6	211	37
1786–9	118	70
1790	34	28
1790–5	55	16
1799–1800	26	0
Totals	444[81]	151

Of the southerners on the list, 90 came from the Kiev Academy, 25 from Kharkiv, 23 from Chernihiv, 5 from Pereiaslav, 5 from Bilhorod and 3 from Novhorod-Siversky, which is a fair indication of the relative standing of the various Ukrainian seminaries. There are a number of reasons why Ukrainians were summoned in particularly large numbers in the second half of the 1780s. This was the period immediately after the final integration of the Hetmanate into the administrative structure of the empire, when for political as well as educational reasons it was in the government's interest to bring southerners to St. Petersburg and show them that they stood to gain from closer involvement with the Russians. At the same time this was the period when the Schools Commission was at its most active. Having obtained students for the seminary from 28 sources in the period 1782–6, the schools administration may have discovered that the same sources were unable to supply them in such large numbers so soon afterward. As a result, it probably turned to the southern institutions because they were the largest and the most fruitful.[82] Later, when the flurry of school-building in Catherine's last years was over and there was no need to cast the net so widely, the 26 men who constituted the fifth intake of 1799–1800 all came from St. Petersburg, Tver or Moscow.

Perhaps the large number of Ukrainians who entered the teachers' seminary between 1786 and 1790 were summoned partly because the government had completed the administrative integration of Ukraine and was now beginning to work on its infrastructure. It therefore had to train Ukrainian teachers to work in Ukrainian schools. This, however, is unlikely to have been the most important reason for summoning Ukrainians. The Kiev

Academy was the joint-largest single supplier of the teachers' seminary even in the period of the first intake; and by no means all those Ukrainians who came north returned to Ukraine when their training was complete. Ukrainians constituted more than a third of the total number of students entering the seminary, and were studying in greater numbers than were required by the need to staff the new Ukrainian secular schools. They began to flow over into many areas of Russian life. They came, it has been said, not so much to study the humanities as to confirm that what was being taught in St. Petersburg was the same as in the reformed Kiev Academy;[83] and having discovered this, they quickly left to fulfil themselves in other ways. One went to work in the Holy Synod, another transferred from teaching to medicine, a number "retired" for unspecified reasons (no doubt because they had found more interesting employment), some were released to other, undescribed jobs (*v drugoe zvanie*), some were expelled, many pleaded illness and left teaching, one went into the army, one into the St. Petersburg censorship, one into the administration of the crown lands, one to work for the geographer G. I. Shelekhov.[84] Even of those (still the majority) who stayed in teaching, relatively few returned to Ukraine. Many stayed on in St. Petersburg, and the rest were scattered throughout the length and breadth of the empire.

The St. Petersburg teachers' seminary provides a neat, coherent example of the way in which Ukrainians were taking advantage of the opportunities to move northward in the second half of the eighteenth century. It was by no means the earliest opportunity which presented itself, however, nor indeed the most striking instance of central government exploitation of the Ukrainian educational tradition. Perhaps the first major non-ecclesiastical call for Ukrainians came from the Russian medical schools. The Medical Chancery's application of 1761 to Moscow University has already been mentioned,[85] but before that the Chancer was procuring large numbers of students from the south. This is a subject which has been relatively intensively studied.[86] In the last century it was calculated that of 523 doctors practising in Russia in the eighteenth century, 431 were foreigners, another 31 had foreign surnames and were presumably second-generation immigrants, while of the remaining 61, 42 were Ukrainian and only 19 Russian:[87]

which indicated that all parts of the empire were technically backward, but that Ukrainian educational preparation was superior to that obtainable in Russia. This impression is confirmed by a modern list of the most distinguished products of the eighteenth-century Russian hospital schools.[88] Of 73 names on the list, only 20 appear to have had no southern connection whatsoever. The Latin taught in the church schools of Ukraine enabled Ukrainians to take advantage of the medical instruction offered in Latin by foreigners teaching in the Russian medical schools. Seventeen fifty-four seems to have marked the first edict from the Holy Synod to the Kiev Academy instructing it to release students for medical training,[89] and thereafter there were constant departures to the northern schools. One authority argues that they fell away only when other opportunities for moving northward arose—provided, for example, by the teachers' seminary or by the possibility of direct entry into the civil service.[90] By 1795 the academy was unable to meet all the demands placed upon it by the medical authorities, for in that year Myslavsky had to tell V. I. Zinoviev, head of Russia's Medical College, that not only could he not supply the 25 new students Zinoviev had asked for, but that he could not produce even one.[91] By then large numbers of future doctors had already gone north. If the academy was exhausting itself in trying to provide educated personnel for an integrated empire, its influence, and the influence of Ukraine as a whole, were beginning to be felt in northern secular society.

Ukrainians did not have to become teachers or doctors in order to make their way north. Often they did not wait for a call but left Ukraine of their own accord. Many entered Moscow University after its foundation in 1755. The journalist Ruban and the archivist and historian Mykola Bantysh-Kamensky were among the first products of the Kiev Academy to do so. Bantysh-Kamensky stayed in Moscow until his death in 1814, and provided something of a focus for other Ukrainians in Russia. The seminarian Ivan Martynov, later Zavadovsky's right-hand man at the ministry of education, called on him on his way to St. Petersburg in 1788.[92] A copy of Ruban's will was to be found at Bantysh-Kamensky's house in 1795, enabling interested parties to make their claims.[93] Mykhailo Antonovsky, another journalist of Ukrainian origin who worked in Russia, was instrumental in organizing finance for a

group of Kievans to come to Moscow University in the early 1780s. Some of them went on to distinguish themselves.[94] Later, travelling south with the Imperial party in the progress of 1787, Antonovsky persuaded his master, I. G. Chernyshev, to take on a number of Kiev academicians for the Admiralty College.[95] When one energetic Ukrainian found his feet in Russia, it could notably accelerate the northward movement of others. That Ukrainians were welcomed at Moscow University is perhaps shown by the greeting which M. M. Kheraskov, the Curator, accorded Illia Tymkovsky when he learnt that they were fellow-countrymen.[96] For more than thirty years the head of the noble pension attached to Moscow University was Anton Prokopovych-Antonsky, one of the Ukrainians whom Antonovsky had brought north in the early 1780s. In the words of the pension's historian, "As a Little Russian indebted to Moscow for his education, Antonsky had as one of his constant goals the bringing together (*sblizhenie*) of his fellow-countrymen with the Muscovites." The list of those who received prizes at the pension, which included the Ukrainian names Rodzianko, Poletyka and Velychko, bears out this assertion.[97]

Martynov's migration to St. Petersburg in 1788, mentioned above, took place as the result of a particular centralizing manoeuvre on the part of the Imperial government: making the Alexander Nevsky monastery in St. Petersburg the focal point for the higher (religious) education of seminarians. Just as the teachers' seminary was founded to provide the new secular schools with teachers, so now seminary teachers were to be given uniform instruction. Many of them, having been given the opportunity to come to St. Petersburg, never returned to their places of origin. Seminarians, as D. N. Sverbeev said in his memoirs,[98] were much the best students of the day, and possessed talents which could be put to much better use in government than in the seminaries. So Martynov went on to a career not in the church but in the civil service; a pattern best exemplified by that greatest of all seminarians, a non-Ukrainian, M. M. Speransky, who came from Vladimir to St. Petersburg at the same time as Martynov.[99]

Many smaller migrations from south to north were set in train by bodies with more specialized educational aims than those hitherto discussed. We have seen how one energetic Ukrainian, Antonovsky, facilitated the northward movement of others. The Ukrainian

A. O. Samborsky, who had been priest at the Russian Embassy in London and tutor to the young Alexander I, brought students from the Kharkiv Collegium to the short-lived agricultural school which he was instrumental in establishing outside St. Petersburg in 1797. So far as is known, he summoned students only from Kharkiv, an indication of the way in which Ukrainians looked after their own.[100] Another specialist institution to which Ukrainians were summoned (in larger numbers and over a longer period) was the Academy of Arts.[101] The number of distinguished late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century artists and sculptors who came from Ukraine—I. P. Martos, D. H. Levytsky, V. L. Borovykovsky—was either a measure of southerners' innate artistic gifts, or an indication of the way in which a technical skill best acquired in the south could now, in the context of an integrated empire, find a wider field for expression and bring richer rewards. The painters may have sprung from a church tradition, icon-painting, which was better preserved in the south than the north. Borovykovsky came from a family of icon-painters, and himself painted icons before moving to the capital in 1788.[102]

Also artists, many musicians moved from south to north. Their presence in Ukraine was another reflection of the ecclesiastical pre-eminence which the south enjoyed before Catherine the Great, for music was important in the life of the church.[103] The Imperial authorities were making use of ecclesiastical traditions to give the empire a less ecclesiastical complexion. Singers had long been drawn from the south. As early as 1737 a governor of Ukraine (P. A. Rumiantsev's father) had set up a singing-school in Hlukhiv in response to a government decree.[104] A century later scouts were still being sent south almost annually to find singers for the court choir. The reason was made clear in an instruction of 1832:

> Since ordinary voices are often to be found here, it would not be worth the effort and the superfluous expenditure to send to Little Russia for them, and so I instruct Your Excellency to make your choice on the strictest basis.[105]

Ukrainians' musical ability acquired significance in various Russian cultural and political contexts. The empire's leading composers were Ukrainian.[106] Ukrainians brought with them their folk music, which was to play a large part in the early nineteenth-century debates

about indigenous Slavic culture. Vasyl Trutovsky, a Ukrainian court singer of the late eighteenth century, was one of the first to publish some of those Ukrainian folksongs which were to attract so much attention in the 1820s and 1830s.[107] Perhaps more important, court singers from Ukraine did not necessarily remain within the confines of the court. Like their fellow-countrymen who became doctors and teachers, they had enjoyed in the south an educational preparation which fitted them for service in all the different fields of Imperial administration. They were not slow to transfer to other walks of life when occasion arose. Brought to the capital because better qualified than Russians to fulfill or train for specific functions, they started "looking about them" after their arrival. The most startling promotion achieved by a Ukrainian singer was probably that of Oleksa Rozumovsky, who married the Empress Elizabeth and made his family's name for a century.[108] Other Ukrainian singers advanced more steadily, but not insignificantly. In January 1767 Catherine the Great asked Moscow University to take on nine court singers, six of them apparently Ukrainian.[109] She was giving them the chance to prepare for other forms of service. One of the many Ukrainian doctors began as a court singer before transferring to the medical service, and thereafter studied in Leiden before becoming physician to a guards' regiment.[110] A pair of singers summoned from Kharkiv by Kochubei in 1798, for despatch to the Russian Embassy in London, had even more interesting careers. One of them spent the last forty years of his life as Russian consul in Boston and New York and wrote literary works in English.[111] The other was Nikolai Longinov, a product of the Kharkiv Collegium, who returned from London to Russia and became secretary to the Empress Elizabeth. Even when still within the court choir a Ukrainian might have influence beyond the musical sphere—at least to judge by the way one Stotsky attempted to find work for Anastasevych after the latter had been sacked by Czartoryski in 1817.[112] When this potential power of patronage is set alongside the possibilities of further advance which were open to singers, their significance becomes still more apparent.

Singers are illustrative of what was happening to many of the Ukrainians who came north in the eighteenth century. The way in which they transferred from court life to the civil service at large may be compared with the behaviour of many who were originally

earmarked for the teaching or the medical professions. The government needed bureaucrats as well as doctors and teachers, and given the chronic shortage of manpower there were many opportunities for Ukrainians to move into offices. M. M. Shtrange, whilst speaking of I. H. Tumansky, refers to the many Ukrainians who were serving in the Senate in the 1750s and 1760s.[113] At the end of the century, when the government acquired vast new areas of land in the west and south-west, the civil authorities were reduced on at least one occasion to applying directly to the Kiev Academy for potential civil servants. Whereas earlier the academy's students had been entering the civil service indirectly, after being released in the first instance for further study, now they were being invited to cut out the intervening stages. The Governor-General in the western provinces, P. V. Tutolmin, wrote to Samiilo Myslavsky explaining that he needed more than 1300 chancery officials to handle the administration of the provinces newly acquired from Poland. How many could the Kiev Academy supply? By this time Myslavsky seems to have had enough of losing his best men to the central power. He replied that he could provide no more than twenty, from the ranks of those who were not needed to fill ecclesiastical places. Nor could he vouch for the administrative capacity of those he would send, for their studies gave them not the least idea of the way in which secular business was conducted.[114] But Myslavsky was fighting a losing battle. If he thought to save his students for the church and to part only with those whom the church did not need, he had lost the argument long before this exchange of 1795. Although the Kiev Academy was indeed to become a purely ecclesiastical body, it did so only when its task as provider of secular personnel had been accomplished, and when the secular schools and universities, which it had helped considerably, were able to take over.

Memoir literature shows how Ukrainians of greater and lesser importance were interconnected in St. Petersburg in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The many different roads leading from Ukraine came together in the Imperial capital. V. N. Hettun, for example, arrived in mid-1797 after his judicial position in the south had been abolished under Paul's reform of the Ukrainian administration. Through his friends the Pokorsky brothers, he made the acquaintance of large numbers of Ukrainians

who were serving in the Guards and the College of Foreign Affairs—two Hudovych brothers, Koretsky-Kuliabko, Bakurynsky, O. I. Khanenko, M. O. Skorupa, V. O. Lobysevych; "and we often used to spend time together, whichever of them was free from service."[115] Hettun borrowed money from a Ukrainian court singer; found that he already knew the Ukrainian official in the Procurator-General's office who was handling an estates question in which he had an interest; and frequently provided Ukrainian fare at his table. When his father and youngest brother both died in 1800, he spent every day with the Pokorsky-Zhoravko brothers, "who were living in Count Bezborodko's house." He met prejudice against Ukrainians in his service career and was called a *khokhol* by the head of the St. Petersburg military governor's chancery. One of the military governors under whom he served, however, recognized the merit of Ukrainians in the capital, and wanted to pack one of them off home, "so that this degenerate doesn't blacken your brotherhood of Little Russians here." A later military governor took Hettun with him when he had to discuss a problem with V. P. Kochubei, the minister of internal affairs; Hettun spent the time drinking with Kochubei's secretary, his "friend and fellow-countryman" Mykola Novytsky. Hettun's memoirs are full of detail illustrating the extent of the Ukrainian "network" in St. Petersburg. A final example serves to confirm the impression that St. Petersburg was where Ukrainians wanted to be. P. A. Tolstoy secured one Kalynovsky a 300-ruble pension when his job was abolished, and gave him the money to get back to Starodub; but he quickly reappeared in the capital and asked (without success) for a new position.[116]

Other memoirs add to the picture given by Hettun. Ivan Martynov described making the acquaintance of the Paskevych family at a house in St. Petersburg where men from Poltava used to meet, and in consequence being made tutor to the future General, Prince I. F. Paskevych-Erivansky.[117] A scion of the Kochubei family recalled the hospitality offered to all Ukrainians by Illia Bezborodko in the first decade of the nineteenth century: "Only occasionally, when the Count was not in good spirits, he used to say: I'm soon going to order the affixing of a sign to the gates with the inscription, Little Russian Guest House."[118] Fedir Lubianovsky, who became a civil servant of some note, remembered the excellence of the Kharkiv Collegium, complained that the

syllabus at Moscow University (perhaps by contrast) did not concentrate adequately on things Russian, and on arriving in St. Petersburg secured an appointment through Kochubei's connections.[119] Ukrainian connections were close—sometimes too close. Iakiv Markovych, whose *Zapiski o Malorossii* appeared in 1798, was said to have moved almost exclusively among Ukrainians after coming to the capital, and for that reason to have become suicidally depressed.[120]

Not many of the Ukrainians in St. Petersburg made Markovych's mistake. Although they retained a sense of their southern identity, on the whole they mixed well with the Russians and took advantage of their opportunities for advancement. In a letter of 1834 the Ukrainian writer Ievhen Hrebinka remarked upon the preponderance of Ukrainians in the capital. "St. Petersburg," he wrote, "is a colony of educated Little Russians. The whole bureaucracy (*vse prisutstvennye mesta*), all the academies, all the universities are full of our fellow-countrymen, and when appointments are being made the Little Russian attracts special attention as *un homme d'esprit*."[121] Ukrainians did not associate solely with one another in the north. They mingled everywhere with the Russians and often achieved positions of responsibility in the Imperial system. Those discussed individually in the next chapter, the most prominent southerners in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russia, reached the top of the tree.

Chapter Four

Highly Placed Ukrainians

A Ukrainian Group at Court

The four Ukrainians who appear in this chapter, and who headed a Ukrainian group at the Russian court, were different in some respects from their fellow southerners. Unlike most of those who moved from south to north in the late eighteenth century, Bezborodko and Zavadovsky entered central government service near the top. They were nominated by P. A. Rumiantsev in 1775, after Catherine the Great asked her southern general for secretaries.[1] Dmytro Troshchynsky joined them some ten years later, when he came to St. Petersburg to work under Bezborodko. Viktor Kochubei, Bezborodko's nephew, did not even have a southern upbringing. Only eight years old when his uncle settled in St. Petersburg, he received a northern, indeed a cosmopolitan, education, and was appointed to his first important post when he was twenty-four. With the passage of time, these Ukrainians took on many characteristics of the Russians with whom they worked. Their geographical origins and affiliations, however, remained important to them and to others. At the simplest level, because many questions arose concerning the administration of the south in an age when it was being brought fully into the Imperial system, Russians turned to the prominent Ukrainians for advice. Successive

Russian governors of Ukraine preserved close ties with the Ukrainians at court—Rumiantsev with Bezborodko and Zavadovsky, Repnin with Kochubei. Perhaps the best evidence for the way in which Russians looked upon the court Ukrainians as a group with a particular usefulness is furnished by A. B. Kurakin's letters to his brother during the period of the former's Ukrainian governorship between 1802 and 1808. Kurakin referred constantly to "the Ukrainians residing in St. Petersburg" in terms which indicated his desire for their approval. He visited their estates in Ukraine and saw them together in the capital.[2] Sometimes, therefore, by asking these Ukrainians for the benefit of their local knowledge, Russians encouraged them not to forget their southern identity. The first three of the four stayed loyal to it anyway. They came from the ranks of the *starshyna*, had been educated at the Kiev Academy,[3] and continued to think partly in Ukrainian-gentry terms. Bezborodko was still deeply concerned for the standing of the Ukrainian gentry twenty years after his arrival in the capital. In a detailed letter to his brother-in-law explaining how important it was that Left-Bank Ukraine be properly represented at Emperor Paul's coronation, he listed families which were of sufficient stature to provide deputies, recalled those who had represented the region at Catherine the Great's coronation, and tried to ensure that no recently ennobled delegates were selected.[4] The reason he gave for avoiding the selection of new nobles illustrates the continuing Ukrainian-Polish antipathy. New nobles, Bezborodko felt, would be put to shame by the old nobles of Podillia, Volhynia and Lithuania—the Polish gentry who had once been masters of what became the Hetmanate. Many other instances demonstrate the court Ukrainians' feeling for their homeland. Can we go so far as to say that these ministers of the Russian crown constituted, in the words of Isabel de Madariaga, "a veritable Ukrainian mafia"?[5]

Not in the sense that they secured precedence for Ukraine in the context of Russian policy objectives. While they participated in the resolution of Ukrainian issues, tried to influence Ukrainian appointments and constantly gave hearings to Ukrainians with one local interest or another, the bulk of their work lay in spheres which involved Ukraine only peripherally. Bezborodko devoted himself chiefly to Russian foreign policy, Zavadovsky to education, Troshchynsky to the law and the organization of the empire's

administrative system, Kochubei to home affairs. In some of these spheres, of course, Ukraine or Ukrainians stood to benefit from the approaches adopted by Ukrainian ministers. Troshchynsky, probably because he was Ukrainian, showed greater insight into the problems of local government than most Russian bureaucrats. Zavadovsky, aware of the relatively enlightened condition of Ukraine, provided openings for many Ukrainians in his development of the Russian educational system. Bezborodko played a part in the annexation of the Crimea and the second and third partitions of Poland, and so helped to liquidate two of the oldest threats to Ukraine's security. But these achievements were by-products of Russian policies, not developments which originated in the presence of Ukrainians at court. The need for local government reform had become particularly pressing in light of the Pugachev rebellion. Education reform sprang from Catherine the Great's interest in "Enlightenment," and above all from the help she received from Joseph II of Austria in formulating a programme. So far as foreign policy is concerned, it is tempting to see Bezborodko as the originator of a southern orientation to succeed Nikita Panin's "Northern System." The Ukrainian negotiator of the treaty of Iaşi makes a superficially attractive contrast to the one-time Stockholm ambassador. But Bezborodko did not initiate a change of direction from north to south. That change of direction began before his arrival at court, when the outbreak of war with Turkey in 1768 revealed the inadequacy of Panin's foreign policy.[6] Even when Bezborodko exercised considerable influence in foreign affairs, he was not unduly anxious to hasten Russia's geographical realignment. At the time of the second and third partitions of Poland he was much less hawkish than other advisers of the Empress, far too aware of the possible international complications to allow prejudices from his Ukrainian past to dictate to him.[7] Ukrainian ministers, therefore, did not manage significantly to alter the balance or change the pace of Imperial policies.

So in what sense did they constitute a discrete group at court? They did not stress the importance of specifically "Ukrainian" solutions to Imperial problems, although their views sometimes reflected their Ukrainian background. They seem to have displayed their political priorities in their association with the opposition to Paul I, but Ukrainian issues were of no importance in the genesis of

the conspiracy against the tsar.[8] Were they, then, a political "party"? The behaviour of court factions in late eighteenth-century Russia has lately been much discussed, notably in David Ransel's *The Politics of Catherinian Russia: The Panin Party*, but also by Soviet historians.[9] De Madariaga, reviewing Ransel's book, questioned his use of the word "party" and pointed out that although "he is careful to stress that 'party' in his context is primarily a network of family and patronage connections, imperceptibly he shifts his ground, and refers to the 'Panin party' as united in the pursuit of particular policies."[10] The same temptation threatens the student of the Ukrainian group. I approach the problem, the impossibility of identifying particular groups with particular policy platforms, by looking at the group under discussion from the point of view of cultural change. The Ukrainians illustrated the impact of south on north, and extended the implications of that impact. They looked different to Russians, stimulated the Russians to think about the difference between northern and southern parts of the empire, and opened doors for other Ukrainians. In these ways they contributed to a gradual change in the Russian Empire's cultural orientation, and had an importance which went beyond their short-term political achievements.

Oleksander Bezborodko

Oleksander Bezborodko was born in 1747 in Hlukhiv, the administrative capital of the Hetmanate. He came to St. Petersburg at the age of twenty-eight and died there, a prince, Chancellor of the empire, and at the height of his power, in April 1799. The son of "one of the most significant official figures of the eighteenth-century Hetmanate,"[11] he became in his turn one of the most significant and powerful figures of the eighteenth-century Russian Empire.[12] What effect did coming to the capital have on him? Fedor Rostopchin, not perhaps the most sober judge, wrote to Semen Vorontsov on the day of the Chancellor's death: "Your friend is approaching the end of his life.... Everyone is in tears. Russia will be proud of him; but he did not love her as a son loves his mother."[13] The émigré Ukrainian historian Oleksander Ohloblyn asserted that "the problem of the Bezborodko circle requires special investigation," and outlined a case for the continuous Ukrainian affiliations of that circle; but elsewhere in his book he called the Chancellor "an outright opponent of the Hetmanate."[14] Bezborodko was clearly neither a committed Ukrainian autonomist nor a full-blown man of St. Petersburg. A moderate and a gradualist, he kept himself in power without rejecting his background or ingratiating himself with his Russian masters. On the basis of his Ukrainian experience he preserved a distance and a detachment from affairs. That experience gave him an awareness of political, social and cultural variety, and an understanding of the difficulties of running a many-sided empire. Whereas the small Russian ruling class was educated on pan-European lines and lost its distinctive characteristics, Bezborodko was brought up in a strong local tradition and thereafter worked outward, adding new talents, not generalizing in accordance with an "Enlightenment" stereotype but thinking pragmatically.

His pragmatism led him to associate, in St. Petersburg, not only with Ukrainians. In the St. Petersburg of the 1770s that would have been unthinkable for an ambitious civil servant. Bezborodko kept his close ties with P. A. Rumiantsev, the Russian integrator of Ukraine,[15] and he cultivated the friendship of the Vorontsov brothers, Semen and Aleksandr, whose sister, Princess Dashkova,

was close to Catherine the Great in her pursuit of enlightenment. He committed his nephew, Kochubei, to the charge of Semen Vorontsov at the London Embassy in 1788; and in 1799 offered to give up his own house in St. Petersburg to the London Ambassador, should he come home and take charge of foreign affairs at the centre.[16] In the College of Foreign Affairs where he worked so long, Bezborodko made a friend of A. I. Morkov—at least for a time. The two seem to have had in common the looseness of their private lives, for Morkov wrote tantalizingly from Paris, alluding to his life-style amid "this place's heavenly delights." When Kochubei first set out on his foreign travels, to Stockholm in 1784, Bezborodko entrusted him to Morkov's care.[17]

But the friendship with Morkov exemplified the difficulties of political association in the highly charged and competitive atmosphere of St. Petersburg. In the 1790s Bezborodko's former friend deserted him, struck out on his own, and for a time supplanted him at the head of foreign affairs. Bezborodko was phlegmatic about it.[18] He had been familiar with the problem of jealousies at court from the time of his earliest successes. When, in late 1778, Rumiantsev had written from Ukraine warning his young protégé of the difficulties that would arise out of Catherine the Great's imminent land grant to him, Bezborodko had reacted strongly, declaring his readiness to stand up for himself.[19] Later, he did battle with Grigorii Potemkin and G. N. Teplov when the latter were casting aspersions on his southern breeding. Zavadovsky could let them "go on thinking that we're no more than 'parvenus,' Cossacks who've changed into French kaftans," but that was not his own position, and he was not prepared to let his honour go undefended.[20] In the 1790s, similarly, he stood up to Platon Zubov, last and most grasping of Catherine's favourites.[21]

By then, however, the strain of factional warfare seemed to be telling. He deplored the hegemony of the Empress' last lover. Potemkin, he wrote, was a man "who at least did not bear down upon private individuals, and who, having got one or two parts [of government] into his grasp, did not look for universality."[22] The same could not be said of Zubov. The whole political world was beginning to pall for Bezborodko in the 1790s. He seems to have seen the light in the south in 1791–2, whilst enjoying his triumph at the Iaşi negotiation. "I never used to love those outward

manifestations," he wrote to Zavadovsky, "which only superficially gladden our great men.... I used to like the most private society. That is the way I shall behave in future too...."[23] It was indeed the way Bezborodko conducted himself for much of the remainder of Catherine the Great's reign, collecting paintings, living the good life, retiring to Moscow, never fully withdrawing but no longer involving himself in the melée of politics.

Bezborodko never became fully integrated into Russian society. He never married, for reasons which are perhaps apparent from the congratulations he offered Mykhailo Myklashevsky in 1797, on the latter's marriage within the tight-knit circle of the Ukrainian *starshyna*.[24] Myklashevsky had stayed in the south, but in St. Petersburg such brides were not to be found. Bezborodko did not approve of the Russian whom Zavadovsky married (an Apraksina), and deplored the way she influenced his political behaviour.[25] Zavadovsky himself had long hesitated before proposing in 1787, but in the end overcame his doubts; Bezborodko, like Troshchynsky, lacked the power of adaptation. Socially, he seems to have remained in the mould determined by his Ukrainian upbringing.

He was torn, however, between allegiance to that pattern and the wish to realize his material ambitions. The conflict of loyalties was well brought out in 1775 when he was about to transfer from Ukrainian to central government service. He wrote his father a tense letter, explaining that he was unable to undertake a journey with his sister because his fate was about to be decided in Moscow and he was awaiting the result.[26] Rumiantsev had made his recommendation, and Bezborodko felt himself tied until he knew whether it had been accepted. His ambition, on this occasion, took precedence over family feelings.

Ukraine became a remembered image of security, a guide, a reference point, but not a driving inspiration. "I can never forget," Bezborodko wrote to his brother-in-law in 1784, "the time which I used to spend so pleasantly in your house when I was young, receiving many kindneses from you."[27] But the wish to refurbish the memory of that time was not strong enough to make Bezborodko go south again. He bought an estate from his brother-in-law and wished he could find time to visit it and see Pavlo Vasylovych again;[28] in early July 1786 he wrote to him and hoped for a reunion

during Catherine the Great's coming royal progress through Little Russia;[29] but within a fortnight of that second letter, ironically, Pavlo Vasylovych was dead—and Bezborodko responded by writing to his sons and urging them to stay in service, not to bury themselves in Ukraine now that they had come into their inheritance.[30] In 1799, finally, the Chancellor planned to travel first to Little Russia before going on to take the waters at Carlsbad, but died before he could put the plan into effect. Ukraine, then, remained a "prospect in the mind," worth standing up for but not apparently offering a strong enough pull for material involvement.

Part of the reason, perhaps, why Bezborodko was reluctant to become more deeply entangled in the situation on the ground in Ukraine, even when circumstances did not conspire against him, lay in his knowledge of the complexity of the local infrastructure. He found other courtiers ignorant of the socio-economic situation in the south: "...the strange [resolution] on the prohibition of the purchase of estates from Cossacks does not mark the operation of any hostility toward us, but can be ascribed simply to downright ignorance...."[31] Bezborodko knew what was feasible in Ukraine, and acted accordingly. He knew that there were richer pastures elsewhere. A few months before the complaint about northerners' ignorance, he had been granted 1,200 serfs by the Crown. Allowed to choose, he elected to take up the offer in Belorussia.[32] Knowing from long personal and family involvement how difficult it was to become firmly established among the landowners of Left-Bank Ukraine, he preferred to keep out of the conflict.

In the 1780s, however, perhaps made more "dynastically" responsible by the death of his father in 1780, Bezborodko did enter the Ukrainian landowning fray. In August 1783 he wrote to Rumiantsev promising a letter on his own private affairs in the south (generated by further royal land grants), and in the meantime appealed for help on behalf of his brother, the victim of a typical local feud.[33] Shortly afterward, writing of his own affairs, he asked for help against the encroachments of a branch of the Kochubei family.[34] In 1779 he had been anxious not to take land in Ukraine precisely because of the internecine local strife which he knew would ensue, but now he seems to have been prepared to face it. His brother married a Shyrai, one of his sisters a Kochubei, yet these were the families with which the Bezborodkos quarrelled.

Oleksander's initial inclination to stay out of the politics of Ukrainian landholding was probably the right one, for land disputes die hard. His own relations with Kyrylo Rozumovsky, at court in St. Petersburg, were clouded at one point by a land dispute to do with Ukraine which dated back to the 1750s.[35] But nevertheless he insinuated himself into the system within which he had been brought up, and became a Ukrainian landowner. He remained equivocal in his attitude toward the desirability of estates in the south, and when granted 6,000 peasants in the coronation honours of 1797 chose to have them in Moscow and Voronezh provinces, near other estates which he possessed already;[36] but he never completely disengaged himself from the problems of estate ownership in Left-Bank Ukraine.

A second reason why he was tempted to disengage, apart from the problem of family feuds, derived from the lower profitability of estates in the south. Bezborodko was nothing if not a pragmatist. When he argued in 1797 that it was sounder economically to choose lands outside Ukraine, the argument was not a forced one. In a subsequent letter to the same correspondent, he made more explicit his attitude toward the holding of property in Ukraine: "What will you get out of your much-vaunted oast-house? A real Little Russian property. You buy the grain and distil the drink, you buy grain again and so on. Organizational cycles which never throw out cash: you can't live or set yourself up on cycles."[37] In St. Petersburg, entertaining, concerned for the impression he was making, Bezborodko needed cash, liquidity, a ready supply and no complications. He was chronically aware of the excessive financial demands of life at the centre of power.[38] When reporting to Pavlo Vasylovych Kochubei the good news of his son, Viktor, he affirmed: "I am certain that he will win himself both a good name and excellent material rewards.... "[39] The latter were as important as the former in Bezborodko's philosophy; there was no escaping the need for cash.

Bezborodko compared his situation unfavourably with that of a friend whose land was not in Ukraine. "From his 600 souls Nikolai Karadykin gets 8,000 rubles without fuss, under a charter agreed by his peasants in a language not understood by them, for they are Mordvinians."[40] Yet Bezborodko did not abandon his Ukrainian land. He diversified, perhaps, he exploited to the hilt, but he did not

sever his ties. For family reasons he even held on to Ukrainian land which for economic reasons he ought to have given up. Keeping land for his nieces, on one occasion, came before considerations of economic prudence, and got the better of Bezborodko's pragmatism.[41]

Much earlier, he had gone so far as to declare a confidence in the continuing traditions of the Ukrainian economy which belied the hostility he expressed toward Ukrainians elsewhere. Distilling was the principal concern of many Left-Bank Ukrainian estates, particularly in the northern part of Ukraine with which Bezborodko was most familiar, and he was quick to dismiss talk of a decree from St. Petersburg upsetting its traditional pattern.[42] Perhaps his confidence was exaggerated—perhaps, indeed, it was designed to bolster his compatriots' morale at a time when integration was at its height; but it marked Bezborodko's awareness and respect for the economic order of the south, and his feeling that it should not undergo fundamental change.

This dualistic attitude toward property-holding in Ukraine, in which understanding the drawbacks did not bring about complete rejection, found a parallel in Bezborodko's view of the Russian Empire and of its proper cultural orientation at the end of the eighteenth century. Working in foreign affairs, he moved in a world of cosmopolitan diplomats; but he was anxious to stay "Russian." Perhaps, coming from the provinces, he was "more Russian than the Russians," less determined than they to ape the European nobility. When one of his nephews returned from abroad in 1784, Bezborodko wrote to the young man's father: "He has studied very well . . . and what is most marvellous of all for one who has grown up in foreign parts, he speaks and writes Russian as if he had been educated here, which puts to shame many Russian travellers."[43] Bezborodko accepted foreign travel as the done thing, but remained in no doubt about the cultural orientation he wanted to predominate. Arranging a job for H. P. Myloradovych in 1792, he wrote to him: "It will be very profitable for you, for . . . it will be easy for you, with an adequate income, to organize . . . the education of your children, especially your sons, so that you get not Frenchmen, not Germans, but good Russians."[44] "Russia first," then, seems to have been Bezborodko's outlook on life.

This is not to say that he was blind to the drawbacks of life in the provinces. Despite what has been said above about the Kiev Academy and the institutions modelled upon it, Bezborodko felt that a rounded education was not to be had in Ukraine. "He sees no more of the world," he wrote of one Lukashevych, "than is opened up by an ordinary Little Russian education, not the best. . . ."[45] Bezborodko was aware that in his own family the education of the children had been deficient. He knew no foreign languages, and had had to learn them after entering government service. Pressing his father to enter Illia, his brother, in service, he felt obliged to explain that he would still be acceptable despite the fact that his foreign languages were poor.[46] He was defensive—unduly so—about Ukrainians' cultural preparedness for the highest circles of empire.[47]

Perceiving that his fellow-countrymen lacked the sophistication and some of the practical gifts needed to govern, Bezborodko remained proud of their independent cultural standing. As has been pointed out already, he defended their noble status against the calumnies of Potemkin and Teplov, and insisted, in the controversy over distilling, that no one was dreaming of taking away the traditional and characteristic "Little Russian freedom." He was concerned for Ukrainian culture in the more artistic sense. "Why should I take my request any further?" wrote Zavadovsky to Bezborodko about an unnamed Ukrainian poet; "Of course you will be good to the Ukrainian Aesop on your own initiative."[48]

Bezborodko fostered things Ukrainian. In his early days in St. Petersburg he became involved in the study of Ukrainian history. In August 1776 he wrote his father a letter enclosing a four-point memorandum, the second point of which urged Andrii Iakovych to send a whole series of texts bearing upon the history of Ukraine—manuscript histories, the Lithuanian Statute, the Magdeburg Law: "for all these books are the more necessary here, because there are men who have undertaken to publish the history of Little Russia, and to print a translation of the Statute."[49] Bezborodko had been drawn into the work of Vasyl Ruban, a St. Petersburg journalist who will be considered in detail later, the publisher of a *Kratkaia letopis* of the history of the Ukraine.[50] Oleksander Andriiovych despatched this volume to his father in March 1778, eighteen months after his own request for documents. He made plain his involvement in the writing of the work, and was

thankful that his upbringing had enabled him to contribute to it. He saw it, furthermore, as only the preliminary to a much more substantial history.[51]

Did he therefore go on to write the *Istoriia Rusov*, that staunch declaration of faith in the values of the independent Hetmanate? Some think that he did.[52] Yakovliv argued that he wrote it in the years after Iaşi—bad years for Bezborodko, when Zubov established a grip even stronger than Potemkin's, and when Morkov challenged him for the lead in the conduct of foreign affairs; years, in short, which might have tempted Bezborodko to let off steam in the anonymous authorship of an anti-Imperial manuscript.

If Bezborodko did indeed write the *Istoriia Rusov* in the period after Iaşi, he wrote it at the time of the second and third partitions of Poland, when he was also formulating his attitude toward the question of Cossack mobilization against the Poles. Advocating Cossack mobilization would have shown sympathy for the positive qualities of that old order in Ukraine which had just come to an end, and which the *Istoriia Rusov* lauded. But Bezborodko was not prepared to back the idea of Cossack revival. In 1790 he seems to have been inclined to do so, for he wrote to Aleksandr Vorontsov during a major international crisis: "In Polish Ukraine we shall form a confederation of our co-believers like the one which was formed by Hetman Khmelnytsky. . . ."[53] In 1794, however, he rejected Prince Repnin's proposal "to create Zaporozhians." The situation in 1790, he now felt, had been exceptional: ". . . if in 1790 there was the desire to use such an extreme method [the 'creation of Zaporozhians'], then the very extremity of our situation required it. . . ." At that time the Swedes, the Turks, and possibly Great Britain, Prussia and the Poles had all been hostile. "Now we are not in such an extreme situation. Ukraine, Podillia and Volhynia are ours. Consequently, it ['to create Zaporozhians'] would be to arouse our own people, which remembers the time of Khmelnytsky and is given to Cossack ways (*sklonnyi k kazachestvu*). . . ." If the government were to do so as Repnin suggested, Bezborodko argued, "then a nation in arms (*voennaia natsiia*) would be created, and [the situation would be] that much the more dangerous because Little Russia, too, would be infected simultaneously by the same spirit, and after it its province. . . ." The effect on Ukraine would be such that from it "would issue a new sort of revolution, in which we

will be compelled, at the least, to restore the Hetmanate, to sanction many ridiculous liberties, and in a word to lose what we would have held in peace and tranquility for ever."[54] This anti-Ukrainian position made plain Bezborodko's commitment to the Imperial cause. Whatever his cultural allegiances, he allowed them no political expression outside the framework laid down by Catherine the Great. Whether or not the *Istoriia Rusov* issued from his circle, he did not intend to live by its political implications.[55]

Bezborodko's moderation was calculated and deliberate moderation. It did not spring from poverty of spirit. Although conservative, for example, in respect of the methods to be used against the Poles in 1794, in Ukrainian fashion he was anti-Polish. While rejecting Repnin's suggestion that the Zaporozhians be resurrected, he asserted categorically that "we will never make friends for ourselves out of the Poles."[56] In June 1794 he wrote of a pro-Russian administrator in the newly acquired Polish territories: "As for Shcheib . . . it is difficult for him to be with the Poles, for he is a Pole himself and I think not even one of the best; though of their number. . . . I have not known a single good man."[57] If Bezborodko opposed the revival of the Cossacks, then, it was not for want of a traditional Cossack prejudice, but because he had a different understanding of what now constituted the best interests of his land of origin.

Perhaps because Bezborodko exercised calculated moderation himself, he seems to have expected a similar moderation from the central government in its handling of Ukrainian affairs. The vexed field of church appointments provided a case in 1783 which gave him occasion to voice his wider views on Russo-Ukrainian relations. Ukraine had long provided Russia with many of her churchmen, but under Catherine a "Russianization" programme was being put into effect. Bezborodko complained to Rumiantsev that in the ecclesiastical sphere, "It is not possible to overcome the prejudices militating against Little Russians; and I see that, with regard to the clerical estate, views detrimental to that region operate more strongly than ever, although it would seem that that is contrary to good politics, for time will erase all the difference."[58] Just as he was himself moderate with regard to the revival of the Cossacks, so Bezborodko seems to have hoped for a similar display of tact from the central government in an area where there was no need of haste.

Bezborodko believed in "good government," efficiency, service to the Crown—unusual, perhaps, at a time when the Charter of 1785 was "emancipating" the Russian gentry and accelerating the process of separation between state bureaucracy and society. We have seen Bezborodko urging his father to enter his brother Illia in service, and writing to his nephews pressing them not to retire to their estates after their father's death. In 1797 he looked forward to Kochubei's return from Constantinople because the two of them shared the same professional attitude to affairs. It would be good to have him back, "because our College [of Foreign Affairs] is deserted, there's nobody to do the work now that Count Panin has set off for Berlin. In the present century, toward the end of it, there have been many clerks like the ones we used to have in the old days, that is to say illiterate ones. I am compelled for the most part to do the work myself, but I'm not as energetic as I was."[59] Kochubei would supply the needed energy.

Bezborodko wanted more efficiency in the administration of Ukrainian affairs. He was shocked in the 1790s that the benefits of Russian rule were not yet more clearly apparent in Ukraine. He felt that the decrees of 1783 were not simply designed to "extend serfdom" to the Ukraine, but to develop the local infrastructure and to stimulate the growth of towns.[60] The process of fusion was intended to benefit both parties.

At the level of personalities, Bezborodko did what he could to prevent hardship befalling Ukrainians in the course of fusion. He kept Ukrainians together at court, and secured them jobs both at the centre and at home. He remained close to Zavadovsky even though at first Petro Vasylovych made greater strides than he (by becoming, briefly, the Empress' lover), and despite the fact that later, in 1793, Zavadovsky was tempted to go over to his rival, Morkov.[61] He brought Troshchynsky to the fore, introducing him to Semen Vorontsov in 1785 as "a man highly industrious and business-like," and urging Aleksandr Vorontsov to prevent him from retiring in 1791 (when Bezborodko himself was at Iaşi and particularly needed the information his associate could provide about affairs at the centre).[62] He cultivated an older Ukrainian in St. Petersburg, Kyrylo Rozumovsky, who was still a relatively young man when Bezborodko arrived in the capital. Though Rozumovsky's direct influence on Ukrainian affairs was already ten

years past, there was still business outstanding from that time, and still cause for personal dispute with the Bezborodko family. Teplov, furthermore, one of Bezborodko's *bêtes noires* but Rozumovsky's right-hand man when he ruled in the south, was complicating the issue. Bezborodko took care not to give offence to Rozumovsky, and by promising to do whatever he wanted in the matter of a debt repayment (and with the help of Zavadovsky), he preserved his goodwill.[63] Similarly, he provided for the Ukrainian "succession" at court, by devoting care to his Kochubei nephews. Apollon fell by the wayside, but Viktor Pavlovych, perhaps because he was younger and more malleable when he came under Bezborodko's influence, in a sense developed what he stood for.

Underlying Bezborodko's web of Ukrainian relationships at the centre was his continuing connection with families still in Ukraine. He was constantly on the watch to secure a good position for a relative and to improve Russian understanding of the claims of Ukrainians. His happiness was perhaps complete in 1797 when he was able to report to his mother the replacement of one member of their family by another in the governorship of the province of Little Russia.[64] He did a great deal for his three brothers-in-law, Pavlo Kochubei, Iakiv Bakurynsky and Petro Haletsky. In Kochubei's case the help was indirect and consisted of bringing his sons into the high political world of St. Petersburg. For Bakurynsky the advantages of a friend in high places were much more personal and immediate. When he married Bezborodko's sister in January 1779 he had already been head of the Chernihiv judiciary for about eight years, but before the year was out things were starting to happen, for in September Bezborodko was writing to Rumiantsev and pressing his case for promotion.[65] The case of Haletsky, Bezborodko's third brother-in-law, was perhaps most interesting of all for the light it shed on Bezborodko's attitudes toward Ukraine and Russia. On the one hand he urged Haletsky to ensure that his children be given the benefit of the better education which he, Bezborodko, could make accessible to them in the capital,[66] but on the other hand he defended Haletsky's Ukrainian lineage. "From the point of view of breeding," Bezborodko wrote of Haletsky,

> he can show himself anywhere without shame. Apart from the fact that his family springs from the old Polish aristocracy, it has already been in service in Little Russia for about a hundred years.... His

> house possesses many estates granted and confirmed in charters by Peter the Great, Anna Ioannovna, and Elizaveta Petrovna.... [67]

Haletsky may not have been a name to conjure with in Russia, but in Ukraine it had standing and Bezborodko was prepared to stand up for it.

Bezborodko was prepared to push the claims of relatives much more remote than brothers-in-law. In 1795 he urged S. F. Golitsyn to take on one quartermaster Zilbergarnish because "his wife's father, Tamara, is a relative of mine and an old friend, and his wife's brother you know yourself."[68] The ramifications of his patronage network were immense. Rostopchin said that Bezborodko could only be criticized for two things, his laziness and "the people he puts up with at his house."[69] A German wrote that Bezborodko used to escape the place-seekers who beset him by leaving his house on foot, using the back exit.[70] The bearers of Bezborodko's private correspondence show the number of miscellaneous Ukrainians who came to him in St. Petersburg: Iakiv Ruban (not to be confused with the author of the *Kratkaia letopis* of Ukrainian history), postmaster of Nizhyn and therefore well placed to take a letter on the way back to his duties; Ivan Seletsky, who in 1786 spent two months staying with Bezborodko before returning to Ukraine; a Hulak, also for long a house guest; the cleric Khrystofor Sulyma; and H. P. Myloradovych. All these at one time or another carried letters from Bezborodko to his mother,[71] and although of course it was natural in such an undertaking to use other Ukrainians, the fact that they were there to be called upon says something for Bezborodko's system of connections. Southerners knew where to turn when they came to the capital. Even that anomalous community, the Greeks of Nizhyn, applied to Bezborodko when they felt that their distinctive rights were under threat.[72] Samborsky, tutor to the future Alexander I and another Ukrainian protégé of Bezborodko, did not fail, when he went south in 1783 to help his indigent family, to visit the Bezborodko estate and to see his patron's mother and brother.[73] While absent from Ukraine, Bezborodko kept constantly in touch with it.

Not only his natural predilections, but also political good sense inclined him to do so. In 1791 he intervened in a Myloradovych family quarrel simply in order to preserve domestic harmony,[74] but in 1797, when he had occasion to intervene again, he made

plain the wider significance of his intervention. The need for a settlement was pressing, "the more so because I can't accompany the Tsar to Chernihiv next year, and if they are quarrelling and I'm not there, they will bring displeasure on themselves and blame (*predosuzhdenie*) on all of us."[75] Ukrainian quarrelling in the south reflected badly upon Ukrainians at court and could undermine the latter's work in building up connections between the province and the capital. When Bezborodko took an interest in Ukraine, it was not always out of altruism, but sometimes out of concern for his own standing at the centre.

Nevertheless he was genuinely anxious that the integration of the Hetmanate into the Russian system should proceed smoothly and without detriment to the south. When he defended Haletsky's social status he did so not in order to secure him something he did not deserve, but to ensure that he received the consideration which was his due. He was concerned with the general question of the fusion of Ukrainian and Russian ranks. In an undated letter to Aleksandr Vorontsov he asked whether A. A. Viazemsky, the procurator-general, had acted upon a memorandum which he had submitted on Ukrainian ranks.[76] He wrote to his father in August 1779 giving a lists of the names he was submitting for Viazemsky's consideration (for Russian ranks), and explaining how he had persuaded the procurator to bypass the anti-Ukrainian prejudice of others.[77] Examples could be multiplied from Bezborodko's career to show that his interest in the problems arising out of the integration of Ukraine was perennial. In October 1795, for example, he lamented that Zubov had thwarted him in the matter of military recruitment in Ukraine, always a subject fraught with difficulties because of Ukraine's independent military traditions.[78]

Others have made clear Bezborodko's importance in the conduct of Russian foreign policy.[79] Here the object has been simply to show that, while moving on a European stage, he remained concerned for his land of origin and considered its interests in the Imperial context. He did not harp on them, but neither did he forget them. A "good government" man and a gradualist, Bezborodko certainly looked out upon the world from St. Petersburg rather than from Hlukhiv, Kiev or Poltava; but he never lost sight of the south. His awareness of north and south benefited them both.

Petro Zavadovsky

Petro Vasylovych Zavadovsky was born in northern Ukraine in 1738 or 1739,[80] came to St. Petersburg at the same time as Bezborodko, and died in the capital in the first days of 1812. His political activity, unlike that of Bezborodko, was concerned with Russia's internal development: with education, medicine, banks and the law. Perhaps for this reason Zavadovsky showed more clearcut "Ukrainian" characteristics than Bezborodko. Although Bezborodko continued, when in the capital, to show an interest in Ukraine and to provide work for his fellow-countrymen, he moved principally in a world of sophisticated diplomats. Zavadovsky, concerned with the empire's infrastructure, had less occasion to modify his personality.

In 1782 he became responsible for what was to be his chief field of activity, Russia's new educational system. Twenty years later, when ministries were created, he duly became the first minister of education, and only in 1810, two years before his death, moved to the Department of the Laws in the newly constituted State Council. Medicine and banks were additional responsibilities he assumed in the 1780s and 1790s. Despite his wide-ranging activities at the centre of the empire, he kept in close touch with Ukraine. Almost as soon as he arrived in the capital and came into favour, he was given the estate of Lialychi (next to his Ukrainian family home), and began to devote a good deal of attention to it. Bezborodko had hesitated before entering upon landownership in Ukraine, but Zavadovsky immediately converted his success at court into the material Ukrainian terms with which he was familiar. It was at Lialychi, not St. Petersburg, that he had a house built,[81] and though he declared that he would have been happy to have such a house in St. Petersburg, it was not until 1786 that he bought one.

The acquisition of Lialychi provoked that animosity from Zavadovsky's fellow-countrymen which Bezborodko had feared in his own case, but Zavadovsky nevertheless persevered in developing the land. He commissioned agents, asked Rumiantsev to give his elder brother several months' leave to take estate affairs in hand, and complained about the territorial encroachments of his neighbours.[82] The estate continued to engage his attention.[83] That it was important to him was illustrated by his jealousy of Bezborodko,

when the latter received coveted lands in Ukraine in 1783.[84]

Zavadovsky's attitude toward life in St. Petersburg was at best equivocal. Making friends through the Hudovych family with Kyrylo Rozumovsky, he lived in the former Hetman's house until 1786, and only then, "bored with the condition of lodger,"[85] bought the home of N. I. Panin. Until that time he seems to have thought of his stay in the capital as temporary; now he changed his mind, "seeing that affairs and service are prompting me to think about establishing my stay here on a somewhat more stable footing."[86]

Buying a home in St. Petersburg seems in its turn to have induced Zavadovsky to marry. A month after the wedding in 1787 he reported laconically to P. A. Rumiantsev, "Boredom and emptiness in the house—and business (*delovaia zhizn*) obliges me to be there permanently—have brought it about that I am now married to Countess Vera Nikolaevna Apraksina."[87] It had taken Zavadovsky a long time to decide to marry,[88] and marrying into the Russian nobility did not ease the problem arising out of his southern cultural orientation. Three months after the wedding he was having the house decorated, because "as you know, I have lived till now like a Zaporozhian from the point of view of domestic management."[89] Marriage was clearly inducing him to change his cultural perspectives, but he seems not to have become "Russian" enough for his wife; in 1801 she was horrified, when they were on their southern estates, that he was about to choose "je ne sais quel ukrainien" to teach their children.[90] Adapting to the northern style was a perennial problem for Zavadovsky. A year after marrying he had written, "I have started living at home, but as I am not drawn by any natural inclination to St. Petersburg, this does not bring me inner relief."[91] He seems never to have felt completely at home in the capital. Unlike Bezborodko, he frequently visited the south and spent long periods there.[92] In many ways he remained a typical member of the Ukrainian *starshyna*, an *ukrainskaia umnaia golova*, in Vigel's mocking phrase.[93]

Perhaps because he retained such clear signs of his southern allegiance, Zavadovsky was not understood by the Russians. Alexander I described him as *un vrai mouton.*[94] When he withdrew from central politics after the death of Bezborodko and the government decided to put him under surveillance, the authorities found themselves in difficulties because they did not even know

exactly where his estates were:[95] an example of that ignorance of the south which Bezborodko had perceived in respect of the peculiarities of Ukrainian landholding.[96] Unlike Bezborodko, Zavadovsky did little to help Russians to understand him. He was proud of his brother in 1782 for not being swept off his feet by the high life of St. Petersburg.[97] He said that Troshchynsky, after retiring in 1800, would be slow to withdraw from the capital because he was accustomed to the social life there[98]—implying that personally he had not become accustomed to it.

Zavadovsky surrounded himself with Ukrainians in his work. The number of them in the ministry of education between 1802 and 1810 shows the sort of company in which he found himself most at home. He may not have been personally responsible for the appointment of Ivan Martynov as Director of Department, although Martynov had been a seminarian in Poltava before coming to St. Petersburg in 1788;[99] but the appointment seems to have been a happy one, for Martynov clearly understood the minister's outlook on life, setting on record how Zavadovsky enjoyed reminiscing about his Shyrai relations in Ukraine.[100] Zavadovsky certainly kept one of the two places for heads of section under Martynov for a fellow-countryman from one of the best-known families of northern Ukraine.[101] Shortly afterward he asked P. V. Chichagov to release a Ukrainian from the naval administration in order that he might enter the ministry of education.[102] Other Ukrainians seem to have been readily accepted into the ministry.[103] They did not always dwell in harmony with one another, for Martynov incurred the animosity of Anastasevych when he usurped Vasyl Karazyn's position at the head of the schools administration.[104] Nevertheless, the complexion of the ministry of education in the period 1802–10 says something about the character of the minister and his continuing southern orientation.

As was pointed out in the last chapter, Zavadovsky bore Ukraine in mind in his educational activity. Not only did he summon Ukrainians to St. Petersburg for further education, but also he made provisions for the south. When the foundation of new universities was proposed in 1786, the cities put forward included Chernihiv, the principal city of Zavadovsky's province.[105] In 1793 Zavadovsky offered A. S. Myloradovych, for long Rumiantsev's deputy in the south, teachers trained in the capital: "These men are

for the most part natives of Ukraine, and for that reason particularly happy to be used in the towns (*v mestakh*) of their homeland. . . . "[106] Zavadovsky continued to take a special interest in southern education after he became minister, entering into private correspondence with Tadeusz Czacki, leading educationalist of Right-Bank Ukraine, who after he had ceased to be minister remembered him with affection.[107]

The relationship with Czacki provides an insight into the precise nature of Zavadovsky's Ukrainian affiliations. Czacki was Polish, and a thorn in the flesh of the pro-Russian administrator of the Kiev gymnasium,[108] but Zavadovsky found him congenial because his own part of Ukraine, the extreme north, had been subjected to substantial Polish influence. The Zavadovsky family had come from Poland to Russia in the seventeenth century,[109] but seem not to have lost their Polish affinities. Zavadovsky's distinctive views on the similarity of the Polish and Russian languages have been discussed above.[110] He spoke Polish, citing Polish newspapers in 1794 when the partition crisis was at its height.[111] He began his education not in the Ukrainian heartland but nearer the area of Polish predominance, at a Jesuit seminary in Orsha in Belorussia.[112] He still had Belorussian connections later in life. Konysky, the famous anti-Uniate Bishop of Mogilev, wrote to him in his own hand in 1789;[113] one Kozlovsky came from Mogilev to serve under him in 1806, as had his father before him.[114] Geographically speaking, then, Zavadovsky's interests focused above all on the point where Russian, Pole and Ukrainian met. It was an area with a flavour of its own, a centre for Old Believers,[115] an area in ferment in the very year, 1800, when Zavadovsky was under surveillance on his estate of Lialychi.[116] As a Ukrainian, Zavadovsky was an outsider in St. Petersburg anyway; his origins in north Ukraine gave him a still more distinctive stamp.

His geographical roots perhaps made him even more likely than his fellow Ukrainians at court to take the partitions of Poland to heart. He saw local reasons necessitating partition which were not of prime importance for Russian diplomats with a larger view of the world. Semen Vorontsov seems not to have approved of the imminent second partition because Prussia would benefit from it. Zavadovsky disagreed. Russia's gains would be greater than Prussia's, and would open the way to further aggression against the

Turks. Furthermore, "if Poland is not partitioned, someday she might be able to endanger our security by her own internal forces."[117] This last consideration was probably not one which would have weighed heavily with most contemporary statesmen, but for a north Ukrainian bred in the fear of Poland as the ancient enemy, it was of great importance. Zavadovsky's near-incredulity in 1794, when Poland's final dismemberment was at hand, reflected the part which Poland played in his view of the world. "Just think, my friend, that in the current year this business will undoubtedly be settled, and Poland will cease to exist in Europe, like stars which have disappeared in the heavenly sphere;"[118] and again, two months later: "How in our day we used to envy Polish Ukraine! Remember, and now it's all ours, and with what a great increase in size too! All that fruitful land, all the Polish woods are turning into a source of enrichment for us. It's only a matter of organizing them well (which, however, is not easy in an immense area), then we can lack for nothing."[119]

Zavadovsky's world-picture did not extend far beyond Poland. Having spoken in favour of a second partition early in 1792, he was not in favour of intervention in France shortly afterward. He asked Semen Vorontsov why the Empire should go beyond Poland: "Hasn't it got everything? (*Chem on [krai Pol'skoi] ne izobiluet?*)."[120] Vorontsov seems to have connected disorder in Poland with disorder in France and to have seen the contemporary turbulence in a European context. Not so Zavadovsky: "Poles are not Frenchmen; I don't think of them in the same way as you do. There the whole mass of the people is at war; here only the gentry (*shliakhetstvo*) is taking up arms. . . ."[121] Zavadovsky was no cosmopolitan.

An incident from his career in medical administration shows him trying to undo the influence of foreigners in Russia, and provides suggestive evidence for the view that, at a time when Russian nobles derived their cultural inspiration from the West, it was Ukrainians, "more Russian than the Russians," who represented the patriotic cause. The vast majority of doctors in eighteenth-century Russia came from abroad, but of the few who were native, about two-thirds were Ukrainian.[122] At the end of 1783 the *Kalininskoe khirurgicheskoe uchilishche* was set up under Zavadovsky's supervision, with instruction in German. Before its statutes were

finalized, Zavadovsky seems to have tried to make a purely Russian institution out of it. According to the memoirs of one of the German doctors involved, he introduced a leading Ukrainian doctor, Martyn Terekhovsky, into one of the sessions discussing the new school, and Terekhovsky put forward proposals radically different from those of the Germans, designed to ensure that Russia would eventually acquire her own cadres of medically qualified personnel and become independent of foreign aid. The manoeuvre failed, but it says something, perhaps, about Zavadovsky's views on Russia's proper course of development.[123]

Zavadovsky's political outlook was not usually wide-ranging. His temporary desertion of Bezborodko for Morkov in 1793 testified to his inability to assess the long-term political climate. He was no match for Bezborodko in determination and staying power. He could not understand Bezborodko's withdrawal from the centre of the stage in the last years of Catherine the Great, and took the opportunity to voice criticisms of him which perhaps he had long felt. Surprised that A. R. Vorontsov should find Bezborodko's decline in spirits out of the ordinary, he commented, "When have you seen him really *uplifted* in spirit? His memory and his facility with the pen are great, and that's all. Don't believe anything he told you or promised you about himself: his words on that score are like smoke."[124] Zavadovsky's powers of political analysis were weaker than Bezborodko's. He showed it when, in a letter in which he declared his belief that Bezborodko's disappearance from the stage was complete, he set Troshchynsky's rise against Bezborodko's decline.[125] In light of the close connection between Bezborodko and Troshchynsky, the rise of the latter was no more than a case of *plus ça change*. Bezborodko was deferring to Zubov while keeping himself well-informed and waiting for the new reign; and when that new reign began, Zavadovsky was ready enough to return to the fold. He lamented the passing of the leader in 1799 and the disruption of political connections.[126]

Zavadovsky lacked Bezborodko's grasp of the detail of politics and possessed only simplistic general beliefs. Troshchynsky was something of a philosopher of government, but one whose views were closely related to the situation on the ground. Zavadovsky took refuge in sweeping generalizations. "All histories," he wrote in a philosophical mood in 1801, "will be of identical value, if we start

wanting to stuff our memories just with events.... The voice of history should not sink to the level (*na tony*) of boring trifles. The only thing which can set it on a course likely to attract our curiosity is what is worthy of the attention of all ages.... " In defining what merited such attention in Russian history, Zavadovsky discounted the middle ages and the extension of the empire. All Russian history before Peter the Great could be covered in a page, and the occupation of Siberia and the integration of Ukraine into the empire in the seventeenth century were of more interest to the geographer than to the historian.[127] For a Ukrainian to assert that Ukraine's integration into the empire was of little historical import, when in fact he surrounded himself with Ukrainians and presented a distinctly "Ukrainian" face to the society of the capital, was a measure, perhaps, of his lack of perception. To deny the significance of pre-Petrine history, when in a sense he stood for the antithesis of post-Petrine sophistication, was a little ingenuous.

But that Zavadovsky did lay great weight on Peter's innovations is apparent from a paper he wrote on behalf of the First Department of the Senate in July 1801. In June the new emperor had declared his intention of restoring the Senate to its former position in government, and had called for a statement of its rights and duties. Zavadovsky began his paper, "Across a century, the All-Russian Autocrats Alexander I and Peter I, the Great, meet in their identity of views about the government.... "[128] He went on to define what needed to be done to re-establish the Senate on its old footing. Having familiarized himself, on arrival in St. Petersburg twenty-five years before, with the system of government then obtaining, he seems to have become its ardent advocate, reluctant to entertain the notion of further radical change. In early 1803, in a letter in which he discussed many of the changes which had in fact supervened since the 1801 paper, he expressed his growing conviction that "we have no immovable planets," but were in constant flux.[129] It was a confession of confusion on the part of a politician who lacked long-range perception. His confusion, his desire for a fixed point of reference in government (in the early 1800s the Senate), perhaps sprang not least, to return to the principal thread of the argument, from the changes he had observed in his own part of the empire in the 1780s. He had concerned himself at that time, in St. Petersburg, with the question of

appointments in the reorganized Ukrainian administration, with a rumour of unrest in Hlukhiv, with the vexed problem of how to tap Cossack military potential.[130] Perhaps he had seen enough change in the world. Certainly he was less able to relax than Bezborodko, less able to philosophize than Troshchynsky. As a result he presents the phenomenon of the Ukrainian in St. Petersburg in sharp relief.

Dmytro Troshchynsky

Dmytro Troshchynsky was born in Hlukhiv in 1749 and died at Kybyntsi, his estate in the province of Poltava, in January 1829.[131] He entered service in Ukraine in the mid-1760s, and served as a soldier in Catherine the Great's first Turkish war of 1768–74. Whereas after that Bezborodko and Zavadovsky began their careers in central government service, Troshchynsky joined the staff of Prince N. V. Repnin, Russian military commander in the western lands newly acquired under the first partition of Poland. Under Bezborodko's aegis he transferred to the capital and the life of a civil servant in the mid-1780s. In 1793 he attained the important position of State Secretary. In the reign of Paul he shared in Bezborodko's pre-eminence, but his position was undermined by the death of the Chancellor in April 1799 and he was away from the capital for most of 1800.[132] After the accession of Alexander I he was briefly at the very centre of affairs, but by the time of the foundation of ministries in September 1802 his star was already on the wane.[133] Out of sympathy with the reformist spirit of the new reign, he had to be satisfied with the relatively minor position of minister of crown lands, not one of the new creations. Remaining in this position until the summer of 1806, he then retired and withdrew to his estates in the south. In the summer of 1814 he came to St. Petersburg as the representative of the nobles of Poltava, to congratulate the Tsar on the success of Russian troops in the Napoleonic Wars and to share in the victory celebrations. At the end of August he was made minister of justice. The glory, however, had departed, and although Troshchynsky remained at the head of his ministry for three years, he was unable to attune himself to the political climate. He retired again in August 1817, and in 1821[134] returned for the last time to Ukraine, where he spent the remaining years of his life.

The prime interest of Troshchynsky's career lies in his response to the changing political environment of the early nineteenth century, above all in his last period of office. By that time, firmly established as an important landowner in Ukraine and just returned to the capital after a long period spent in the south, his outlook was strongly conditioned by his local experience. He brought into the

open the differences between cosmopolitan aristocrats and men with an understanding of the interior, making explicit the practical implications of strong regional affiliations.

Perhaps because he was in origin less socially significant than the other Ukrainians at court, not from the front ranks of the *starshyna* and even less likely than they to penetrate Russian society, Troshchynsky concentrated on developing rather than abandoning his southern roots.[135] Despite the hostile appraisal he received from Panteleimon Kulish in the mid-nineteenth century,[136] he remained throughout his life a southerner. He acquired the estate of Kybyntsi in 1787,[137] and assiduously cultivated the role of provincial landowner. In the last twenty-five years of his life his property became a focal point for local life. The library, for example, served not only Troshchynsky himself, but his neighbours and protégés. The young Gogol's use of it is well known.[138] In 1810 the poet Kapnist, who lived nearby, sent a messenger to ask when Troshchynsky would again be at home and to borrow a book on Russian rivers which he had been reading when he was there.[139]

A catalogue of the library survives, providing many insights into Troshchynsky's intellectual outlook.[140] At Lialychi Zavadovsky had possessed 3,750 volumes,[141] but no record of them survives. The Troshchynsky catalogue contains 4,500 items, and shows a man in tune with the intellectual trends of his day. He was interested in books throughout his life—as early as 1780 he was corresponding from Smolensk with Iakov Ivanovich Bulgakov about the distribution of a book with which Bulgakov was concerned commercially.[142] Troshchynsky's library reflected his military predilections, but also contained the works of the "liberal" N. I. Novikov, the *Sanktpeterburgskii vestnik* of 1798 (which the future Alexander I sponsored in his liberal youth), and that mouthpiece of the Decembrists, Kiukhelbeker and Odoevsky's *Mnemozina*. Troshchynsky took not only the standard periodicals of the time, but missed few significant ephemeral publications, from Fedir Tumansky's *Zerkalo sveta* (1786–7) to Anastasevych's *Ulei* (1811–12). He seems to have taken an interest in the question of the origins of Russia and the character of the Slavs, for he possessed A. I. Musin-Pushkin's *Istoricheskoe issledovanie o mestopolozhenii drevnego rossiiskogo tmutaranskogo kniazheniia* (1794), together with A. N. Olenin's letter on the subject to

Musin-Pushkin, written twelve years later. He owned A. S. Kaisarov's *Slavianskaia mifologiia* (1807), D. I. Iazykov's translation of Schlözer's edition of the chronicler Nestor (1809), and both the first two editions of Peninsky's *Slavianskaia grammatika* (1825 and 1826). He clearly followed fairly closely the work of the Rumiantsev circle (the first co-ordinated investigation of Slavic antecedents), for he possessed six works by each of Rumiantsev's two greatest protégés, P. I. Köppen and K. F. Kalaidovych.

Troshchynsky's library reflected his southern orientation. It contained the travels of Hryhorovych-Barsky, the Kievan who spent twenty-four years visiting the Holy Places of the Near East and whose narrative was published by the Ukrainian journalist Ruban in St. Petersburg in 1778. It contained accounts of journeys to Ukraine made by Otto Hun, V. V. Izmailov and P. I. Shalikov. It included Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky's four-volume *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, Siestrzencewicz-Bohusz's *Istoriia tsarstva Khersonesa tavriiskogo*, Vasyl Narizhny's novels on Ukrainian themes, and a number of Kharkiv publications.

Confirmation both of Troshchynsky's interest in the things of the mind, and of his southern bias, is provided by the three books which were dedicated to him in the course of his career: Iakiv Markovych's *Zapiski o Malorossii* (1798), the beginnings of an attempt to go beyond the mere chronicling of events in Ukrainian history and to conduct an ethnographical and geographical survey; A. F. Iakubovych's *Drevnie rossiiskie stikhotvoreniia* (1804), the first edition of the celebrated "Collection of Kirsha Danilov," no doubt dedicated to Troshchynsky because of his interest in folk poetry, particularly that of Ukraine;[143] and Prince Mykola Tsertelev's *Opyt sobraniia malorossiiskikh pesnei* (1819), which stands at the head of a long series of collections of Ukrainian folksongs.

Books were only one of the ways in which Troshchynsky brought his estate to life. He employed his own musicians, had a church dedicated,[144] and provided the locality with a doctor.[145] Kybyntsi took on political significance in that it became a meeting-place and a forum for discussion. Vasyl Kapnist was a frequent visitor and a weighty figure among the local nobility.[146] Illia Bezborodko, brother of the late Chancellor, would have stopped to see Troshchynsky in

1810 had the latter not been away from home.[147] Kochubei was in the locality and asked after Troshchynsky a few months later.[148] Zavadovsky visited him on another of his estates in 1811, and Troshchynsky returned the compliment.[149] The Decembrist Muravev-Apostols were at Kybyntsi in late 1825 when the news came of the sudden death of the Tsar.[150] The estate had become a well-known local centre.

Troshchynsky's view of the world radiated outward from it. He was involved in the whole atmosphere of the south, in both Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine. He looked upon Kiev as the home of Orthodoxy, and described leaving it as "parting with the holy places."[151] He possessed an estate of 5,000 souls in Western Ukraine, in Podillia.[152] But he seems to have felt more at home in the lands of the old Hetmanate than among the Poles. When, in 1812, he was elected Marshal of the Nobility in both Kiev and Poltava, he chose to represent Poltava.[153] Perhaps his feelings about the Poles emerged in a remark he made about polonaises in Kiev in 1811. Feeling bored, he wished a certain friend would come and give a concert "and in it play his inimitable new polonaise. For where can he find the best judges of his work, if not amongst those light-weight people who were themselves created by polonaises (*koi i sami sozdany polonezami*)?"[154] There was no hint of irony, by contrast, in Troshchynsky's response to Ukrainian music; he was moved to tears by the folksong *Chaika*, "which allegorically presented Little Russia as a bird which built its nest by the roads which encompassed it on all sides."[155]

Troshchynsky took great interest in the administration of the province of Poltava, where he was most deeply entrenched. He made peace between Governor Kurakin and one of his subordinates in 1805, pouring oil on troubled waters.[156] Outraged by the depredations of Kurakin's successor, Lobanov-Rostovsky,[157] he showed concern for the well-being of the next Governor, Repnin. Troshchynsky had served under Repnin's grandfather in the 1770s, and Repnin, whose wife was of Ukrainian stock, showed great interest in the province which he ruled for so long. In 1827, shortly after Repnin's brother had been sent to Siberia for his part in the Decembrist conspiracy, a letter from Troshchynsky's nephew clearly indicated the concern they both felt for the Governor's political survival.[158]

With his strong southern orientation, Troshchynsky took some time to adapt himself to the complexities of politics at the centre in the 1780s and 1790s. He could not at first understand, for example, the policy of virtual withdrawal from politics pursued by Bezborodko in the face of Zubov.[159] Even Zavadovsky commented on the newcomer's awkwardness soon after his appointment as State Secretary in September 1793.[160] But although Troshchynsky may have been overwhelmed, at the outset, by the pressure to which he was being subjected, he soon acquired a degree of political perspicacity. Paul's coronation in Moscow in 1797 seems to have brought home to him the significance of Bezborodko's earlier policy of withdrawal. His reflections after the triumphal entry into the city turned on the passing of the Zubov hegemony. He had ridden in a carriage formerly used by Zubov, and asked in a letter: "Did he [Zubov] think then [when he was at the height of his power] that I could be conveyed in this carriage with such luxury?"[161] Troshchynsky himself would hardly have thought it possible earlier, but now, implicitly, he understood Bezborodko's acuity in the last years of Catherine.

Troshchynsky seems to have devoted effort to the acquisition of the political skills he needed, to judge, for example, from the fact that when he read the memoirs of the eighteenth-century administrator Ia. P. Shakhovskoi, he was struck by the author's subtlety in political accommodation.[162] Admiring this quality in others, he developed it in himself. Having made peace between Kurakin and one of his subordinates in 1805, he showed a similar flair for bringing people together in 1814. On coming to the capital to represent Poltava in the peace celebrations, he persuaded Kochubei to represent the province too, although Kochubei had earlier refused and presumably felt it beneath his dignity.[163] It may not have been unconnected that shortly afterward, when he had been made minister of justice, Troshchynsky offered a job to one of Kochubei's relations[164]—perhaps a *quid pro quo.*

Troshchynsky learnt his diplomatic skill in a St. Petersburg environment which continued to be Ukrainian in colour. From the first days of his departure from the south, he cultivated his own kind. Just as Bezborodko had promoted him, so he in turn assisted the careers of other southerners. As early as 1780 he asked Bulgakov to use his good offices on behalf of one Ivan Onysymov,

"both because he is my fellow-countryman and because his brother is a dear friend of mine."[165] When Troshchynsky arrived in the capital and fitted into an already well-established Ukrainian circle, the incentive to show interest in fellow-Ukrainians was increased. His letters to H. P. Myloradovych in the south show him hard at work expediting matters of interest to them both. Troshchynsky and Myloradovych had been closely associated earlier in their lives, and were united in things private as well as public. They had been part of a social circle whose break-up Troshchynsky regretted. He felt it important that old friends keep in touch, and in sending on to Myloradovych a letter from Kochubei in London he offered to put the two in direct contact. He wanted others to have the same sense of the Ukrainian group that he had himself.[166]

Troshchynsky's group sense stayed with him throughout his career, and extended far beyond his association with Bezborodko and Zavadovsky. Although he was concerned about appointments of major political importance which mattered to the leading Ukrainians—like the question who was to replace A. S. Myloradovych as Governor of the Chernihiv province in 1796[167]—he gave information in his private correspondence about less significant Ukrainians as well as about the great.[168] In or out of office, he continued his patronage of southerners both in the capital and in the province of Poltava. As one of the trustees of the Sheremetev estate, for example, he secured the Ukrainian painter Borovykovsky the commission to paint the posthumous portrait of N. P. Sheremetev (killed in a famous duel).[169] Out of office in 1819, he nevertheless ensured that one of his former civil servants at the ministry of justice, Kosovych, was taken on by M. M. Speransky, at that time Governor of Siberia.[170] While at the head of the ministry, he continued to send children to school in Poltava at his own expense.[171] At the end of his political career, no less than at the beginning, he was turning the money and the connections he made into material advantage both for himself and his fellow-countrymen.

Troshchynsky's life-style in his last period of office, between 1814 and 1817, showed how "Ukrainian" he remained. A subordinate commented on his idiosyncrasies: "a native of Little Russia, he retained even far from his homeland the independence of his staunchly Little Russian character and his Little Russian sense of

humour—an incisive but inoffensive ability to mock"; "The circle of his personal friends did not include many men of note"; "Count M. A. Myloradovych, in his capacity as fellow-countryman and hero of 1812, was the only one who was admitted into this half-Little Russian, patriarchal world."[172] Myloradovych was the son of that Governor of Chernihiv whose death in 1796 had caused Troshchynsky to speculate on Bezborodko's chances of getting his brother-in-law the reversion, and a cousin of the H. P. Myloradovych to whom Troshchynsky was close and with whom he corresponded so affectionately.[173] The parties held by Princess Khilkova, Troshchynsky's illegitimate daughter, when he was minister, showed how his outlook differed from that of the majority of St. Petersburg's Westernizing nobles. They marked the "origins of pan-slavism (*zarozhdenie panslavizma*)": "Russian, Polish, Little Russian—everything was intermingled in the actions and in the conversation of the unrestrained young people, whom the old men and old women admired." Khilkova's literary interests embraced the work of poets of Ukrainian origin. "Arkady Rodzianko would always bring and submit to her judgment everything that he wrote. Sometimes both Kapnist and Hnidych would honour us with a reading of their works." Among the audience were men who made listening to the poetry of southerners natural: Myloradovych again, and Karazyn, "admirer of the Little Russian philosopher Skovoroda. . . . "[174]

At the ministry of justice itself, Troshchynsky's subordinates further illustrated the extent to which he surrounded himself with Ukrainians. Ivan Martos, his Director of Department, was later to live with him at Kybyntsi and catalogue the library, before retiring to the Kiev *Lavra* and conducting from there an extensive correspondence. He came from a family many of whose members distinguished themselves. I. P. Martos was Russia's most distinguished contemporary sculptor, O. I. Martos one of the early historians of Ukraine, and a third Martos the sponsor of Shevchenko's *Kobzar*.[175] Also in the ministry of justice under Troshchynsky's charge was Oleksander Markovych, younger brother of Iakiv, who dedicated his *Zapiski o Malorossii* to Troshchynsky in 1798. Oleksander relinquished his appointment in the ministry soon after Troshchynsky, returned to the south, and later wrote his own work of history, a study of the Chernihiv nobility which he

completed in 1838.[176] Both he and Martos seem to have felt at home in the ministry of justice only when Troshchynsky was there.

What then was the political philosophy engendered by a life divided between the capital and the provinces? Troshchynsky was particularly interesting among the Ukrainians at court in that he put his views down on paper, and in that they brought out his feelings for the differences, and the proper relationship, between the provinces and the centre. As minister of justice he argued the case against introducing a Russian law code derived from western models, painting an eloquent word-picture of the difficulties in which the peasant would find himself if the new code were to be introduced: "Does the author of the project appreciate all the circumstances of rural life?"[177] He expressed his view of nineteenth-century politics most forcefully in the long paper, "On the Inconvenience Resulting from the Government of the State in the One-man Style, Introduced by the Closure of the Colleges and the Abolition of the Collegiate Form, and Confirmed by the General Establishment of Ministries in 1810 and 1811."[178] This tract, which reflected the whole of Troshchynsky's background and political career, is worth looking at in some detail.

"The present form of government," wrote Troshchynsky, "is the consequence of the reforms undertaken in 1802." Alexander I had set out to put the existing system to rights, but the improvements he introduced had been based on "the abstract concepts of the newly arisen philosophy," instead of on practical experience.[179] What Alexander should have done (and what Troshchynsky argued he intended to do) was to get back to the system of government prevailing after Catherine's reforms. The principal significance of those reforms for Troshchynsky was the way in which they overcame the problems arising from the sheer size of the empire. Troshchynsky's strong sense of the purely physical nature of the difficulties confronting Russian administrators underlies the whole paper. He began the first part, "A Picture of Government in 1802 before the Establishment of Ministries," with a section entitled "In the Districts," and moved from there to consideration of the provinces and the two capitals—starting from the grass roots and working upward. The approach was the opposite of that of the best-known early nineteenth-century reforming bureaucrat, M. M. Speransky, whose reform plans before 1812 laid the

emphasis on getting things right at the centre first.

Troshchynsky felt that Imperial administration before Catherine the Great's reforms was fragmented. In theory the Procurator-General was supreme, and in the capitals he very nearly was, but elsewhere the administration was too heavily subdivided, and "the inconveniences . . . were felt most keenly in the government of the provinces and the districts"; "the physical distancing of the remote administrations from their focal point [i.e. the Procurator] led to harmful delay. . . ."[180] Districts and regions were not connected with one another, but all came independently under the authority of the centre, with the result that a matter affecting two adjacent regions had to be decided via the capital. Catherine's local government reform corrected this situation. "Not only did it not destroy the unifying authority which existed in the Senate, but on the contrary it deepened it by adding general supervision of all aspects of provincial administration in the person of the governor."[181] The regional governor, responsible to the Senate, became a sort of local Procurator-General and extended to the provinces the advantages of the system already obtaining at the centre.

Troshchynsky went on to speak at length about checks and balances and the need for cohesion in government, subjects to which other Russian political thinkers of the day also devoted much attention. What distinguished his views, however, was the premises on which they were based. He expounded them in section seven of the paper, "On the Form of State Government Appropriate for the Russian State." The two determining factors were "everything that relates to expanse, to the local situation, . . . that forms the state's physical condition," and "everything that relates to the people from whom the state is formed."[182] First, then, Troshchynsky concentrated on the sheer physical size of Russia and the problem of distance. Although useful from a military point of view, size hindered cultural growth. "To acquire riches and knowledge men need proximity with one another and mutual aid."[183] In Russia they lacked these advantages. Troshchynsky stressed that universities, in particular, were remote from the local centres—a reflection, perhaps, upon the fact that no universities had yet been founded in central Ukraine, despite the plan to found one in Chernihiv in 1786. The size of the country made educating the people difficult.

Nearly half Troshchynsky's long paper—the last section, "On the Inconveniences Arising out of the Non-Uniform Government of the Regions"—was devoted specifically to the problem of the localities. "The organization of the central administration," Troshchynsky wrote, "... undoubtedly deserves the utmost attention, but still more worthy of consideration is the organization of the local administrations. ... "; "... in the great majority of instances, at any time and over the whole extent of the empire, the well-being, peace, property, honour and even the life of the great number of the inhabitants of the state depend almost exclusively on the local administrations."[184] Troshchynsky wanted to extend to the provinces all the benefits of the system which he felt was most appropriate for the centre. He was not, therefore, concerned to preserve regional variety, or to ensure that the different contributions made by the different parts of the empire be recognized and allowed individual expression. What was unusual about his thinking was simply that he devoted so much attention to the problem of the regions and that he gave it such prominence in his discussion of the state of the country.

He seems to have felt that an integrated administrative system linking provinces and centre would eliminate a problem which was greater than the advantages conferred by regional variety: the problem of minor provincial despotisms. Protests from the Baltic provinces at the time of Catherine's provincial reorganization, he argued, had come only from the previously ruling clique. Catherine had "turned foreigners into citizens of the Russian state by uniting peoples alien to one another in origin, customs, language, religion, and most important of all in their special, completely oligarchical forms of government—by uniting them in a union conferring motherly protection equally upon all."[185] Troshchynsky wrote little about the Hetmanate, but perhaps he implied that a ruling clique similar to those in the Baltic provinces had been circumvented in the southern part of the empire. This would explain why he was not a Ukrainian separatist. He was more concerned for the mass of the provincial communities and for the social advance they could make by virtue of being integrated into the Russian system.

Most significant of all, however, is that Troshchynsky devoted space to the problems of the regions at a time when others were for the most part expending energies on tinkering with central government. He knew only too well that the provinces received

scant consideration in St. Petersburg. When A. A. Bekleshov, Governor of Little Russia, wanted to come to the capital in 1798 to find out precisely what the policy of the administration was with regard to Ukraine, Troshchynsky was glad that A. R. Vorontsov dissuaded him. "I always look with pity on *namestniki* when they're here, the way they get discussed. . . . " Later, when Bekleshov did come to St. Petersburg (despite having been coldly received by the Tsar in Moscow), Troshchynsky wrote that "he is in great difficulties on account of his appointment as Governor-General of the provinces of Little Russia and Kiev. . . . "; the limits of power were unclear, the military and civil authorities separated, contact with the Tsar non-existent. Troshchynsky knew perfectly the difficulties under which provincial governors laboured, and felt for them.[186] He knew what it was like to live in the provinces for long periods and understood both the problems facing the administrators and the difficulty of solving them. He proposed no new answers, but focused attention on an area of political life less carefully considered by other government servants, and presented the fundamental problems of the empire in a new order of priority.

Viktor Kochubei

Viktor Pavlovych Kochubei (1768–1834) was the most "Russian" of the Ukrainians who achieved high office in St. Petersburg in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There was no doubt that on the question of the balance between north and south, he stood on the side of the north. Whereas Bezborodko, Zavadovsky and Troshchynsky all felt for their homeland, Kochubei was much more narrowly a man of the centre. But although he did not relish the thought of Ukraine, he was nevertheless unable entirely to escape the influence of his southern connections. He illustrated an aspect of Ukrainian-Russian interaction which was less clearly brought out in the careers of his predecessors at court: the way in which the south made a mark even on those who turned away from it.

The Kochubei family was distinguished in the Hetmanate. "The family of the Kochubeis," wrote Viktor Pavlovych's cousin in 1797 when he was trying to secure recognition as a Russian noble:

> comes from the Crimean peninsula, and was honoured there as one of the most distinguished noble families of the Tatar people, as is proved by the very name Bey, which in the province of Crimea is of first importance after that of the Chinghiz family which ruled there, and given only to scions of Sirin and Mansur; other noble scions are called Murzas. One of these Beys, after leaving in the sixteenth century for Little Russian Ukraine, adopted the Orthodox Greco-Russian eastern faith, and having settled under the name of Andrii Kochubei served in the ranks of the army there.[187]

The family fortunes were made by Vasyl Kochubei, grandson of the Crimean immigrant, who was executed by Peter the Great in 1708 for asserting that Mazepa, Hetman of Ukraine, was about to betray him. When, in the following year, Mazepa did betray Peter, and the Tsar defeated him in the Poltava campaign, full restitution was made to the Kochubei family and their lasting honour assured. They adopted the motto *Elevor ubi consumor* in memory of the events of 1708–9.[188] Their reputation spread far beyond Ukraine. Pushkin's poem *Poltava*, which appeared in 1828 when Viktor Pavlovych was chairman of the Committee of Ministers, opened

with the words *Bogat i slaven Kochubei.*

After Poltava the Kochubeis consolidated their position at the head of the society of the Hetmanate. A single Kochubei marriage made the fortune of the parvenu Rozumovsky family in the 1740s, for it connected them with the entire Ukrainian *starshyna.*[189] Vasyl Leontiovych's favourite estate Dikanka, fifteen miles from Poltava, became famous.[190] Gogol's Rudyi Panko, whose *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki*, like Pushkin's *Poltava*, appeared when Viktor Pavlovych was chairman of the Committee of Ministers (in 1831–2), declared that he had "deliberately exhibited" the name Dikanka on his title-page, so that his imaginary audience could reach him more quickly.[191] Kurakin, Governor of Ukraine, commented to his brother on the beauty of the site, the seventy rooms of the house and the three churches on the estate, and used Dikanka as a base for organizing his cadastral survey of Ukraine.[192]

Viktor Pavlovych Kochubei was born in 1768, the great-grandson of the posthumously exculpated traitor of 1708. His mother was Bezborodko's sister, his father a typical member of the Hetmanate gentry, one of their representatives at the coronation of Catherine the Great and eventually a *statskii sovetnik.*[193] Both had died when Kochubei was young, the mother in 1777, the father in 1786, and in the latter year, as we have seen, Bezborodko was anxious that Viktor Pavlovych should pursue his service career rather than entertain the notion, which might have been tempting, of returning to the south and assuming direct responsibility for the inheritance. In the light of subsequent events, it would appear that Bezborodko had little to worry about. The loss of his parents may have contributed to Kochubei's introversion—Vigel was to refer to his "few words and murderous cold"[194]—but it does not seem to have moved him to return to the south for good. He was already well-set on the road to political success. Bezborodko had brought him to the capital almost as soon as he, Bezborodko, had arrived there, and in 1776 Kochubei had been enrolled in the Guards.[195] In 1784 he began his active service with an attachment to Russia's mission in Stockholm. Bezborodko had determined he was to have a diplomatic career. In 1786 he returned to Russia on the death of his father, but instead of retiring was shortly promoted *kamer-iunker*, and in the following year travelled to the Crimea in the suite of Catherine II. Early in 1788 he was appointed to the staff of

Russia's London embassy, with permission to travel in Europe to complete his education, and in the course of the next four years in the West he became closely acquainted with Semen Vorontsov, the London ambassador, and spent a year (1791–2) in France and Switzerland. Summoned home, he arrived in St. Petersburg in July 1792, and was soon made ambassador to the Sublime Porte. Not hurrying south, he served there with some reluctance until 1798, when he returned to St. Petersburg to join Bezborodko at the height of his power.

The Chancellor was dying, and probably hoped that at some time in the future Kochubei would succeed him. In October 1798 Kochubei was made Vice-Chancellor, and two days before Bezborodko's death a count. He retired, however, four months later, and spent 1799 and 1800 getting married and travelling (first to Dikanka and then abroad).[196] The news of Paul I's death in 1801 reached him in Dresden, and on hurrying home he was appointed to the Senate and the College of Foreign Affairs. He appears to have refused the Paris embassy, however, and to have held out for the first position of substance at home. In September 1802 he received the ministry of internal affairs, and stayed there until 1807. Thereafter he held effective ministerial office only once again, when he was minister of internal affairs for a second time between 1819 and 1823;[197] but he continued to sit on the State Council, despite further long absences when he travelled to the south and abroad (1816–18 and 1823–6). In the last seven years of his life, from 1827 to 1834, he was chairman of the Council and of the Committee of Ministers.

Kochubei's career shows how far removed he was from the little world of the Ukrainian Hetmanate. He was the perfect European. Running out of money in Paris at the end of 1791, he wrote to Semen Vorontsov that "I would be in despair if I found myself compelled for that reason to make a journey to Russia, a journey which neither the death of Prince Potemkin nor the standing (*credit*) of my uncle will ever make me want to make."[198] He was no keener to take up the later Constantinople appointment. Lingering in Vienna on the way, he met a fellow Ukrainian who was to succeed him as ambassador to the Porte five years later. He wished he could replace him now.[199] Kochubei seems to have found the work in Constantinople distasteful. According to his biographer, the

trade between Russia and Turkey was largely in the hands of Armenians and Greeks, and the business tended to be "not quite clean either."[200]

Kochubei enjoyed the life of the Russian court and being close to the centre of power. Before returning to Russia in 1792 he claimed that this was not the case, and wrote to Semen Vorontsov describing how much he disliked the members of the particular faction to which he belonged.[201] But he was probably being disingenuous. He disliked being without news of the capital during his long absence after 1792, and complained constantly that Bezborodko was ignoring him.[202] Although when he got back to the capital he claimed to be tired and to be accepting work merely because his uncle was ill and needed him,[203] the burden of his letters during the time of his absence inclines one to believe that this was once more less than frank. In fact he was not as out of touch with the life of the court in the 1790s as his correspondence with Semen Vorontsov seemed to indicate. Troshchynsky wrote frequently, and passed on letters from the future Alexander I.[204] Perhaps Kochubei's complaints arose because he wanted to be completely, not partially, in touch with events at the centre.

A major difficulty under which Kochubei laboured throughout his life was not lack of information but lack of social flair, an inability to form close relationships with his colleagues even when he was fully in the swim of political life. He was the odd man out on Alexander I's Unofficial Committee. The other members, Czartoryski, N. N. Novosiltsev and P. A. Stroganov, were called the "triumvirate."[205] He greatly irritated Bekleshov when the latter was Governor of Moscow and came under the jurisdiction of the ministry of internal affairs.[206] He had a high sense of the dignity of his office. When in December 1805 Sergei Rumiantsev presented an affair touching upon the salt supply from the Crimea in a way which he thought inaccurate, Kochubei responded vigorously. Rumiantsev had made it clear that he intended no personal attack on the minister, but what concerned Kochubei was the implicit attack on "the position which I occupy." He could allow no reproaches to be laid at the door of the ministry.[207]

Kochubei showed his refusal to give ground in a matter of far more than technical significance in 1803. He wrote to the Governor of Chernihiv commenting on another proposal of S. P. Rumiantsev,

the so-called Free Farmers Law. This law allowed peasants to buy themselves out by agreement with their masters, but Kochubei made it clear that "the agreement of conditions with peasants depended on the reckoning and the goodwill of their landowners, and it can have no effect on the right given peculiarly to the gentry, if they do not find that the agreement works to their own advantage." Peasants "must remain in exactly the same depedence on and obedience to their lords as they have hitherto. . . ."[208] Kochubei clearly applied his belief in order, apparent in the earlier example at the administrative level, to the social structure of the country at large.

His attitude toward the substantial administrative changes which took place in the reign of Alexander I showed that his priority was the form rather than the substance of change. Unlike Troshchynsky, he welcomed the introduction of ministries in 1802. He disapproved of the earlier collegiate system, because "where responsibility on one matter rests on many, there, so to speak, it does not exist."[209] But Kochubei's definition of ministerial responsibility tended to reduce the value of the administrative changes to which he subscribed. At one end of the scale he was in favour of defining more closely the relations between ministers and the Senate,[210] but at the other, where the country at large was involved, he was prepared to let confusion continue. In Kochubei's view, the minister of internal affairs's responsibility was to be only for what he had signed himself. Subordinate offices were to answer for their misdeeds directly to the Senate or the Tsar.[211] In everything, then, which had failed to penetrate from the provinces to the minister, confusion would continue. So Kochubei accepted the new ministries with some reservations in practice. He regarded with considerable disfavour the other major political organs of the day, the reformed State Council of 1810 and the Committee of Ministers. He wrote to N. S. Mordvinov in 1814, as is clear from Mordvinov's reply, that he concerned himself little with the affairs of the council;[212] in 1816 he explained to Speransky that he had been "completely removed from all participation in affairs, with the exception of the rotten committee."[213] Perhaps it was with concealed relief that he wrote to Olenin in 1819, after his reappointment as minister of internal affairs, that he would no longer be able to be so assiduous in his attendance at meetings of the council.[214]

Kochubei was close to M. M. Speransky, like him an "outsider" in the capital. The two had a similar approach to government. The editor of Kochubei's 1803 letter to the Governor of Chernihiv, remarking upon the way in which Kochubei carefully set limits to the meaning of the Free Farmers Law, described him as "the father of this sort of system of clerical evasions and interpretation," and considered that Speransky was no more than his pupil of genius.[215] Not all the correspondence between the two has been published,[216] but Kochubei spoke frankly about the state of politics in letters to Speransky of 1816 and 1818.[217] The slighting reference to the Committee of Ministers, which appeared in the first letter, has already been quoted. In the second letter Kochubei spoke of contemporary political factions, which were already turning their attention to him even though he had only just returned from abroad. He was extremely cautious about his political prospects. Rumours had been circulating about his involvement in the great domestic question of the day—provincial reorganization—but he denied that he was to be appointed minister of internal affairs. Within a year, however, he was in fact appointed. He may have been concealing his hand in order to prevent the factions undermining his position.

The letters to Speransky show something of Kochubei's ambivalence—on the one hand depressed by court politics and withdrawing from them, and on the other leaving the way clear for his return. Political analysis clearly provided him with a consuming interest.

There was no scope for it in the provinces, and no doubt for this reason Kochubei rarely visited his estates in Ukraine. Having been withdrawn from the southern environment in early youth, he could derive little satisfaction from it thereafter. When he left St. Petersburg in 1799, 1816 or 1823, it was not to settle in the south, but at most to pass through Dikanka on his way to Western Europe. In the 1816 letter to Speransky, having declared his intention of going abroad for two years, Kochubei admitted the possibility of staying away even longer and spending some time on his estates on the way back. But his order of geographical priorities was clear: St. Petersburg first, the West second, the backwoods last. He made arrangements for Ukrainian cousins to come to the capital, and asked in connection with one of them, in 1804, what

would have happened "if from his youth he had had to stay in Little Russia."[218] Kochubei did not know Ukraine well. He misinformed Kurakin's brother about the distance between two Ukrainian towns, with the result that Kurakin took much longer making the journey than he had bargained for.[219] Kurakin felt that Kochubei had little understanding of the Ukrainian gentry, for if he thought, as he appeared to do, that they could be relied upon to provide a million rubles for various public works, he was very much mistaken.[220] Kochubei does not seem to have been ashamed of his ignorance of provincial life. In the 1803 memorandum on the ministry of internal affairs he appeared to be disclaiming responsibility for much that went on in the provinces. In the 1818 letter to Speransky he declared how useful it would be to have Speransky back in St. Petersburg (in the context of the debate about local government), because "You unite practice with theory"[221]—an implicit admission of his own ignorance of the way things were done outside St. Petersburg.

Kochubei's comments on Dikanka and on southern life in general illustrate how urbanized he had become. Early in 1798, on receiving his recall from Constantinople to St. Petersburg, he had the chance to meet his cousin Vasyl on the way home and wrote to him in advance apologizing for the fact that they hardly knew each other.[222] At the end of the year, when he had been through Ukraine and was once more ensconced in the capital, he wrote to Semen Vorontsov making it clear that he cannot have been unduly attracted by what he had seen in the south. Dissatisfied with the political situation at the centre, he claimed that he was resigned to his fate. If he lost office, however, he might be "reduced to going and vegetating in Ukraine."[223] In July 1799, three months after Bezborodko's death, Kochubei wrote ironically of the fate which awaited him now that his political star was very much on the wane. He envisaged marrying and settling down as a good farmer, travelling briefly to London to present his wife to Vorontsov and then returning to the depths of Ukraine and living under police supervision (*sous le bon plaisir d'un kapitan-ispravnik*).[224]

How little resigned he really was to this prospect is apparent from his reaction when it more or less materialized in January 1800. Writing to Vorontsov from Dikanka, Kochubei explained that he was happy with his property from the point of view of climate

and the beauty of the surroundings; but although the lands of Ukraine were perhaps the richest in the empire, they lacked outlets, with the result that Ukrainians were rich in produce and poor in cash. As Kochubei put it, he was a great lord on the plains of Poltava but of little account on the banks of the Neva. He was not impressed with the assiduity of the local peasantry, nor did he feel at home with the local gentry. Finally, he felt himself cut off from the news. He was receiving no letters or newspapers, and although he did not expect letters, he had ordered newspapers in St. Petersburg, "in order not to become an Ostrogoth in the full meaning of the term."[225] It was hardly surprising that Kochubei soon left Ukraine to go abroad.

His feelings about Ukraine did not change over the years. In Dikanka again in 1824, travelling south (and then abroad) on indefinite leave from the ministry of internal affairs, he wrote to a friend that they were awaiting the descent of the locust, which had already attacked the Crimea and Kherson (and was a perennial threat to agriculture in the south). Continuing his account of life on the land in the mocking vein which he had used to Vorontsov a quarter of a century before, he wrote: "The banker never ends a letter without mentioning the state of the market (*ne upomianuv o vekselnom kurse*). The farmer thinks that there is nothing more interesting than the harvest, so as a landowner I will inform you that we have very little hay, an abundance of corn, poor sheaves (*snopy toshchie*), tall straw, and there will be no fruit at all."[226] Kochubei seems to have looked upon his involvement with the land as something of a joke.

And yet he was never able to sever his ties with Ukraine. Nor perhaps, however much he pretended otherwise, did he altogether want to. The attempt to enter completely into the role of the European man of the world, to become simply another Russian nobleman, broke down. The Ukrainian circle of which he became a part when he first came north, and the considerable number of clamorous relatives he retained in the south, prevented Kochubei from devoting himself entirely to high politics. When he passed through Ukraine in 1798, he found himself called upon to defend the Skoropadskys against a charge of sedition.[227] The wife whom he married in the following year came from within the Ukrainian group at court,[228] and partly explains why Kochubei was close to

N. G. Repnin, the later Governor of Ukraine; for Repnin's wife was his own wife's first cousin.[229] Toward the end of his career Kochubei claimed never to take part in political matters which concerned his relations,[230] but in 1804, when Governor Kurakin was thinking of returning north, he certainly hoped to have his brother-in-law, H. P. Myloradovych, appointed as Kurakin's successor.[231] Throughout his life Ukraine placed demands upon him, and he was not totally unsympathetic toward its inhabitants.

That Kochubei wanted to do more for Ukraine than he did, but felt constrained by his official position, is brought out by his attitude toward two Ukrainian educational projects of 1804–5. He was at this time minister of internal affairs, and could not afford to show favour to a particular region of the empire. When, therefore, in late 1804, the Marshal of the Chernihiv nobility, Storozhenko, asked his opinion about the possibility of raising money from the Chernihiv nobles for the foundation of a gentry school in Ukraine, Kochubei wrote him a memorandum expressing personal sympathy as a private landowner in the area concerned. Storozhenko used the memorandum in an assembly of Chernihiv district marshals as if it came from the ministry of internal affairs. Kochubei was horrified, and wrote a long explanatory letter to A. B. Kurakin, Governor of Ukraine, and another to S. P. Rumiantsev (who was forwarding similar proposals from another Marshal of Nobility). To Rumiantsev, Kochubei wrote that it would be illegitimate for him to use his position to secure the realization of such a project, but that he had already ordered his manager to contribute to any educational fund which was in fact set up.[232] The correspondence provides a good illustration of the way in which Kochubei's political morality differed from that of his Ukrainian predecessors at court. He saw himself as a servant of the central government, determined not to show bias in a "southern" cause.

Yet within six months he was pressing for the establishment of an educational institute similar to that which Storozhenko had suggested. He had found a way to do it legitimately, without detriment to his official position. Bezborodko had left money in his will for some material benefaction to Ukraine, and the money had been growing for six years without being put to use. It seems to have been Kochubei who now took the initiative and persuaded Illia Bezborodko to act. He did so in a way which made it clear that he

was responding directly to Storozhenko's proposals of the previous year. He advocated the creation of a gymnasium on the lines of that founded by the Demidovs in Iaroslavl. This would be an institution "corresponding in a way to a university," which central Ukraine did not possess, and yet it would not be a gentry school, "which they [the local gentry] had wanted to give up to a million for in the two provinces."[233] The last phrase indicated what Kochubei really thought was wrong with the project of the previous year: it was too narrowly class-oriented, and would have shown him to be too much a member of the Ukrainian *starshyna*. The new school was to have a broad social orientation.[234]

Kochubei's behaviour over the educational projects of 1804–5 seems to show that he was prepared to act on behalf of Ukraine when his action could not be construed as representing a particular section of Ukrainian society. He did not want to be typecast as the mouthpiece of Ukrainians at court, but neither did he turn a blind eye to the problems of the south.

This duality of outlook is apparent again in Kochubei's dealings with his many southern relations. He was happy to provide opportunities for the younger scions of the family to be educated, and thereafter to secure them positions in government service,[235] but there were limits to his bounty. He could not accept the headstrong behaviour which characterized the old Ukrainian *starshyna*; some examples will show what he had to deal with in the unregenerate members of his family.

The "hellish character" of his brother, Apollon, which had resulted in Bezborodko's sending him back to Ukraine after an incident in which he had thrown his furniture out of a window in St. Petersburg,[236] brought a protest, in 1804, from peasants whom he was maltreating, and in the following year Kurakin was instructed to take the peasants into his personal care.[237] Kochubei not only made no attempt to intervene, but seems to have been in favour of the controls placed upon the malefactor.[238]

In 1820 the Tsar was planning a journey south, and Kochubei wrote to Repnin explaining that he had asked his first cousin once removed, Semen Mykhailovych, to take charge of plans for receiving Alexander. "But he is so peculiar," he wrote, that he had also been in touch with Semen's business agent as a form of reinsurance.[239] Semen was indeed a curious mix—hugely in debt,

constantly submitting wild projects to the Governor of Ukraine and wearying him with endless letters, sponsor of the first official edition of Kotliarevsky's *Eneida*.[240]

At least Semen Kochubei was not an advocate of the maintenance or the revival of Ukrainian independence.[241] Another of Kochubei's cousins, Damian Vasylovych, may have been. Repnin had constant difficulty with Damian Kochubei in the 1820s, first on account of his bootlegging activities across the Ukrainian border into the provinces of Orel and Kursk, then in 1829 when Damian refused to accept that Repnin would not allow his election as Marshal of the Chernihiv nobility.[242]

Viktor Pavlovych tried as best he could to keep out of this last affair. The letter to Repnin in which he discussed the matter, however, showed the extent to which he was still involved in Ukrainian problems, even bedevilled by them, at the end of his life. Years of involvement in national politics and in the wider European world had not enabled him to escape his Ukrainian roots. Of all the Ukrainians at court in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries he had tried hardest to present himself as a fully integrated Russian, but in his declining years the fact still needed stating. "I have had no knowledge until recently," wrote Kochubei in connection with Damian, "...of what you call the storms of Hlukhiv." He said that he received few letters and wrote none. "I think only of what is general, of what may be useful *en masse*." "As for Damian Kochubei," he wrote, "who has occasioned this little digression, I will tell you what I know and what I have learnt from him."[243] Kochubei was trying not to concern himself with Ukrainian affairs, but failed in the attempt.

Two years later he was still trying to make clear where he stood on the question of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine. "Although by birth I am a *khokhol*," he wrote to Repnin in a letter which has been called his "political testament,"[244] "I am more Russian than any in my principles, my circumstances, and my manners." He was certainly Russian by inclination, but never succeeded in escaping the pull of the south. Although he claimed to be a philosopher of government, he found himself dealing throughout his life with many petty questions deriving from Ukraine. He never became a typical Russian nobleman.

Chapter Five

Ukrainians on Grub Street

Late eighteenth-century Russian journalism

Although the political figures discussed in the last chapter were the most prominent Ukrainians in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russia, they did not make the biggest contribution to the image of Ukraine in the north. They were constrained by their prominence. Whatever their natural loyalties, they were obliged to tread warily for the sake of advancement. Life at court encouraged moderation, not the championing of causes. Even if they had wanted to, Ukrainians at the centre of affairs could not have done much to alter Russia's perspectives. They were outsiders in a centralized political system that had started developing long before their arrival in St. Petersburg. Because they had to devote themselves to maintaining their positions they did not have many opportunities for innovation. Their greatest single contribution to the broadening of Russian awareness probably lay in the employment they arranged in the north for other Ukrainians. For lesser lights, whether or not they owed their jobs to the court politicians, did more to extend awareness of Ukraine than ministers of the crown. Often undistinguished individually, these lesser lights made a notable collective mark in Russia. They were active in literature rather than politics. The limitations upon them, although

still considerable, were fewer than those imposed by life at court. The rules for success in literary contexts were still in the making, for the contexts were new even to Russians. In-fighting in high politics was traditional, but the organization and content of Russian literary life were changing in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[1] The next three chapters concentrate on three aspects of literary life: the late eighteenth-century Russian periodical press; early nineteenth-century Russian fiction; and Russian historical writing. All three of these areas were experiencing expansion and innovation which provided Ukrainians with fruitful opportunities to express themselves. Non-Ukrainians also took advantages of the new opportunities, but Ukrainians were particularly well-placed to make use of them as a result of the Ukrainian educational traditions described in Chapter Three.

Even when no provincials were involved in their publication, eighteenth-century periodicals began to acknowledge the existence of the outlying parts of the empire. A journal of 1763 asked where the title "White Tsar" came from, and why "White Russia" was so called.[2] Usually interest was much less speculative. The same number of the 1763 journal contained an "Instruction on how to set about sowing different types of foreign tobacco in Little Russia."[3] Ten years later a writer discussed the question of Ukrainian tobacco at greater length and made it the occasion for a few wider reflections.[4] An editor published a "Description of the roads from Kiev to Constantinople, composed in 1714" because he felt it would provide information "on the ancient condition of places which many of our fellow-countrymen have recently seen as they are now" (in Catherine's first war with Turkey).[5] Nikolai Novikov printed a letter from Ukraine in the second part of his *Zhivopisets* in 1773, in which the author thanked Novikov for standing up against the changes in manners which he saw all round him.[6] As early as 1787 one Russian traveller to Ukraine, writing in a book rather than a periodical, felt it unnecessary to describe the province's dialect, dress and behaviour, because in his view they were already sufficiently well known.[7] A later historian of Ukrainian literature, Academician N. I. Petrov, observed correctly that "in the second half of the eighteenth century a Little Russian trend began making itself felt even in the north of Russia, in the secular, pseudo-classical literature of that time."[8]

The trend owed most of its vigour not to casual Russian interest in Ukraine, but to direct Ukrainian participation in Russia's literary life. Ukrainians made two contributions to the Russian literary scene. Some Ukrainian men of letters used material drawn from the south, and so made their place of origin more familiar to Russians. Others, while differing little from their Russian contemporaries in choice or treatment of subject-matter, swelled the population of Russia's "Grub Street" and helped to make secular literature an increasingly significant part of Russian intellectual life. Ukrainians thus had both a specific and a general importance in the growth of Russian literature. They published work on subjects that had not been dealt with previously, and they increased the pace of developments already under way.

Ukrainians in the first category occupy most of this chapter, but a few of those who fell into the second category should be mentioned. They include some of the least significant and some of the best known of eighteenth-century writers in Russian. At one end of the scale, a certain Boryspolets published a journal in St. Petersburg in 1801 which appeared so briefly, and presumably in so small an edition, that seventy years later the great bibliographer of eighteenth-century Russian journals, A. N. Neustroev, was unable to find a copy. On advertising for information on the subject, Neustroev received a letter from the author's son saying that Boryspolets had stopped publishing his journal because there were so few subscribers, and because he obtained a position under the Governor of Ukraine and returned south almost immediately. Boryspolets spent the remainder of his career in Zhytomyr, Minsk and Kherson, and did no more to swell the ranks of Russia's literati.[9] He had hoped, no doubt, to make his name by founding a journal, but had given up the unequal struggle as soon as a better prospect of advancement presented itself. Other writers of Ukrainian origin were more tenacious. The playwright M. M. Kheraskov (1733–1807) became one of the leading literary figures of his generation. So did I. F. Bohdanovych, author of the celebrated fable *Dushenka*. Neither of these was ethnically Ukrainian, but both came from Ukraine and cherished its memory.[10] The jurist S. Ie. Desnytsky and the philosopher Ia. P. Kozelsky, authors of prose rather than poetry, also showed signs of continuing allegiance to Ukraine.[11] These different sorts of

writer led their respective fields in eighteenth-century Russia. Where Boryspolets failed, they succeeded.

Ukrainian writers were to be found above all in the middle ground, between the poles of success and failure. Hryhorii Braiko typified the sort of Ukrainian who, after completing his education at the Kiev Academy, moved to St. Petersburg and advanced his career with the pen. He was born in the 1740s into a Ukrainian gentry family, and came to St. Petersburg in 1764 for higher education. Soon afterward he left for Germany to study at Göttingen, and on his return at the beginning of the 1770s he entered St. Petersburg's literary life, while serving as a translator under M. M. Scherbatov in the archive of the affairs of Peter the Great. In 1778 he transferred to the College of Foreign Affairs, and died in 1793 after serving at home, in Venice, and in Vienna. His principal contribution to the periodical literature of the time, after co-operation with Bohdanovych on the *Sobranie Novostei* of 1776, lay in the editorship of *Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik* (1778–1781), which at the time it was founded was the only contemporary Russian literary-political journal, and included among its contributors many of the leading literary figures of the day—G. R. Derzhavin, N. A. Lvov, Vasyl Kapnist, and I. I. Khemnitser. The object of the journal was to publish not only original works of literature, but news both national and local, book reviews, and academic articles. The journal's political orientation was moderately liberal, which eventually seems to have led to its downfall. By this stage of his life, having left Ukraine long before, Braiko was far from intending to promote a narrow particularism in his journal, and indeed he was indebted for much of his material to a contemporary German periodical which was appearing in St. Petersburg. But he still remembered the Kiev Academy, publishing the news of the great fire which destroyed its library in February 1780.[12] The place he obtained in the Viennese embassy in 1789 was made vacant by the death of an old friend and correspondent, another Ukrainian, H. I. Poletyka, and it was no doubt because the two were acquainted that Braiko knew the place was free. The significance of Braiko lies in the way in which he put together his provincial education and his travelling. He derived from them a confidence that Russia had something of her own to offer. In his journal, he saw himself as laying the foundation on which

later generations would build, "for it is indubitable that after us there will be times when Russian journals and other works in this language will start being read in English, German and French towns, just as foreign journals are now being read in Russian towns."[13] Years abroad, and even longer years away from his starting-point in Ukraine, had given Braiko means of comparison denied to others. He knew the two extremes, Western Europe and the Russian provinces, and he put them together to achieve a balance uncommon at the time.

Like Braiko, I. I. Martynov advanced his career by engaging in literary activity. Before being appointed to a senior position in the ministry of education early in 1803, he had published the journal *Muza* in 1796 and been involved in the production of the progressive *Sankt-Peterburgskii zhurnal* of 1798. Later he edited *Severnyi vestnik* in 1804–5 and *Litsei* in 1806. These works were typical products of cosmopolitan enlightenment and show little sign of Martynov's Ukrainian origins. Yet *Severnyi vestnik* included the first significant Russian-language study of the Ukrainians of the Austrian empire,[14] and at the end of his life Martynov still cared enough about his homeland to object to incorrect Ukrainianisms in a St. Petersburg student play.[15] In his later years Martynov was devoting himself to the translation of the Greek classics,[16] but his involvement in Europe's common culture had clearly not driven Ukraine from his mind. Like that of Braiko, Martynov's contribution to Russia's literary expansion sprang from a combination of groundwork laid in Ukraine and broader horizons acquired in the north.[17]

Iakiv Halynkovsky was a Ukrainian who, on coming north, seems to have been anxious to escape at all costs the charge of provincialism. He spoke interestingly about the problem of Russian national identity in the first number of his journal *Korifei*, which was devoted to Clio, the muse of history. Discussing the condition of Russian historiography, he divided Russian historians into three groups, ecclesiastical, secular and foreign, and in the last section introduced a discussion particularly illuminating in the light of his Ukrainian origins. He was considering the work of the German, Scherer, who after serving in Russia published in Paris in 1788 his *Annales de la Petite-Russie*. Halynkovsky considered it shameful that Russians should be reliant on a foreigner for coverage of their

history. He knew of the work of Iakiv Markovych and Vasyl Ruban on Ukraine, but pointed out that the former was unfinished and the latter brief.[18] He then explained why, in his view, "Little Russia" was under-studied at home. "Our fellow-countrymen," Ukrainians, had perhaps been deprived of the means of studying "such an important, necessary subject" by "the dissimilarity of dialect, the unrefined condition of the language, the paucity of means for achieving local enlightment, and the barred entry to archives"; they ought to be taking steps to redress the balance.[19] Halynkovsky felt that the Kiev Academy failed to provide an education relevant to the modern world. He urged curriculum reform and the adoption of the university system now beginning to make its mark in Russia. He seemed, therefore, to be rejecting the south and to be proclaiming himself entirely in sympathy with the "enlightened" spirit prevailing in St. Petersburg. But nevertheless he retained his Ukrainian pride. While advocating the reform of the academy, he did not contemplate its abolition. He acknowledged that "for all its bad system" it used to produce great prelates and distinguished scholars; and once it had been secularized, "what successes, what works (*proizvedeniia*) might one not expect from such an ardent, sharp-witted Nation, and particularly in the field of the Arts . . . ?"[20]

Even Halynkovsky, then, whose principal concern was to take part in the wider literary debates of the day, showed a certain sympathy for Ukraine while condemning its educational system. Other journalists, less scornful of their origins, were more enthusiastic. Those whom we have looked at so far showed few specifically Ukrainian traits in their literary activity in the north. They were significant mainly for their contribution to the volume of Russian literature. Those considered below did something to shape its content.

Vasyl Ruban

Vasyl Ruban was born in Bilhorod in 1742 and attended the Kiev Academy in the first half of the 1750s. In the later 1750s he went to Moscow to complete his education, thereafter returning south to work as a translator in the land of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, where he seems to have learnt Turkish. In 1764 he moved to St. Petersburg and became closely associated with the expansion of publishing activities in Russia. His writing fell into three categories, roughly divided chronologically: literary, historical and topographical, and poetic. It was in the second period, when he leaned most heavily on material derived from Ukraine, that he produced his best work. In the first period his three journals, *Ni to ni se* (1769), *Trudoliubivyi muravei* (1771) and *Starina i novizna* (1772–3), were all failures; as a poet Ruban was little esteemed by contemporaries; but when, in between, he produced almanacs, an *Opisanie imperatorskogo stolichnogo goroda Moskvy*, and various works describing the history and geography of Ukraine, he was performing a useful function, and although "only a dilettante, not a scholar," he "occupies a fairly significant place among the many 'busy bees' of Catherine's time."[21]

Ruban's career in government developed under the aegis of Potemkin. In 1774 he became his secretary and in 1775 went south with him, where two years later he became head of the schools of New Russia. In 1784, when Potemkin was made head of the College of War, Ruban was appointed head of foreign correspondence and translator from Polish, in which position he stayed until his death in 1795. In service, therefore, no less than in his literary career, Ruban preserved his links with the southern frontiers. He expressed in his writing and in his work the increasing interaction of north and south.

Even in the first stage of his literary activity, Ruban published materials bearing upon the history and institutions of the south. In 1770 he contributed to the journal *Parnasskii shchepetilnik* a section entitled "Historical information taken from Polish writers and belonging to Russian history, about Russian provinces and cities which were once under Polish rule and were then taken by the Russians again."[22] Breaking down his article into the sub-sections

"Livonia," "Smolensk," "The Principates of Kiev, Siver, and Chernihiv" and "The Zaporozhian Cossacks," Ruban gave apparently judicious accounts, stating his sources, of various aspects of the history of these regions. Merely making available information drawn from Polish sources was a valuable service in Russia at the beginning of the 1770s, and one which few save Kiev Academicians, perhaps, were qualified to perform.[23] But Ruban went further than this and made his attitude toward the Poles apparent. After describing the final Russian recapture of Smolensk in the mid-seventeenth century, he observed that "All the same, Polish bishops, generals, and castellans still to this day employ the titles of this principate, without a trace of embarrassment, although they are empty and signify nothing."[24] Ruban seems to have been stressing that the days of the Poles were past and that the Russian title was legitimate. Accepting this standard Russian position was not unusual for a Ukrainian experiencing the first fruits of integration into the Russian Empire.

Starina i novizna contained further indications of Ruban's attitude to Poland. In the second volume he published Konysky's speech of 1765, delivered before the Polish king in Warsaw, in defence of the Orthodox against the encroachments of the Uniate Church.[25] "Neither our forefathers, nor we their descendants," proclaimed Konysky, "have ever at any time sinned against the most dear Fatherland [Poland] or against its most mighty kings.... The one thing that is held against us as criminal is our faith...."; when Jewish synagogues stand open, "where Christ is constantly damned," Orthodoxy too ought to be respected. Konysky, Bishop of Mogilev, was throwing down the gauntlet, and by reporting his speech Ruban communicated to the Russian public something of the reality of conflict in the borderlands of the empire. Konysky had been head of the Kiev Academy when Ruban studied there, and the two seem to have been in close contact. Ruban thanked his former mentor for the information covering the period 1506–1734, which he included in his *Kratkaia letopis Malyia Rossii* of 1777,[26] and corresponded with him later on the possibility of publishing his sermons.[27] Keeping in touch with the man who was supposed to have written the autonomist *Istoriia Rusov* was a measure of Ruban's continuing Ukrainian outlook on life.[28]

It was not only Konysky's speech that betrayed Ruban's southern leanings in *Starina i novizna*. Military developments in the south were reflected in the inclusion of letters "from a certain spiritual figure" of Bilhorod to General P. I. Panin, on the capture of the Turkish city of Bender; and from P. A. Rumiantsev to Lieutenant-General Shcherbinin, on the death of the latter's son in battle.[29] Ruban seems to have made good use, too, of his early days translating in the Zaporozhian Sich, for he included at least two Oriental short stories, one specifically "translated from the Turkish."[30] Still dearer to his heart may have been the section *O Kievskikh uchilishchakh*, in which the author (perhaps Ruban himself) gave a detailed account of the history of the Kiev Academy, from its foundation (supposedly in 1588) through the construction of stone buildings in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the present, listing all the privileges and favours bestowed upon the educational establishments of Kiev by the Kings of Poland and the Tsars of Russia, and promising to speak later of the curriculum and to give a list of Rectors and Prefects.[31] This section formed the beginning of a larger section entitled *Istoricheskie izvestiia o pervykh Sloveno-Grekolatinskikh v Rossii uchilishchakh*. It preceded, for example, a description of the Moscow Academy. In its arrangement the section hinted at an outlook on life which held that the good things in Russia proceeded northward from Ukraine.

The religious theme in Ruban's activity, apparent in the publication of Konysky's speech of 1765, appeared again in 1778 when he produced the first printed edition of the travels of the monk Vasyl Hryhorovych-Barsky to the Holy Places of Europe and the Near East, a work which was to prove popular and to go through a number of editions before the end of the century.[32] Barsky was very much a southerner, a native of Kiev who in 1723 set out for the Holy Places, and after travelling via Lviv through Hungary and Italy traversed the Greek archipelago, made his way through Palestine to Cairo, and coming back via Syria spent six years on Patmos, before returning to Kiev in 1747 and dying thirty-five days later. He had become a monk on the way and was particularly concerned in his travels with observing the fate of the Orthodox and the condition of their churches. Like Konysky in Belorussia, although more by implication than by direct attack,

Barsky was presenting a case against the Roman church. Western Europeans, Ruban asserted in his preface, were ill qualified to speak of the Orthodox of the Near East. The story of their co-religionists, however, was dear to the heart of Ukrainians: "In Little Russia and in the provinces surrounding it there is not a single place or house of note where there would not be a copy of [this book]. . . . One enthusiastic collector of Russian books and manuscripts paid sixty rubles to the scribe for copying it out. . . . "[33] Oleksa Rozumovsky, the principal Ukrainian at court in the reign of Elizabeth, had wanted to have the work published, but his death in 1771 had prevented him.[34] In making Barsky available, Ruban was providing evidence of one of his fellow-countrymen's fundamental traits, their religious conviction. At a time when educated Russians tended, perhaps, to be in sympathy with the secular spirit of the Enlightenment, this was a distinctive contribution to the cultural complexion of the empire.

Many of Ruban's publications in the 1770s were devoted to specifically Ukrainian themes. In 1773 he published *Kratkie geograficheskie, politicheskie i istoricheskie izvestiia o Maloi Rossii*; in 1777 *Kratkaia letopis Malyia Rossii s 1506 po 1776 god* and *Zemleopisanie Malyia Rossii.* It was no doubt with his encouragement, furthermore, that his nephew Hryhorii Kalynovsky published, again in 1777, *Opisanie svadebnykh ukrainskikh prostonarodnykh obriadov* (dedicated to Ruban's sister).[35] In the calendar which Ruban issued in Moscow in 1776, the largest of the appendices consisted of a "List of the Metropolitans of Kiev, with a short chronicle," followed by a "List of the Rectors of Kiev Academy" (offered in explicit fulfilment of the promise made in *Starina i novizna* three years previously).[36] Literature facilitating Russian study of Ukraine began, effectively, with these publications of the 1770s.[37] Earlier interest had been casual and occasional, but Ruban, by concentrating his energies, set a pattern for later publicists to follow. Closer examination of his principal works will show the precise nature of his contribution to the development of Russian understanding of Ukraine.

Kratkie geograficheskie, politicheskie i istoricheskie izvestiia o Maloi Rossii was dedicated to P. A. Rumiantsev and began with a letter addressed to him, praising him for not forgetting, even in the heat of battle, those engaged in the liberal arts.[38] The hundred-page

book was written in Ukraine, whether by one author or more we are not told, and merely published by Ruban in the capital.[39] The reason Ruban gave for publishing was that "The Little Russian people . . . does not yet have a solid history and geography of its fatherland," despite being "noteworthy in the world for its arts and sciences, as well as for the excellent fruits of generous nature, the advantages of its freedoms, and the form of its government."[40] Despite the local patriotism of these prefatory remarks, there was nothing "separatist" about the stance adopted in the book; in its opening phrase "Little Russia" was described as "belonging from of old to the Lords of All Russia."[41] The author's concern was simply to give a straightforward account of the principal geographical and political features of a part of the empire little known in the north. He conveyed the flavour of a foreign land, a land of both forest and steppe dwellers (the former more hard-working than the latter), and a land which was still subject to the danger of infection with the plague from the neighbouring Crimean Tatars.[42] He surveyed the Hetmanate's ten *polky* and their principal towns, included an account of local ranks and offices and added various miscellaneous pieces of information about postal routes, times of despatch, and names of postmasters.[43] Ruban's "Little Russia," incidentally, was very much that of the mid-eighteenth century, before Russia had advanced to the Black Sea coast. Trade routes ran to "Riga, Danzig, Silesia, Poland, the Crimea and other places"[44]—principally to the north, that is, in the days before the foundation of Odessa. The author recalled that in the Middle Ages the Dnieper had been navigable to the sea, but had ceased to be so because of Tatar attacks and the falling-away of its waters.[45] Perhaps this picture explains to some extent why Ukrainians were content to move into Russia in the eighteenth century: the south was not nearly well enough developed, as yet, to provide them with the opportunities they needed.

In the preface to the *Kratkaia letopis* of 1777 Ruban expressed the hope that his new volume would have the same success as the *Kratkie izvestiia* of 1773. The *Zemleopisanie Malyia Rossii*, also of 1777, very largely duplicated the earlier work, but the *Kratkaia letopis*, in its treatment of the history of Ukraine, marked an advance on what had gone before. So did Kalynovsky's description of Ukrainian marriage rites. It provided a model for the many

studies of Ukrainian folk life which were to appear in the nineteenth century. In describing a typical Ukrainian courtship and wedding, from the nomination of the intermediaries to the week-long festivities and the reckoning-up of the accounts, Kalynovsky provided Russian readers with the first printed account of events whose distinctive features have been remarked upon by historians.[46]

If Kalynovsky's work marked the beginning of the study of Ukrainian folk customs, Ruban's *Kratkaia letopis* marked the beginning of an even more important current in the bringing of Ukraine to the attention of the Russians, for it was the first publication of a substantial account of Ukrainian history. Chronicles, like the travels of Hryhorovych-Barsky, had long been circulating in Ukraine, but until 1777 none of them had found its way into print. Scherer, in his *Annales de la Petite-Russie* of 1788, and F. O. Tumansky in 1793, were to publish two more chronicles before the end of the century; but Ruban led the field, and in fact it was not until the journal of the Moscow Society of Russian History and Antiquities began to appear in 1846, under the editorship of Osyp Bodiansky, that the sources for Ukrainian history began to get into print in quantity.[47]

The *Kratkaia letopis* went far beyond the summary of Ukrainian history contained in the *Kratkie izvestiia* of 1773. For the period from 1506 to 1734, the part of the narrative which Ruban said he had obtained from Konysky, the Bishop of Mogilev, it consisted of notes compiled by the scribes of the Little Russian Chancery in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; the final forty years were covered by Bezborodko, newly arrived in St. Petersburg, who also added an explanation of the present form of government in Little Russia and lists of hetmans and other senior civil and military personnel.[48] The book contained information on the revenue and expenditure of the Little Russian Chancery, and "On the difference between the different conditions of the people"—the unusual Ukrainian social structure.[49] The chronicle itself, which began in 1506, the traditional date for the foundation of the Cossack host and appointment of the first hetman, spoke above all of conflict with the Poles and of the military prowess of the Ukrainians. It ended with Catherine's first Turkish war, which belonged, in the

words of the author, to the main body of Imperial history.[50] The chronicle seemed to convey the impression that the memory of the Ukrainian past should be preserved, but in an Imperial context, not a context of Ukrainian autonomy.

Ruban's activities were by no means confined to the publication of materials bearing upon Ukraine. His other activities were legion. Potemkin's Polish translator in the War College, he seems to have collaborated with a member of the staff on the translation of plays from Polish;[51] in the 1780s he produced topographical descriptions of Moscow and its surrounds, one of which has been highly praised by a modern commentator;[52] and throughout the last part of his career he turned out panegyric verse, no doubt in the interests of keeping old patrons and attracting new ones.[53] His principal concern, perhaps, was to make a living, but his devotion to Ukrainian materials may be some indication of their growing appeal in Russia.

The books Ruban left at his death, which fetched over 1,100 rubles at auction, illustrate the catholic nature of his interests and his activity.[54] Boltin's commentaries on Shcherbatov and Le Clerc, many of the volumes of Novikov's *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika*; Hobbes and Richardson in translation; Kozelsky's *Rassuzhdenie dvukh indeitsov o chelovechekom poznanii*; *Opisanie Aglinskogo Korolevstva* and *Istoriia o Aglinskoi torgovle*; *Polskii letopisets* (in Russian), *Opisanie Kurskogo namestnichestva*, and maps of Azov, Novorossiia and St. Petersburg: all these are evidence of a concrete mind, in touch with the political, social and philosophical movements of the day. Five hundred copies of a work entitled *Posetitel i opisatel sviatykh mest* (different, apparently, from the edition of Hryhorovych-Barsky, which is separately listed), and thirty-nine of *Zerno istorii polskoi* (unbound) show a man in business to sell books. Ruban had only five works in French, thirty or forty in both German and Polish, and about 130 in Latin; quantities reflecting, perhaps, the nature of his education at the Kiev Academy and his greater involvement with Eastern than with Western Europe. The books convey the impression that Ruban was thoroughly in touch with the principal intellectual movements of contemporary Russia, and devoted so much of his energy to publicizing Ukraine simply because that was the particular

contribution he could make to the advancement of knowledge. In doing so, he showed that books about Ukraine were beginning to be considered saleable commodities in late eighteenth-century Russia.

Fedir Tumansky

One of the works in Ruban's library at his death in 1795 was the six-part periodical *Zerkalo sveta*, which had appeared in 1786–7 under the editorship of F. O. Tumansky. Its presence there indicated that Ruban kept up with the work of other Ukrainian journalists in the capital, for Tumansky was one of his own most interesting younger contemporaries, and in the words of a modern authority "one of the most outstanding representatives of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Ukrainian intelligentsia."[55]

Fedir Osypovych Tumansky was born in 1755 or 1756,[56] the son of a leading official in the south. Not wealthy,[57] he came of a family with good connections both at home in Ukraine and in St. Petersburg. A Tumansky worked with the Ukrainian thinker Kozelsky on the latter's translation from the French *Encyclopédie*, and was one of the many Ukrainians who occupied the lower positions in the Senate in the 1750s and 1760s; another married into the Kochubei family, and corresponded with its leading member, Viktor Pavlovych; a third, in the nineteenth century, earned distinction both as poet and civil servant.[58] Fedir Osypovych studied at Königsberg before entering service in Ukraine in 1774.[59] Thereafter he served in the south for twelve years (1774–86), in St. Petersburg for eleven (1786–97), and in Riga for three or four (until the turn of the century); from Riga he returned to the south, and died in 1810.[60]

In all three of his areas of service Tumansky made his mark. In Ukraine he held two posts, "secretary for the expedition of judicial affairs" to the Little Russian College (from 1777), and "assessor" in the Chernihiv Treasury (from 1782). More important in his southern career, however, were the charges he executed beyond the call of duty: translating the Lithuanian Statute from Polish into Russian, acting as guide to Joseph II of Austria in Ukraine in 1780, and composing a "topographical description of the whole of Little Russia." Chosen again to act in high affairs of state when the Tsarevich Paul and his wife passed through Ukraine on their way to Western Europe in 1780, Tumansky was clearly a man trusted by the authorities.[61] He was trusted, too, by the local population, for they elected him Marshal of Nobility for part of the Kiev

namestnichestvo in 1785.[62] Ohloblyn implies, by including Tumansky in his *Liudy staroi Ukrainy*, that he had Ukrainian autonomist leanings, but a much more feasible context in which to set his activity is one of service within the *status quo*.

Tumansky's concern for enlightenment, perhaps stimulated by his time in Königsberg, made it difficult for him to focus his attention wholly on the problems of the south. He saw Ukraine in a broader context. As early as 1779, before he moved to St. Petersburg, he was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, and set about trying to extend the benefits of enlightenment to his homeland.[63] By 1796 he possessed a library on which he had spent more than ten thousand rubles,[64] clear indication that he was interested in all the intellectual trends of the day. O. P. Kozodavlev, friend of Aleksandr Radishchev, possessor of a European education, praised the first of Tumansky's St. Petersburg journals and called its author "learned and intelligent."[65] Although from early days Tumansky planned a "complete history of little Russia," and wrote to Academician Leonhard Euler asking for the loan of academy manuscripts to help him in his work,[66] later he undertook a major task of much more general import, the publication of materials relating to the reign of Peter the Great. It was in this capacity alone, not as a historian of Ukraine, that Halynkovsky included him in his survey of Russian historians in the first volume of *Korifei*.[67] Ukrainian history, for Tumansky, seems to have been only part of a greater whole.

He may have been persuaded of the need to take a broad view by Academician Euler, to whom he wrote describing his plans for a definitive history of Ukraine. Euler urged a heavy preparatory programme on the young Ukrainian: the collection of chronicles and other documents in the monasteries and private houses of Ukraine, and their close grammatical, palaeographical and historical study; the preparation of an accurate edition of Nestor the Chronicler by comparing newly discovered documents and the Radziwiłł text; the study of lives of the saints; and perhaps most interestingly of all, in that it foreshadowed the work of Slavic experts fifty years later, the study of all the languages related to Russian.[68] Euler seems to have seen Ukraine as part of Slavic culture in general; Tumansky adopted a point of view reminiscent of his advice in the journal *Rossiiskii magazin* of 1793.

In 1786 Tumansky came to St. Petersburg and found work under Zavadovsky.[69] Appointed first to the Schools Commission, within six months he had also been made a Director of the State Loan Bank, again under Zavadovsky, and was drawing up its regulations.[70] Involving himself in the life of the local community, just as he had in Ukraine, Tumansky served for three years as chairman of the St. Petersburg Department of Public Charity and for seven as a deputy in the noble assembly, and drew up a detailed description of the province of St. Petersburg for its Governor, Konovnitsyn.[71] At the same time he retained his interest in Ukraine, and secured Iakiv Odyntsov's return to the Kiev Academy.[72] Already a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, he became in time a member of the Imperial Free Economic Society, of the "Royal Prussian German Assembly," the "Royal Göttingen Learned Society," and the "Free Russian Learned Society at Moscow University."[73] Perhaps he had too much energy for his own good. Having been made *nadvornyi sovetnik* before leaving Ukraine (in 1782), he did not move on to *kollezhskii sovetnik* until the coronation honours of 1797, when he was already serving in Riga. He was twice up before the courts on money matters, and made a point of stating on one of the service records he drew up himself that he had "never been specially rewarded in any way."[74] An investigation into speculation at the State Loan Bank came to an end only in December 1796, and the fire which destroyed his books in May of that year seems to have made him ill for the next eight months;[75] perhaps this combination of unpleasant circumstances led him to take the censor's job in Riga in February 1797.[76]

Two of the journals that Tumansky ran while he was in St. Petersburg, *Zerkalo sveta* (1786–7) and *Rossiiskii magazin* (1792–4), provided the most significant indications of his outlook and interests. The first, founded almost immediately after his arrival in the capital, consisted mainly of news, very often from abroad, and of reviews of books in many languages. It was indeed, as its title declared, a "mirror of the world." Filled out with homiletic articles, "On Economy," "On the Increase of the People," "Greatness of Soul," it showed that its editor thought of himself as a man of enlightenment and wide culture. It made Tumansky a name, for it was as "the editor of *Zerkalo sveta*" that Zavadovsky described the composer of the State Loan Bank statutes, and on

account of this journal that Kozodavlev praised his intelligence.[77]

But for all its broad compass, *Zerkalo sveta* owed something to Tumansky's provincial origins. At the top of the list of subscribers, after the Empress and one or two official institutions, came Kyrylo Rozumovsky, head of the old guard of Ukrainians in the capital. Other Ukrainian names followed: Ruban, I. V. Tumansky, Tymofii Kyriak, P. S. Marchenko, P. B. Passek. Later there were more, at home in Ukraine (for the list was arranged geographically): the Kiev Academy, two Lukashevyches in Kiev, Governor A. S. Myloradovych and the antiquarian A. I. Chepa in Chernihiv, Tumansky's father in Novhorod-Siversky.[78] If he was not catering specifically to Ukrainian tastes, Tumansky was at least fortunate, perhaps, that Ukrainians constituted a body of educated readers capable of supporting his publishing venture. Halynkovsky praised the subscription system whereby Tumansky was able to sustain his publication of materials to do with Peter the Great,[79] but the editor's Ukrainian connections may have made that system easier to run than it would have been otherwise.

The contents of the journal also reflected in some measure Tumansky's Ukrainian origins. He secured a contribution from Vasyl Kapnist, for example, whom he must have met at the gentry elections in Kiev in 1785 and who was at this time in rural retreat on his Ukrainian estate.[80] More important, Ukraine was very much in the news in 1787 on account of Catherine the Great's celebrated journey to the Crimea. Since one of Tumansky's declared intentions was to keep his readers abreast of the news, he could introduce Ukraine without special pleading. But he did not refrain from showing a certain southern bias in pointing out the significance of the Imperial journey. "At last this region of the Russian world, which was formerly of no account, will also receive a life like that of the other parts of the state. . . . "[81] Subsequent issues contained at least five speeches made by Samiilo Myslavsky, Metropolitan of Kiev, to Catherine between January and April 1787, together with others made by the archimandrite of a monastery in Nizhyn, by Konysky in Mogilev, and by the Bishop of Bilhorod and Kursk; and finally Tumansky reported St. Petersburg's joyful reception of Catherine on her return, and printed E. I. Kostrov's poem on the subject.[82] The tone was "integrationist." Tumansky published, for example, a letter from the Bishop of Bilhorod to the school directors

in his area, urging upon them the need to purify their pupils' use of Russian, and summoning the peoples of the Balkans and the Caucasus to look to Russia too.[83] When he spoke out against "foreign expressions or those of the common people," the bishop was clearly doing battle both with borrowings from French and with Ukrainian. In publishing him Tumansky was perhaps expressing a belief in "Russia for the Russians"—not for the centre alone or for any one of the regions, but for all the native inhabitants rather than for outsiders.

A view of this kind found expression at a number of points in *Zerkalo sveta*. "For a Russian," wrote Tumansky, "the first endeavour ought to be to know the condition of his fatherland."[84] The thought recurred, by implication, in a review of S. I. Pleshcheev's *Obozrenie Rossiiskiia Imperii*: "It is shameful, but it must be admitted, that even now we do not yet possess a history or a geography of our fatherland.... "[85] Tumansky believed that the different parts of the empire ought to be known and appreciated, in order that Russia could make full use of her resources. He was proud of what was already being achieved. He printed government decrees on education, on the construction of roads, on the founding of the Loan Bank. He reproduced G. R. Derzhavin's speech on the advance of enlightenment at the opening of the new school in Tambov in 1786.[86] He showed pride in Russia by heaping obloquy on Turkey in a number entirely devoted to the outbreak of war with the Porte in 1787.[87] Writing about schools in Denmark, he added a boastful note: "It is impossible here not to make the remark that, however late Russia has been in becoming enlightened (as many wrongly suppose), nevertheless the statutes and the systems introduced there [i.e. in Russia] will serve as a model for the most enlightened."[88] Proud of his country and of the work she was doing, Tumansky felt that it needed only to be pressed home. In *Rossiiskii magazin* he made his patriotism, and the provincial origins from which it derived, still clearer.

The title of Tumansky's second journal, by contrast with that of the first, indicated that Russia rather than the world was his prime consideration. The journal's motto, *Et fumus patriae dulcis*, was a phrase later adopted by Ukrainian writers enthusing over their homeland,[89] but for Tumansky it seems to have meant feeling for Russia rather than for the West, not love of one region above

others. Extrapolating from his own provincial experience, he urged upon his readers the diversity of the Russian Empire and its ability to withstand cultural encroachments from the West. An article on the proper lading of Russian ships discussed how much *tiagost* they needed, or as Tumansky scornfully put it, what is "now known under the foreign name of ballast."[90] Foreign loan-words were one of his *bêtes noires*. His programme, laid down at the outset, was to print "different sorts of information relating to the understanding of Russia," in the attempt, no doubt, to remedy that lack of knowledge which he had deplored more than once in *Zerkalo sveta*.[91] He published material related not merely to Ukraine, but to Perm, Siberia, the Crimea and St. Petersburg.[92] The Ukrainian material was largely of a historical character, but Tumansky also included historical articles, largely genealogical in nature, on Russian subjects.[93] One writer goes so far as to say that *Rossiiskii magazin* was Russia's first general historical journal, since Novikov's *Drevniaia Rossiiskaia vivliofika* was only a collection of materials.[94] The journal was certainly of general interest and inspired by a broad view of the empire.

Tumansky's Ukrainian origins were significant in forming his view that the empire was the sum of its parts, and that by knowing them better Russians could reduce their dependence on the West. "Conceding everyone's right to his own opinion," he wrote in his preface to the Ukrainian materials which he published in the second part of *Rossiiskii magazin*, "I think that the general history of our Fatherland will hardly attain the necessary completeness if the histories of the parts (*udelov*) of this extensive empire long remain unknown, and on that account, possibly, perish without trace. The whole consists of the parts. . . ."[95] Tumansky went further, and included in his idea of "the whole" the parts of Slavonic Eastern Europe which were not ruled by Russia:

> Russian history, to be complete, ought not to limit itself simply to the present Russian boundaries, but ought first to study the history of all the Slavs and Russians in accordance with their true, ancient boundaries, which have passed in various centuries by various accidents to various foreign powers, in exactly the same way as Little Russia and White Russia once passed under the yoke of the Poles, and as the peoples who border on the Varangian (from of old the Russian) sea passed under the yoke of the Swedes and others.[96]

This proto-pan-slavism, strongly reminiscent of Euler's advice to Tumansky when he had been considering writing a history of Ukraine in the early 1780s, anticipated by some forty years the ideas of other, more famous Ukrainians—notably Osyp Bodiansky and I. I. Sreznevsky—who moved on from feeling for Ukraine to feeling for the Slavs in general. One of the first to see possibilities for Russian cultural growth in the better understanding of the regions of the empire, Tumansky was also one of the first to hint at what might follow from there.

He published in *Rossiiskii magazin* a chronicle of Ukrainian history like that published by Ruban in 1777, a manifesto of Bohdan Khmelnytsky dating from 1648, a letter from the Lithuanian Chancellor Sapieha to the Uniate Archbishop of Polotsk, written in 1622, and an extract from a note of 1749 on elections in the Zaporozhian Sich.[97] The first three had been collected over a period of many years, with the encouragement of P. A. Rumiantsev.[98] Tumansky was utilizing the materials he had collected in Ukraine, when he had hunted in the monasteries and the archives of regiments and hundreds for a "connected chronicle"; he deeply regretted the great fire of 1780 which had destroyed the library of the Kiev Academy, and spoke longingly of the ancient manuscripts in private hands in Ukraine, and of the information to be gleaned from parish churches with their inscriptions, crosses, bells and coffins.[99]

What Tumansky published, however, he tailored to a Russian readership. The chronicle, he wrote, dated from the period of Peter the Great, "as a result of which the Little Russian language in it, too, is already coming closer to Russian."[100] He appended a glossary of unfamiliar words to render comprehension still easier. The chronicle which Tumansky chose, moreover, a recension of that of Hrabianka,[101] was "integrationist" in tone, and therefore likely to prove attractive to Russian readers while still serving Tumansky's purpose of extending their understanding of the empire. The chronicle opened with the origins of the "Little Russian" people in the common origins of the Slavs (when the "Alan-Khazars" came from the east, "for that very language was Slavonic"!),[102] and went on to regret the passing of the Slavs' ancient unity, the subordination of Ukraine to the Polish yoke (*Liadskoe igo*), and the decline of Kiev despite the Polish kings' official confirmation of

local rights. All this was prefaced by a quotation from the Bible on the evil effects of false desire and quarrelling.[103] Twenty years later Metropolitan Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, who had no Ukrainian axe to grind but was interested in the subject of the regions, thought Tumansky's chronicle the best thing of its kind to appear so far.[104] The approval of such a sober judge was a good indication that Tumansky had achieved something, at least, of the effect he intended: that of enhancing the Russians' sense of their own identity.

In publishing the Sapieha letter of 1622, Tumansky made clear his attitude toward the Poles, and cast interesting light on the reason why Ukrainians tended to be content to make their cultural contribution within the context of a Russian-led empire. For Tumansky, the letter and the events surrounding it showed "firstly, that Little Russia, as a true son of Russia, had to be and has to be attached to its Mother, Russia; secondly, that it has belonged to no one but Russia since history began (*ot izvestnykh vekov*), and was stolen illegally by Lithuania or the Poles; thirdly, that the behaviour of the Polish and Lithuanian magnates and the Roman clergy was unbearable."[105] In his letter, Sapieha urged the Uniate Archbishop of Polotsk not to press the Union too hard on the Orthodox inhabitants of his diocese; but his advice fell on deaf ears, and the following year the Archbishop was torn to pieces by a hostile Orthodox mob. The incident, one of the most famous in the bitter battle between Catholics and Orthodox in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Eastern Europe,[106] was still able to excite a researcher working in the Belorussian archives twenty years after Tumansky's publication,[107] when the partitions of Poland were over and Russia's battle with the Union had been won. Recalling the incident in 1793, the year of the second partition, was a gesture pregnant with political significance, and one which Tumansky exploited to the full in his introductory words. Ukrainians, he seemed to be saying, differed from the Russians, but differed far more from the Poles.

In both *Zerkalo sveta* and *Rossiiskii magazin* Tumansky stressed the good things to be found in the Russian empire, the great progress which was being made and the still greater reserves of strength and potential for future development. Above all he emphasized the need for an integrated national identity, and felt

that the interior of the empire could contribute substantially toward its creation. In the last period of his service, when he was censor in Riga, he put his philosophy into practice, if in a negative sense. In Riga Tumansky seems to have been concerned above all to prevent Russia's strength from being undermined by the malign influence of books from abroad. His zeal in obstructing books rapidly made him extremely unpopular with the local community.[108]

After his publishing career in St. Petersburg, Tumansky's behaviour in Riga showed that he combined the benefits of education and the narrowness of the backwoodsman. In this respect he exemplified the part played by many Ukrainians in Russia. Contributors to a developing national consciousness, sufficiently self-confident to take on the capitals, Ukrainians were often hostile to the Western European enlightenment which provided Russia with much of her cultural inspiration. Nikolai Karamzin ridiculed Tumansky in a letter to I. I. Dmitriev of 1791, when Tumansky was inundating him with poems for publication. "I should like to show you," wrote the cosmopolitan proto-Romantic, leader of the movement for bringing Russia into the mainstream of European literature, "these deathless products of the Little Russian spirit."[109] Despite Karamzin's ridicule, however, Tumansky's contribution to Russian intellectual life was far from negligible, and when seen in the context of contributions from other Ukrainians it becomes significant.

Mykhailo Antonovsky

Mykhailo Antonovsky was born in the province of Chernihiv in 1759. After studying at the Kiev Academy he spent four years at Moscow University (1779–83), where he distinguished himself. "In the end" he became "an assistant at professorial lectures and inspector of the behaviour and good conduct of the pupils of this University who were maintained at state expense."[110] Moving to St. Petersburg, Antonovsky entered the Admiralty College as a secretary to I. G. Chernyshev, and in 1789, during the Turkish war, he was appointed head of Admiral Chichagov's campaign chancery. In 1791 he was attached to the Russian Embassy in Vienna, and in 1794 made an inspector in the school for naval cadets. In 1796 his career changed course when he was appointed senior librarian of the Public Library which was in the process of being set up in St. Petersburg. The following year he was promoted to the rank of *nadvornyi sovetnik*, but thereafter he moved no further. In 1810 he was dismissed, and six years later he died, having failed to fulfill his early promise.

Antonovsky was less judicious than Ruban or Tumansky. On coming to St. Petersburg from Moscow University, he founded a "Society of Friends of the Literary Sciences" to keep his university contemporaries together. Their publications sailed close to the wind. Radishchev, for example, wrote a "Discourse on What Constitutes a Son of the Fatherland" for their journal *Beseduiushchii grazhdanin* of 1789—and was made to take to the censor personally the number in which it would appear, in case the whole society got into trouble.[111] In 1795 the group went too far when it put out "An Up-To-Date Narrative Description of All Four Parts of the World," which provoked government displeasure on two counts: for improperly discussing questions bearing upon the inheritance of the Russian throne, and for showing too much sympathy toward the French Revolution.[112] Antonovsky escaped severe retribution, but was advised to give up writing and concentrate on his service career. He took the position at the Imperial Public Library and devoted himself to safer academic pursuits.[113] His literary activity did not come to an end, but now he published on Ukrainian themes.

Antonovsky's memoirs, begun in 1806, are full of his pride in being Ukrainian and of gentry stock. His mother was "of the ancient knightly family of Ruban,"[114] which means he must have been related to the journalist discussed above. The Rubans, according to Antonovsky, were famous in Ukraine in the mid-seventeenth century—as ambassadors, for example, from the Hetmanate to foreign powers. Antonovsky's father, meanwhile, was apparently connected with the French de Langerons. One of their number had become a Polish citizen in the seventeenth century, and then, having been driven from Poland to the Hetmanate, married Bohdan Khmelnytsky's widowed daughter-in-law.[115] Antonovsky's pride embraced his country as well as his family, for he described the French forebear as having become known to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich "when Little Russia of its own free will (*proizvolno*) became subject to the All-Russian throne (having been before that dependent on no one from a certain time, a self-governing republic)."[116]

Antonovsky helped Ukrainians when he could. While at Moscow University, he persuaded the *Druzheskoe Uchenoe Obshchestvo*, of which he was a member, to finance a number of Kiev Academy students in their studies at the university, and proudly records the distinction they achieved. They included a Ruban, Iakiv Andriiovych, and Anton Prokopovych-Antonsky, later head of the noble pension attached to Moscow University and himself a notable patron of Ukrainians.[117] The literary society Antonovsky founded in Moscow, subsequently reconstituted in St. Petersburg and not always getting an easy passage from the authorities, consisted very largely of the Ukrainian confederates he had "summoned" from Kiev. They were "so well educated," he records, that "they showed themselves to be the men most suited to government service, so that it is the exception among them who now serves without distinction. . . ."[118] Later, when serving in the Admiralty under Chernyshev, Antonovsky continued his support for his homeland. He travelled south with the Court in the great Crimean progress of 1787, and on the way persuaded Chernyshev to hire six Kiev academicians for the Admiralty. Antonovsky recorded with pride their subsequent promotion to positions of distinction.[119]

In his writing Antonovsky showed feeling for Ukraine in many ways: by publishing Skovoroda, writing a history of the Cossacks,

intending to publish a topographical description of Kiev *namestnichestvo*, and in his position at the Public Library working on Russian medieval history—a subject dear to many Ukrainians because Kiev lay at its heart. Antonovsky's publishing activity was by no means confined to Ukrainian themes,[120] but parts of it contributed significantly to the development of Russian understanding of Ukraine. In one respect Antonovsky deserves special mention in the history of this process, for a volume he published in 1798 under the general title *Biblioteka dukhovnaya* was the first work of the Ukrainian philosopher Skovoroda to appear in print.[121] A series of discussions on the importance and value of self-knowledge, the volume differed from most contemporary Russian philosophy in that it was not translated from French or German. To that extent it exemplified what Ukraine had to offer—a source of ideas within the boundaries of the empire.

Antonovsky concerned himself not only with ideas emerging from Ukraine, but with Ukrainian topography and history. In 1810 he planned to publish the *Istoricheskoe i topograficheskoe opisanie Kievskoi gubernii* which had been prepared for Catherine the Great in 1787, a "companion volume," as it were, to Shafonsky's account of Chernihiv. A copy had been presented to his superior, Chernyshev, at the time of the progress to the Crimea, and had subsequently passed to Antonovsky. That he thought it worth publishing was a measure of his continuing interest in Ukraine, and of his commitment to Kiev, "this Russian capital more ancient even than Novgorod."[122] Some years before this project he had been responsible for the section dealing with the Cossacks in a multi-volume description of the peoples of the Russian Empire.[123] At the start of the essay, Antonovsky adopted the view that the Rus' were Slavs from the southern shores of the Baltic.[124] This was a position favoured by other Ukrainian historians—Iakiv Markovych, Mykhailo Maksymovych and Mykola Kostomarov. They were reluctant to admit that Scandinavians rather than Slavs were the principal force in early medieval Russian history. Other, non-"Slavic" views were possible, as a Russian writer pointed out twenty years after Antonovsky, when discussing the background and sources of Ukrainian history.[125] In taking the line he did, Antonovsky was expressing a typically Ukrainian concern for the cultural independence of the Slavic world.

In his years at the Public Library in St. Petersburg, history became Antonovsky's first love. "While at this library," he wrote in 1812, "from the books kept in it I drew up an outline for the composition of a history of Russia in the most remote period, long before the times which the Russian chroniclers make the beginning."[126] He spoke with some authority, therefore, in his history of the Cossacks. His time at the library, however, was chiefly of interest for a different reason; political and administrative rather than philosophical or literary. The books that formed the basis of the Library's collection were taken from Warsaw at the time of the third partition of Poland. By setting to work on ordering the nearly four hundred thousand books brought to St. Petersburg from Warsaw,[127] Antonovsky was fulfilling a role comparable to that of the many Ukrainians who taught Russian in Poland or served there as officials. Ukrainians could often speak Polish, but were far more likely to be sympathetic to St. Petersburg than to the newly acquired western provinces. They had suffered at the hands of the Poles in the past, and their memories died hard.[128]

Antonovsky occupied a sort of middle position among Ukrainians outside Ukraine. He neither philosophized about his homeland nor put it behind him. In his work he did things which Ukrainians were particularly well qualified to do, and in his personal interests and prejudices he represented trends in which Ukrainians played a major part. He was a careerist rather than an ideologue, and had less time than Tumansky, for example, for a broad view of Ukraine's importance; but he nevertheless contributed notably to the development of the idea, in Russia, that Ukrainians could be valuable in both practical and intellectual contexts.

Vasyl Anastasevych

Vasyl Anastasevych was introduced in the last part of Chapter Two as an early nineteenth-century interpreter of the Poles to the Russians. Sixteen years younger than Antonovsky, he bridged the gap between eighteenth-century Ukrainian journalists and nineteenth-century Ukrainian writers on Slavdom. The horizons of the former were relatively narrow, whereas the latter developed far-reaching views about the cultural orientation which was most fitting for the Russian Empire. The later writers will appear in Chapter Eight; the present discussion provides an inkling of their significance. Anastasevych's journal *Ulei* (1811–12) reflected the range of his interests. He started it immediately after his return in late 1810 from an extended trip to Vilnius and Krzemieniec, the two principal centres of the educational district for whose administration he worked.[129] His intention was clearly to capitalize upon what he had learnt from his journey and to make his new-found knowledge accessible to Russian readers, who knew little of the western and south-western parts of the empire. P. I. Köppen, who is dealt with later, was to do exactly the same thing in 1825; start a journal after returning from an extended period of travel, this time in all the Slavic areas of Eastern Europe.[130] The sequence, Tumansky on the importance of Ukraine to the empire, Anastasevych on Ukraine and Poland, Köppen on Russians and Slavs in general, is suggestive of the way in which Russia's Slavic vision was gradually broadening at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries.

Ulei, which appeared monthly, had five sections: Literature, Biographical and Bibliographical Remarks, History, On Popular Enlightenment, and Miscellaneous. It was the historical section which best brought out Anastasevych's special regional interests. The first number contained an article, "The Conquest of Kiev by Prince Gedimin," which set the pattern for much of what followed.[131] It consisted of descriptions of the expulsion of the Tatars in 1320, taken first from the unpublished Ukrainian history of Mykhailo Berlynsky, second from the medieval history of the eighteenth-century Polish historian Naruszewicz, and third from an unpublished work of Opanas Shafonsky. The extracts were followed

by a reference to M. M. Shcherbatov's pages on the subject and a description of Naruszewicz's history as a whole. Anastasevych was revealing, at the outset, both the nature of his interests and his keenness to publish materials with which Russians would be unfamiliar. These two things made his journal unusual.

Kiev appeared frequently in *Ulei*. Anastasevych included an extract from Naruszewicz on the conquest of Kiev by the Polish king in 1018, and an extract from Berlynsky's history entitled "On the City of Kiev." He published Berlynsky again in a communication headed "On the Grave of Askold in Kiev"; and also a short history of the Kiev Academy, a poem on the 1811 fire in Kiev and the speeches made at the opening of the new Kiev gymnasium in January 1812.[132] Kiev apart, Anastasevych showed at every turn his attachment to Ukraine as a whole, publishing Czacki's "On the name 'Ukraine' and on the origin of the Cossacks," giving a list of Ukrainian hetmans (taken from Shafonsky), including Berlynsky on "The division of Little Russia into regiments" and Shafonsky on the ranking system in the Hetmanate, and promoting Vasyl Karazyn's 1811 foundation of a "Philotechnical Society" in Kharkiv.[133] This last article revealed where Anastasevych's heart lay. In describing Karazyn's "Thoughts on the establishment . . . of a philotechnical society," he said that they gave a picture "in which is presented . . . the Russian Palestine, fortunate Little Russia." Like other Ukrainians outside Ukraine, Anastasevych had not forgotten the climatic superiority of the south to the dank St. Petersburg in which he worked.[134] Ukraine was at the heart of *Ulei*, even when the authors Anastasevych chose to print included the Poles Czacki and Naruszewicz as well as the Ukrainians Berlynsky and Shafonsky.

That Anastasevych had a feeling for the language as well as the history and current condition of Ukraine is apparent from his comment, quoted toward the end of Chapter Two, on the difficulties facing a non-Ukrainian in the comprehension of Ukrainian folksongs. In *Ulei* Anastasevych published a declaration of faith in the age and purity of Ukrainian, in a commentary on "what language the Lithuanian statutes were written in" and "why the Russian language was called coarse in them."[135] A footnote explained that "By the Russian language is meant here the ancient language, to this day preserved almost in its entirety under the

name of the Ukrainian dialect in the provinces of Volhynia, Podillia and Kiev, and also in several provinces on the other side of the Dnieper." The age of Ukrainian was something Anastasevych both deduced from and applied to his study of the recently discovered *Slovo o polku Igoreve*. In a letter of 1 December 1814, for example, he drew many direct parallels between difficult words in the *Slovo* and modern Ukrainian.[136] "I do not believe," Evgenii Bolkhovitinov had just written to him in connection with another classic of medieval Russian literature, "that Nestor wrote in Little Russian, which did not exist in his time."[137] Ukrainian, Bolkovitinov argued, came into existence later, merely containing more traces of Nestor's language than did Russian because in the provinces things moved more slowly than they did at the centre. Other remote parts of the empire also retained "Nestorian" words, which true Russian, a developing phenomenon, had left behind. Anastasevych was being accused of linguistic fervour arising out of undue sympathy for the south.

Given his attachment to Ukraine, why was Anastasevych taken to be pro-Polish? The Polish element in *Ulei* must have sprung very largely from his personal acquaintanceship with Tadeusz Czacki, the Director of Schools in Right-Bank Ukraine, whom he met in the course of his work in education.[138] On Czacki's estate in Volhynia, Anastasevych had seen the archive of the eighteenth-century Polish historian Naruszewicz.[139] No doubt it was this that inspired him to make extensive use of Naruszewicz's medieval history in *Ulei*. Indeed, in the second year of the journal's life, when the inspiration (at least in the historical section) seems to have been falling away, it was Naruszewicz, increasingly, who provided the padding. Whereas in the opening historical article, on Gedimin's conquest of Kiev in 1320, the policy had clearly been to give different accounts of the same event by Polish and Ukrainian writers, by the end the work of the Poles predominated. This was probably a measure, not so much of a change in Anastasevych's interests, as of the character of the material with which he was most familiar. He was employed in the administration of education in the Polish provinces, and what he had to offer which was new to the Russians was Polish history. He was not so much working in the Polish interest as trying to differentiate himself from other contemporary journalists. Insofar as

the evidence shows emotional commitment on his part, it shows commitment to Ukraine rather than to Poland. Bolkhovitinov seems to have deplored letters from Anastasevych "stuffed with Polishness,"[140] but it was the spirit of academic inquiry, not commitment to Poland, which motivated the Ukrainian journalist. He had worked on the translation of the Lithuanian Statute into Russian, pointed out that it was the law in eight provinces of the empire, and therefore felt justified in including in his journal an extract from Czacki's book *On Lithuanian and Polish Laws.*[141] Anastasevych was providing information, not trying to campaign for the Poles. He included in *Ulei* not only work by Naruszewicz and Czacki, but Siestrzencewicz-Bohusz "On the Lithuanian People," Orechowski "On the Origins of the Poles" (translated from the sixteenth-century Latin), an extract from the travels of Prince Sapieha through the lands of the Slavs in 1802–3, Linde on the Polish writers, and a number of extracts from Czartoryski on Polish literature and historians.[142] His object was clearly to increase knowledge of Poland in Russia and to bring the two peoples closer together. It was not, however, simply that. It was to show the relationship and the differences between Poland and Russia: by quoting both Polish and Ukrainian historians, for example, on the same event, or by giving Naruszewicz "On Russia and Poland in the eleventh century."[143] More widely, Anastasevych seems to have aimed to set both Russia and Poland in the general Slavic context. This was the point of publishing Sapieha's travels, and it was the theme of the five Naruszewicz extracts in part three, "On Russians and Slavs in the tenth century." Anastasevych was not simply pro-Polish. Russians accused him of it, but his position was more complicated than that. He was concerned with perceiving differences, making comparisons, providing information about Poland. What distinguished him from his contemporaries was his neutrality in a context of rivalry. Making room for Poland looked to many like going over to the enemy, whereas in fact it was introducing an element of balance into the growing debate about Slavic culture. Most important of all, for Anastasevych, was the fact that Slavs rather than Western Europeans were under discussion. By focusing squarely on the East European triumvirate of Russians, Ukrainians and Poles, Anastasevych made the point

implicitly that Slavs had more in common with one another than any of them had with the West. This was the position most frequently adopted by Ukrainians who came north into Russia and found themselves in a world of Francophile aristocrats.

Chapter Six

Ukraine and Russian Literature

Romantic Nationalism

The forms and content of Russian literary activity had been changing in the late eighteenth century, but soon after 1800 they started changing more dramatically. While, in the eighteenth century, the Ukrainians described in the last chapter increased the population of Russia's Grub Street and brought aspects of Ukraine to the attention of Russians, they attracted relatively little notice. When romantic nationalism came to Russia, both Russians and Ukrainians made more of Ukraine. Russians became interested in questions which were implicit in the Ukrainian contribution to Russian culture. What was distinctively "Russian" about the Russian Empire? How did its traditions and practices differ from those of other countries? These questions could not be answered merely by looking at salon life in St. Petersburg. They involved the provinces and the people as well as the capital and the French-speaking gentry. In this context Ukrainians and Ukraine came into their own.

Exactly when and why the new questions arose is hard to define. Edward Thaden pointed out thirty years ago that even in the eighteenth century Russians were concerned to some extent with the question of their individuality. He distinguished three important

stages in the rise of romantic nationalism in Russia. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries Freemasonry and sentimentalism began to combat the rationalism and cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment. Then Russian patriotism received an important fillip from the threats posed by the French Revolution and the war with Napoleon. Finally, in the second and third decades of the nineteenth century, German idealistic philosophy began to make an impression on educated Russian society, stimulating it to look more closely at the question of Russia's individuality.[1] By the early 1830s the Russian historian N. A. Polevoi had produced "one of the most striking and succinct statements of European romantic nationalism to be found anywhere": "People, like individual human beings, are born, grow, attain maturity, get old, and die; that is, they exist in the manner of man with a childhood, maturity, and old age. . . . The secret wisdom of Providence . . . consists in this: each society appears at its own time and in its own place in order to fulfill its particular purpose in the general history of mankind."[2]

This quotation clearly reflects Russian participation in a pan-European intellectual movement. The lines could have come straight from Herder. The concern for the individual identity of peoples was a widespread phenomenon.[3] But did it emerge in Russia solely because of stimuli from outside the empire? Although Edward Thaden believed that Russian romantic nationalism had its origins in a period before the impact of German philosophy, he still assigned its rise to external phenomena. Peter Christoff took a different view. He felt that although two foreign "hearts" beat in Russia, epitomized by the influence of the philosopher Schelling and the poet Goethe, a third "heart" was more important than either. "This third heart beat for the individual Russian, for his self-respect, and for Russia, and it was still there when the fads and infatuations had passed."[4] By implication, the "third heart" was present at the beginning as well as at the end of the intellectual developments of the first half of the nineteenth century. Continuity, for Christoff, was more important than change. Foreign stimuli affected the forms taken by Russia's national awakening, but did not make that awakening more likely.

The difference between Thaden and Christoff is paralleled in the work of other scholars. Two books published by St. Petersburg

University just before the First World War showed how far opinions could diverge with regard to the significance of foreign and national factors in Russia's cultural transformation. The first work presented studies of A. A. Bestuzhev-Marlinsky, M. N. Zagoskin and V. F. Odoevsky, prefacing them with two chapters discussing "Romantic Idealism in Western European Literature at the End of the Eighteenth and the Beginning of the Nineteenth Centuries" and "Romantic Idealism in Russian Society and Literature in the Twenties and Thirties of the Nineteenth Century."[5] The thesis was clear: that ideas which could be discerned in early nineteenth-century Russian literature—individuality, nationality and universality—had their origins in Western Europe. Five years later a second writer, dealing with the same period of literature, approached the question of its inspiration quite differently. He placed the emphasis on continuous native interest in folk poetry.[6] "The influence of Romanticism in its pure form," he wrote, "was not remarkable for its special intensity." He considered "classicism" more influential. Both the content and the genres of early nineteenth-century Russian literature had their roots in pre-Romantic days.[7] Interest in folk poetry was not confined to the lower classes; it was mistaken to speak of an educated upper class which looked to the West for inspiration.[8]

The difference of opinion expressed in the works of these early twentieth-century writers remains unresolved. A Soviet author writing about the Russian romantics' interest in the culture of the empire's minority races felt that this interest should be seen, at least in part, "in the pan-European context of Romanticism";[9] while diligent Soviet folklorists, on the other hand, have collected enough material to show that not every native collector of folk material in the early nineteenth century could have been inspired by Herder or Schlegel.[10] I propose an addition to the terms of the longstanding debate, by arguing that changes in the political and cultural complexion of the empire in the late eighteenth century contributed to the creation of a context in which, in the early nineteenth century, romantic nationalism could flourish in Russia. Although ideological and military influences from outside the empire were clearly important, they were not the whole story. A recent student of historical writing on eighteenth-century Europe spoke of "a still largely unstudied question of great importance—that of the

differences of outlook which undoubtedly existed on some issues between the members of the ruling class in different areas of Russia."[11] These differences of outlook enriched the exchange of views which took place in early nineteenth-century Russia. Southerners who came north were largely untouched by Western ideas. They were prepared to do battle for the Slavic soul with the western-oriented writers they found in St. Petersburg. Proud of their own traditions, perhaps defiantly so at a time when those traditions were being eroded, they attempted to convey to the Russians the "Slavic" significance of the south. They did so at a time when Russians were prepared to listen. Russians were anxious to find ways of reformulating their identity in the face of foreign invasion and new foreign influences. Many of them looked to Ukraine for assistance in the task. They interpreted its significance in different ways. According to taste, Ukraine could stand for either medievalism or the pristine simplicity of the state of nature; either age-old tradition or freedom from the straitjacket of modern society. It therefore provided both conservatives and liberals with food for thought. Given this wide appeal, and given the presence of Ukrainians in Russia who could respond to Russian interest and advance the discussion, it was not at all surprising that Ukrainian subject-matter figured prominently in early nineteenth-century Russian literary activity. On the contrary, it was a natural consequence of earlier political developments and current cultural concerns.[12]

The year of the Napoleonic invasion probably witnessed the earliest indication of Russian interest in Ukraine as a focus for the debate about Russian national identity. Before then, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, Russian interest in the south had remained casual. Admittedly *Vestnik Evropy*, the leading journal of the day, often contained Ukrainian matter. It included, for example, Vasyl Karazyn's speech formally requesting the creation of a university in Kharkiv, some addresses made by Vasyl Poletyka to the gentry of Poltava, news of M. Ia. Trokhymovsky, the famous doctor of Sorochyntsi, and a report on an extraordinary community of midgets in eastern Ukraine who fished rather than farmed for a living.[13] But when the editor, Mykhailo Kachenovsky, published a patriotic ode in the Ukrainian language in 1807, he felt obliged to apologize to his readers for taking up five pages with it. He did so

by explaining that his journal had many readers in central and eastern Ukraine.[14] He came from Kharkiv himself (of Greek rather than Ukrainian stock),[15] and may for that reason have been biased in favour of Ukrainian material.

A. A. Shakhovskoi's play *Kozak stikhotvorets*, first staged in St. Petersburg on 15 May 1812,[16] occasioned more serious consideration of Ukraine's cultural significance than had been evident as a result of earlier literary activity. The play, a musical, was set in the period immediately following the battle of Poltava in 1709. Its hero was one Klymovsky, Cossack author of *Ikhav kozak za Dunai*, a famous Ukrainian song.[17] What made the play popular was its theme of triumph over the foreign invader. The opening words of the last scene, which contained the declaration of the enemy's defeat, evoked spontaneous applause at the first performance.[18] In the month before Napoleon entered Russia, Shakhovskoi had caught the mood of the hour. But his play had more than ephemeral significance. Mykola Hnidych, a Russian poet of Ukrainian origin, called *Kozak stikhotvorets* "the first Russian opera-vaudeville." Reviewing a second work in the same vein by Shakhovskoi, he spoke of the genre as a whole and of the fact that, before *Kozak stikhotvorets*, Russia had had only French vaudeville. When a Russian work appeared, with "the conquerors of Poltava" as its heroes, one was made aware of the deficiencies of native historiography: "Who among us knows Klymovsky? The names of the brave regiments of Iskra and Kochubei [leading Ukrainians of the early eighteenth century] fly past the ears of the audience, and the very uniforms of the time of Peter seem comic to them." Hnidych approved of the playwright's Ukrainian theme and his attempt to reverse the bias in favour of works of foreign origin. He thought that the heroes were "drawn from nature" and the songs, "borrowed from our Italy, Little Russia," were "very well adapted to the personalities of the characters. . . ."[19] His approval was set very much within the context of the contribution which Ukrainian subject-matter could make to the empire's general cultural orientation.

Shakhovskoi's vaudeville did not please everyone as much as it pleased Hnidych, but it went on stimulating debate about the national character both in St. Petersburg and in the south. A Russian who saw the play in Kharkiv in 1817 thought it fell

between two stools; as a Russian he saw that the play was not Russian, and having lived five years in Ukraine he recognized not a single Ukrainian among the characters. In both language and sentiment it offended Ukrainian ears.[20] The Ukrainian poet and playwright Ivan Kotliarevsky produced his *Natalka-Poltavka* of 1819 as a direct riposte to *Kozak stikhotvorets*. A play on the same theme, it aimed to portray Ukrainian life more truthfully.[21] A Ukrainian who saw *Kozak stikhotvorets* in the capital in 1823 thought that the Ukrainians it contained represented true Ukrainians no more than they did Germans; the eponymous hero seemed to be opening his mouth for the first time, and possessed neither voice nor skill.[22] Critics became more severe, perhaps, as time went on and the standard of artistic representation of Ukraine improved. The nine years between Hnidych's praise of *Kozak stikhotvorets* and the St. Petersburg Ukrainian's condemnation had seen not only Kotliarevsky's artistic response, but also the appearance of the first Ukrainian grammar and the first separate collection of Ukrainian folksongs. Knowledge and awareness of Ukraine had increased, and with them, perhaps, the expectation of accurate depictions. But the fundamental significance of Ukraine as a bastion of native against foreign culture remained unchanged.

Ukraine, as has been said, was attractive to both conservative and liberal writers. Shakhovskoi was a leading conservative, a friend of the traditionalist A. S. Shishkov and the man who, by satirizing V. A. Zhukovsky in a play of 1815, caused the formation of the liberal literary society, "Arzamas."[23] No doubt he chose a Ukrainian theme for his vaudeville of 1812 out of patriotic motives, to bolster Russian morale during the French war by writing of a time when Russians had been militarily victorious. In this respect he anticipated the patriotic novels of the conservative M. N. Zagoskin. In the liberal camp, meanwhile, Ukraine found admirers in the "Free Society of the Lovers of Russian Literature." The appearance within this society of a significant interest in the "civic theme"—the theme which became Decembrism—was marked by the publication in the society's journal of F. N. Glinka's *Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnitsky ili osvobozhdennaia Malorossiia* at the beginning of 1819.[24] This landmark in prose, incidentally, was matched in the society's history by a landmark in verse which, although not about Ukraine, came from the pen of Orest Somov, a

Ukrainian whose feeling for his homeland is undoubted.[25] Ukrainian themes and Ukrainian men of letters were beginning to provide a large variety of stimuli. Glinka, leading light in the literary society which published his historical novel, made clear in his preface the reasons for his choice of theme. He compared Khmelnytsky with other great liberators of history, Tell, Gustav Vasa, William the Silent, D. M. Pozharsky,[26] and he expatiated upon the great advantages Russia had derived from the success of the seventeenth-century rising. "Who will enumerate all the achievements and services of the inhabitants of the Don and Little Russia in the military and civil spheres?"[27] His novel opened in the high style of romantic liberalism: "The proud Lithuanians were waking up cheerfully, but the sons of Little Russia looked with sorrow on the light of day: the first were ruling, the latter groaning beneath the yoke of slavery."[28] Freedom, then, was what Glinka saw in Ukrainian history. He had done his homework well, travelling to Ukraine, entering into all sorts of traditions, listening to folksongs, speaking to specialists in Polish history in Lithuania and in Warsaw, reading the works of Scherer, Lesur and Plotho on the Cossacks, receiving "important manuscripts" from Ukrainian associates in St. Petersburg.[29] He clearly intended his novel to be what Bazanov has seen in it, a political tract. He admitted that it was not history,[30] but neither was it "art for art's sake."[31]

Ukraine and related subjects appeared more than once in the debates and publications of the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature. With so many Ukrainians among the literary intelligentsia, it was to be expected. One of the earliest active members of the society was E. P. Kovalevsky, who published a "Letter from Ukraine" in the society's journal in 1819, which spoke of Ukraine as essentially Russian and of cosmopolitantism as a scourge; not for Kovalevsky the tag *ubi bene, ibi patria*, but rather the oft-quoted *Et fumus patriae dulcis*.[32] Somov, Karazyn, Anastasevych and Chodakowski were all associated with the society in or around 1819 when Glinka was changing its orientation with his novel from Ukrainian history. K. F. Ryleev, who of all the Russian poets of the day was the one perhaps most concerned with the Ukrainian theme, did not become a member until rather late, in 1821, but he may have derived the inspiration for his *dumy* in the Ukrainian manner from acquaintance with Hnidych, who had

become a member just before him.[33]

Shakhovskoi's play of 1812 and Glinka's novel of 1819 were the first Russian treatments of Ukrainian subject-matter to make a mark in Russian literary life, but many other publications of the 1810s and 1820s enlarged the context which they established. The rest of this chapter looks at aspects of the early nineteenth-century literary debates in Russia, and attempts to show that a Ukrainian dimension was never far from the centre of the stage. If it could serve the purposes of the conservative Shakhovskoi and the liberal Glinka, its appeal was clearly wide-ranging.

Ukraine and the Language Debate

The part played by Ukraine in early nineteenth-century linguistic debates turned on two questions: did modern Ukrainian bear any relation to the language of the recently discovered *Slovo o polku Igoreve* and other monuments of medieval Russian literature, and was it a language in its own right, or merely a dialect? These questions were fraught with implications for the temporal and geographical unity of Imperial culture. If old Russian was closer to Ukrainian than to modern Russian, its rediscovery could hardly underpin the new flowering of Russian letters in the early nineteenth century. If Ukrainian was a separate language and not a dialect of Russian, the Ukrainian element in Russian literature threatened not to enrich but to subvert it.

In a fanciful "Vision on Mount Parnassus" of 1820, a Russian critic expressed hostility toward Ukrainian accretions in Russian. He imagined himself observing Apollo's judgment on poets. The author of the *Slovo* was sent to "the temple of glory and immortality," and Kirsha Danilov, that other medieval poet whose poems (dedicated to Troshchynsky) had first appeared in 1804, was given a place near Scheherezade and the author of the Odyssey. But already, the critic observed, certain fashionable writers standing by were shrugging their shoulders and saying that Apollo had grown old and his taste had become impaired. After these two—by implication, in lineal succession—came a "crowd of Little Russian seminarians," speaking "some sort of language which was neither Russian, nor Church Slavonic, nor Polish, but an extraordinary mixture of all three. What they called verse was the worst sort of prose with verse; what they called learning, a combination of the most vulgar ignorance and the stupidest pedantry." They were cast from the mountain. "But certain faces familiar to me grew pale from annoyance and from fear"—fearing the same fate because they had been influenced by the Ukrainians just expelled. Even Kantemir and Prokopovych were lucky not to be cast out.[34]

This Russian critic was alarmed by the publication of Russian literature in styles other than that to which he was accustomed. He sought to cast doubt on its value and mock its creators. Other critics, however, whose backgrounds were different and opinions less

conservative, regarded the same material in a different light. The Ukrainian Anastasevych saw noteworthy parallels between the language of the *Slovo* and contemporary Ukrainian, and although Metropolitan Bolkhovitinov disagreed with him, he influenced K. F. Kalaidovych in the latter's important 1818 discussion of the language of the *Slovo*.[35] Anastasevych was prejudiced in favour of his southern homeland, so much so that on one occasion, in a remarkable slip for one whose prime distinguishing feature was his erudition, he confused Kliucharev, Kirsha Danilov's first editor, with Kotliarevsky, founder of the modern Ukrainian literary language.[36] Medieval Russian and his native Ukrainian were clearly, for Anastasevych, inextricably intertwined. He was not alone in thinking the connection close. One of the fundamental themes of Mykhailo Maksymovych's contemporary collection of Ukrainian folksongs was the drawing of comparisons between them and the *Slovo*, in language and in content. Maksymovych stated explicitly that "The *Slovo o polku Igoreve* is a precious document of south Russian poetry of the twelfth century, and is in my view poetically one with Ukrainian songs and *dumy*."[37] He called the medieval ruler Sviatoslav the "prototype of Cossack leaders," derived the word *getman* from Gedimin, and in his constant endeavour to show the significance of Ukraine pointed out that at least one medieval chronicler, when referring to the Ukrainian Pereiaslav, called it *Pereiaslavl Ruskii*, to distinguish it from *Pereiaslavl Zaleskii*.[38]

Yet Maksymovych, first Rector of Kiev University, friend of the conservatives S. S. Uvarov and M. P. Pogodin, was not a Ukrainian separatist. He believed firmly in the unity of the empire. If he spoke of the links between Kievan and modern Russia and if in time he became one of the most distinguished Ukrainian historians of the nineteenth century, it was not out of a desire to establish the separate identity of north and south, but in order to give them both a fuller sense of their common cultural base.[39] By connecting Ukrainian songs with the *Slovo*, he seems to have been arguing not so much that the *Slovo* was Ukrainian, but that the songs, by virtue of their connection with it, were Russian (if "south Russian"). Maksymovych's integrationist attitude toward Russian history was well illustrated, in the 1820s, by his review of Pushkin's poem *Poltava*, which appeared in 1828. Maksymovych agreed with Pushkin's hostile assessment of Mazepa. He believed that the

Hetman felt a stronger affinity with Poland than with the Hetmanate, and he claimed that Mazepa "forgot his fatherland" as soon as he discovered the means of self-aggrandizement.[40] In defending Ukrainian culture, therefore, Maksymovych had in mind the enlargement of Russian cultural perspectives, not the creation of an antithesis to them.

Others placed the emphasis elsewhere. Maksymovych looked at the closeness of Russian, Ukrainian and Polish in a way which did not satisfy Ukrainian contemporaries with stronger views about the separate status of Ukrainian. One critic of the first edition of Maksymovych's collection of folksongs admitted it was "indisputable that Polish had a powerful influence on the Little Russian or Kievan dialect," but felt that the latter had "so many peculiarities that it was quite impossible to derive it directly from the Great Russian dialect, and still more impossible to derive it from Polish . . . one must look upon our Little Russian dialect as the remains of the ancient language of our forebears."[41] Even so the difference between this critic and Maksymovych was a difference of degree rather than of kind. Both were saying that there was a great deal to be learnt from looking at Ukrainian. The debate remained within the confines of philology; radical political conclusions were not being drawn. The fact that philological arguments were being conducted in the centrally published Russian press showed above all that citizens of the empire were looking to their own cultural resources rather than perpetuating Russia's dependence on the West.

The journal in which Maksymovych's critic inveighed against him, *Vestnik Evropy*, manifested perennial concern for Ukrainian affairs. As we have seen, it included Ukrainian material even in the first decade of the century. Not surprisingly, it went on doing so when Ukraine acquired broad significance in literary debates. In 1817 it included a long article by Karazyn on foreigners' ignorance of Russia and the need to live in the provinces to understand her best.[42] The editor, Kachenovsky, who personally disliked St. Petersburg,[43] was particularly interested in the relationship between the various Slavic languages. In the 1830s he was to become the first holder of a chair in Slavic studies at Moscow University.[44] But although he published a Ukrainian ode in 1807, he was not biased in favour of the Ukrainian language. His attitude

was balanced. He could both reprint the preface to the first edition of Maksymovych's collection of Ukrainian folksongs and publish the critic who disagreed with Maksymovych's view of the origins of Ukrainian.[45] In publishing some "Little Russian anecdotes" in 1822, he commented in an editorial note that "The Little Russians' dialect is already not only in printed books, but also on the stage in both capitals. It is desirable that Little Russians speak there in their real language, as for example in these anecdotes."[46] This was pro-Ukrainian. On the other hand, Kachenovsky was not prepared to give the Ukrainian language an importance greater than it merited. In 1815 he published (in translation from Polish) Bandtke's "Observations on the Bohemian, Polish and present-day Russian languages," in which the author concluded by expressing the hope that these languages would continue to develop, and that "even the Little Russian language may enter the ranks of the learned (*uchenykh*) Slavonic languages!" To this Kachenovsky added an editorial footnote: "The Great Russian language, in which many thousands of books of different sorts have already been written, is still far from perfection: when will Little Russia reach it . . . and what purpose would its elevation . . . serve, accompanied by insuperable difficulties?"[47] In his own work on the relationship between various Slavic languages, moreover, Kachenovsky gave Little Russian no place.[48] His attitude seems to have been a severely practical one: while not opposed to Ukrainian in principle, and indeed considering it of sufficient interest to merit an occasional appearance in his journal, he was not going to promote it at the expense of losing sight of the greater goal, the forging of Slavic languages able to stand up to pressure from the West.

Kachenovsky made his position clear in the long note with which he prefaced publication of Petro Hulak-Artemovsky's "Little Russian ballad," *Tvardovsky*.[49] In offering his readers this "Little Russian poem written in Kharkiv," Kachenovsky spoke at some length of the great area occupied by Ukrainian speakers. Readers, he said, already knew about Poltava and Chernihiv, about the Ukrainians of the Kharkiv area, in Voronezh province and in other southern parts of the empire; but not all of them knew about the Ukrainians "beyond the Dnieper," in Galicia, Bukovyna and the northern counties of Hungary. Russian had become a literary language and could look forward to a bright future now that Russia

was breaking out of "our closeness to the learning of Europe"; but Ukraine, long beset by enemies, could boast only the beginnings of a literature. In publishing *Tvardovsky*, Kachenovsky was showing himself in sympathy with those beginnings, and in speaking of the great area of Ukrainian speech he was explaining why they were worthy of attention. But he was not diverting the main current of his allegiance from Russian. At this stage of the literary debate there was no question of taking sides between Russian and Ukrainian. Kachenovsky was offering information about Ukraine, but in the context of a wider theme: Russian divergence from the West. He was asking, perhaps, that Ukraine be given a hearing as one element within the wider Slavic culture he was so concerned to foster.

In the linguistic sphere, where so much more than language was implicitly under discussion in early nineteenth-century Russia, the supply of technical information about Ukraine had taken some steps forward by the time Kachenovsky published *Tvardovsky* in 1827. In 1818 the first Ukrainian grammar-book had appeared and given rise to some discussion. Kachenovsky mentioned it in describing where Ukrainian was already to be found in print. Its author, Oleksander Pavlovsky, seems to have been close to Bezborodko, for in 1805 he had published verses eulogizing the former Chancellor.[50] He was not himself Ukrainian, but had lived a number of years in Ukraine[51]—apparently in Kiev, for it was the Kievan form of Ukrainian which his book represented. One of the criticisms levelled at Pavlovsky in *Syn otechestva* was that he took Kiev rather than Poltava as his standard—a criticism which he somewhat grudgingly accepted in his reply to the review.[52] But more important than the detail was the fact of debate in the public eye. Pavlovsky's work had lain by him for a long time before he published it.[53] Publication in 1818 shows that he realized times were changing. Others seemed to realize it too, for three expatriate Ukrainians were planning a Ukrainian dictionary in 1818. One was the son of Ivan Kotliarevsky, author (in 1798) of the first work in modern Ukrainian. The second was Mykola Hnidych, mentioned above as one of the commentators on Shakhovskoi's *Kozak stikhotvorets*. The third was Prince Mykola Tsertelev, who reviewed Pavlovsky's *Grammar* in *Syn otechestva* and who published, in 1819, the first collection of Ukrainian folksongs.[54] The project for a dictionary

came to nothing,[55] but the fact that three Ukrainians could conceive it in St. Petersburg says something about the pro-Ukrainian orientation of the capital's literary life.

Pavlovsky's claims for the Ukrainian language were extremely modest: "If the examination of the Archangel, Novgorod, Polotsk, Starodub, Murom and other dialects . . . sometimes evokes curiosity (*zanimaet liubomudrie*) . . .; why not also study in some measure a dialect which practically constitutes a living language?"[56] Seeing Ukrainian in this way, as one of a number of regional linguistic variants, was a common attitude in early nineteenth-century Russia. A debate in the Society of Russian Literature approached Belorussian from the same point of view. The Ukrainian Ivan Loboiko, professor of Russian at Vilnius University, had been collecting old Belorussian charters in connection with N. P. Rumiantsev's project for publishing them. He read them to the members of the society with the object of proving that Belorussian and Polish were virtually identical languages. Ryleev disagreed with Loboiko's view, on the grounds that all the words in Belorussian which Loboiko said were Polish existed also in the language of the common people of Novgorod (Ryleev's home town).[57] Defining linguistic boundaries was a major concern of Russian men of letters in the early nineteenth century. At the outset they tended to adopt extreme positions. Admiral Shishkov, for example, upheld the merits of Church Slavonic against the spectre of accretion from French. By the twenties it was clear that Russian could stand up to French. But what was true Russian? The debate between Loboiko and Ryleev contributed to the discovery of an answer. Both had lived in the provinces and had ears attuned to varieties of speech. Pavlovsky's qualifications were similar, and his *Grammar* played its part in the same debate.

Tsertelev, Pavlovsky's reviewer, claimed that Ukrainian deserved more recognition. He still felt that its main usefulness was in the possibilities it offered for enriching Russian, but he was "even ready to think" that if Ukrainian could be purified of its Tatar, Latin, German and other foreign words, "then we would see one of the purest dialects of the Slavic language of our forefathers in the time of Vladimir."[58] Pavlovsky had made no such ambitious claims. His subtitle had put Ukrainian firmly in its place as a junior relation of "the pure Russian language."[59] When, however, Tsertelev's review

took the argument onto a new plane and made it of concern to the general public—and when Tsertelev made his own position clearer in his 1819 collection of Ukrainian songs—Pavlovsky came back sharply in the reply of 1822. He had alluded in the original work to priests, government ministers, generals and writers produced by Ukraine,[60] and now he gave two distinguished Ukrainian expatriates, Doctors Martyn Terekhovsky and Nestor Ambodyk-Maksymovych, as authorities for one of his translations questioned by Tsertelev.[61] Made aware by Tsertelev's review of the possibility that his work might have wider implications than he had envisaged, Pavlovsky was mobilizing the Ukrainian opinion that had long existed in the capital. Disagreeing with Tsertelev on many points of detail, he was replying to his review because he had heard that many writers were praising it, "among them even Gentlemen Members."[62] These were members of the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, which was showing such an interest in Ukraine. Tsertelev had become a member in 1820 and Pavlovsky's argument with him about Ukrainian makes good sense in the light of the interests of the society. Pavlovsky's book, as he seems to have realized only after publication, was feeding a debate already under way.

The investigation of Ukrainian grammar was in its infancy in 1818, far behind the contemporary study of Czech or Polish or even Serbian.[63] Pavlovsky's book, as Tsertelev pointed out, was not really a grammar at all, but a word-list with examples of writing in Ukrainian.[64] A grammar was still to come. Sixteen years later, placing a new collection of Ukrainian proverbs in the context of other contemporary Ukrainian works, the distinguished Ukrainian philologist Osyp Bodiansky was to report hearing that someone was working on a grammar comparing Ukrainian with the other Slavic languages; it had not yet appeared.[65] Pavlovsky's book, however, was almost better for being no more than a beginning. It was more meaningful because less technical than a true grammatical study, more relevant to the general debate about the vigour of Russian and other Slavic languages. It gave examples of words and styles of composition that Russians might find attractive and introduce into their own language. It contributed notably to the enlargement of the Ukrainian presence in Russian literary life.[66]

Ukrainian Folksongs

Understanding the Ukrainian language was particularly important in early nineteenth-century Russia because of the large part played by Ukrainian folksongs in the rapidly developing field of folk poetry. This major element in literary Romanticism was sustained in Russian very largely by the contribution of Ukraine. Before the folk poet A. V. Koltsov became a cult figure, before P. V. Kireevsky published his monumental collection of Russian folksongs, Ukrainian folksongs were known and under discussion. A grasp of the Ukrainian language was valuable in order to understand these expressions of Slavic identity. The reviewer of the second edition of Mykhailo Maksymovych's collection, published in 1834, regretted that very few Russians could understand them, when they were "full of true feeling and poetry!"[67] It was considered desirable, not laughable, that they be understood. S. P. Shevyrev, later a principal advocate of Nicholas I's conservative doctrine of Official Nationality, thanked Maksymovych for the vocabulary he attached to the first edition and for his attempt to standardize Ukrainian orthography.[68] He clearly felt that these were steps toward fulfilling a need. They made the songs more generally comprehensible and accessible. Mykola Markevych, in his *Ukrainskie melodii* of 1831, went further than Maksymovych and wrote Russian poems on Ukrainian themes to the rhythms of Ukrainian songs—another attempt at satisfying Russian demand for the poetry of Ukraine. I. I. Sreznevsky, a Russian brought up in Ukraine, virtually began his long and distinguished career with the Ukrainian songs he published in *Zaporozhskaia starina* (1833–8).[69] Maksymovych set the contemporary interest in folksongs in the context of Russia's rejection of cultural inspiration from abroad: "It seems that the time has come," he wrote, "when the true value of national identity (*narodnost*) is being appreciated. Our best poets are no longer making foreign works the basis and the model for their compositions, but only the means to the fullest development of original (*samobytnoi*) poetry. . . . "[70] Ukrainian folksongs fell into the category of "original poetry."

It was a Russian, M. D. Chulkov, whose *Sobranie raznykh pesen* of the early 1770s marked the first step in the publication of

folksongs in Russia; but already at that time Ukrainians were active in the field. The singers who came from the south to serve at court did not lose interest in the music of their land of origin. While Skovoroda, having sung in the court choir, went home and roved Ukraine with his bandura, other stayed and propagated Ukrainian songs in the capital. The first collection of songs with music as well as words was published by a Ukrainian court musician between the 1770s and 1790s, and included Ukrainian songs.[71] Ukrainian songs were well represented in the Lvov-Prach collection of 1790.[72] It included *Ikhav kozak za Dunai*, which Shakhovskoi made popular on the Russian stage in 1812. A Ukrainian correspondent of Prince Ivan Mikhailovich Dolgorukov, describing all-night festivities at Potemkin's house in St. Petersburg in 1791, related how "among other things, a favourite Little Russian song of the Prince's—now a favourite throughout the town—was sung with full instrumental accompaniment."[73] This Dolgorukov, after a journey to Kiev a quarter of a century later, was to reflect upon the sorry state of Ukraine and to express surprise that the many Ukrainians in authority in the capital had done so little for their homeland; but he would have done well to consider the part played by Ukrainians in altering the cultural priorities obtaining at the centre.[74] Indeed, as far as Ukrainian folksongs were concerned, one collector of the 1830s, P. A. Lukashevych, implied that there was more interest in them in the capital than in Ukraine itself. While Ukraine was being Russianized, the centre of the empire was in a sense being "Ukrainized." Lukashevych thought that his collection would probably be the last deriving directly from Ukraine, because "folksongs have not existed there for a long time now; they have all been replaced, without exception, by military or Great Russian songs."[75] This was very far from the truth at the centre, where Ukrainian songs were pre-eminent. A reviewer of the first edition of Maksymovych's collection wished someone would do for Russian folksongs what Maksymovych had done for those from the south.[76] Maksymovych himself, in his 1834 volume, brought his readers' attention to the fact that P. V. Kireevsky had already collected more than 1,500 Russian "songs and verses"; but in listing his own collaborators (who included Tsertelev, Gogol, Sreznevsky, Bodiansky and the late Chodakowski), he made plain that many more contemporaries were working on the collection of songs from

Ukraine.[77] His own work was perhaps the most significant, but it was only the tip of the iceberg.[78]

The consideration of folksongs gave rise to the most far-reaching judgments on Ukrainian and Russian national character and on the vitality of Slavic culture as a whole. Their collection was far more than a mere academic pastime or intellectual diversion. Tsertelev made the most extravagant claims in the "Discussion of Ancient Little Russian Songs" with which he began his volume of 1819, comparing Ukrainian descriptions of storms with Ossian and the account of a Cossack leaving home with the parting of Hector and Andromache in the *Iliad*.[79] Ukrainian poetry was putting Russia on the cultural map, giving her a sense of native tradition and merit. Whether it was reasonable to found this sense on such foundations is debatable, but that it was being done cannot be doubted. Perhaps the most famous essay of all on the character of Ukrainian songs was that of Gogol, published (in response to Maksymovych's second volume) in the official journal of the ministry of education for 1834.[80] "Doleful Russian [folk] music," wrote Gogol, "expresses . . . forgetfulness of life: it strives to escape it, to deaden the needs and the cares of every day; but in Little Russian songs it has merged with life. . . . "[81] Ukrainian folksongs, then, expressed involvement, the confrontation and solution to problems. Analysis along these lines was attractive to believers in native culture, for it implied that citizens of the empire could be masters of their fate. In a brilliant closing passage, Gogol compared Ukrainian songs with the raindrops which linger on trees after a storm. Both recalled past troubles after the descent of peace.[82] This was a view well calculated to appeal to the editors of an official journal. It urged the Slavic capacity for surviving trials. When in addition Gogol described the songs as "addressing themselves to God as children to their father,"[83] he was providing further support for official doctrine, describing a world which, though vigorous and energetic, was nevertheless obedient to authority. This was precisely the Slavic world which the government was interested in—uncorrupted by the West, alive, but tameable.

Folksongs had implications not only for the interpretation of the Slavic character, but for the assessment of Russia's place in the world. The interpretation of their affinities could underpin Russia's drive toward the Mediterranean. Tsertelev had compared a

Ukrainian song with Homer; Hnidych, perhaps the most famous contemporary translator of Homer, spoke at great length of the relationship between Slavic and Greek songs in his introduction to *Prostonarodnye pesni nyneshnykh grekov*, translated from French and published in 1825.[84]

Despite coming north early in life, to Moscow University and then to St. Petersburg to work in the ministry of education, Hnidych never lost his feelings for Ukraine. At the end of his life he was still asking the minister for leave to take the waters in Moscow, and afterward "to spend a certain amount of time in the southern regions of Russia."[85] At least one member of his family was anxious to improve himself by foreign travel and Western education,[86] but the poet's temperament seems always to have contained a strong element of nostalgia for home. We have seen him reacting favourably to Shakhovskoi's *Kozak stikhotvorets*, with its image of an early eighteenth-century Ukrainian folk poet. In 1814, at the formal opening of the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg, Hnidych made a speech "On the Reasons which have Slowed Down the Development of Our Literature," in which he concentrated on the pernicious effect of imitating foreigners.[87] The need to be Russian was an attitude highly likely to be adopted by a man with roots in the interior of the empire. Hnidych never lost his cultural affinity with Ukraine. He identified Teofan Prokopovych as the author of an anonymous work of literature on the basis of "the Little Russian dialect of which the work is full."[88] In 1818, after the appearance of the first volumes of N. M. Karamzin's *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, Hnidych wrote an interesting account of his views on Ukrainian history. "Strictly speaking," he said, "the history of a people is the history of the thought which prompts all its actions, expectations, hopes and strivings toward a single goal, well or poorly understood, but one and constant. This thought . . . can be seen in all . . . the achievements of a people, in its very manners and customs, its life-style and mode of living, but above all in its songs and stories." "The history of Little Russia is the history of this thought, dominant, popular (*narodnoi*), from the hetman to the Cossack." The "thought" which ran through all levels of Ukrainian society was the thought of independence, a love "wild, savage, often frenetic."[89] Hnidych was out of sympathy with Karamzin's "statist" approach

to the history of Russia, in which only the upper social echelons and high politics made their appearance. He looked for a governing principle which brought all sorts and conditions of men together, and thought it existed in the history of Ukraine.

In presenting Greek song to the Russian public, Hnidych extended his views about Ukraine to a people who lived beyond the frontiers of the Russian Empire. If "songs and stories" were so revealing of a people's essential disposition, then the Greeks' songs made them part of the Slavic world. Hnidych's preface to the volume of 1825 was in effect an extended polemic with the French editor of the same songs, Claude Fauriel, who traced Greek song to the Orient. Hnidych accepted the Frenchman's views on the poetic qualities of the songs, "but as far as their peculiarities of taste and imagination are concerned, noted by the Frenchman but ascribed to the Orient, this, I think, is inadequate for a Russian reader."[90] Hnidych went on to draw a whole series of comparisons between the folksongs of Greece and the Russian Empire, and more particularly between Greece and Ukraine. He pointed out that the tradition of the blind wandering singer was common to Greece and Ukraine; he indicated linguistic ties between the two countries; he cited a Greek song which was so like its counterpart that one could say it was "a Russian song translated into Greek."[91] He argued the historical case for Slav settlement in Greece from the sixth century, and concluded triumphantly that these Slavs, who even then were "praised for their love of music," could have been communicating the spirit of their folksongs to the Greeks for twelve hundred years.[92]

The political implications of such an interpretation were obvious at a time when the Greeks were fighting for their independence, and when the Eastern Question was engaging the attention of the whole of Europe. Hnidych was claiming the Greeks for the Russian Empire. The empire was deeply involved both politically and culturally in the Greek question,[93] and as editor of the 1825 volume Hnidych provided a certain philosophical justification for that involvement. In the preface to the Lvov-Prach folksong collection of 1790, N. L. Lvov had argued that Russian songs derived from Greece, but in 1834 his cousin, F. P. Lvov, Director of the Court Choir, firmly reversed the order of precedence and boldly declared that "our songs could hardly have passed to us from the Greeks, who now have no folk music."[94] This was mere statement, not

argument, but it showed how Russia's cultural self-confidence was growing at the beginning of the nineteenth century; and Lvov gave Hnidych as his authority. This was a neat example of the way in which a Ukrainian, combining an acute sense of his origins with a classical education, directly influenced the cultural outlook of the empire. F. P. Lvov, the assimilator of his views, was the composer of the new Imperial anthem, the tune which replaced that of "God Save Our Gracious Queen" at the end of 1833.[95] He was the exponent in music of the doctrine of Official Nationality, and in writing *O penii v Rossii*, quoted above, he was partly deriving his inspiration from a philosophy dependent on Ukraine. The official world was probably not very aware of the extent to which new ideas about Russia's national identity came from and were supported by Ukraine, but in this instance, at least, some part of its indebtedness can be traced.

Gogol's Vechera[96]

The young Nikolai Gogol (in Ukrainian, Mykola Hohol) arrived in St. Petersburg late in 1828.[97] His first publication, *Hans Kuchelgarten*, bore little relation to his place of origin, but within a few months he was writing to his mother in Ukraine that "everyone here is taken up with everything Little Russian."[98] His second publication, stories set in Ukraine called *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki (Evenings on a Farmstead near Dikanka)*, intensified contemporary discussion of the Ukrainian theme in Russian literature. Published anonymously in 1831 and 1832, they were reviewed in all the major periodicals of the two Russian capitals. That they received such prominent treatment was testimony not only to the talent of the anonymous author, but to the significance of the vein in which he was writing. In 1825 the Russian critic P. A. Viazemsky had written that, before reading the Ukrainian Vasyl Narizhny's *Dva Ivana*, he had felt "that our manners and that the life of our people as a whole did not have, or had few, artistic extremes for the observer to get hold of to write a Russian novel."[99] Viazemsky had found, on reading Narizhny, that Ukraine's non-Western identity was strong enough to provide a backdrop for indigenous literature. Gogol's stories confirmed this discovery. They made Ukraine still more clearly a focal point in the intensifying arguments about Russia's cultural orientation and potential. Gogol epitomized the duality of Imperial Russian culture. In 1844 he wrote to a friend that he did not know whether his soul was Ukrainian or Russian.[100] A modern critic has ascribed his psychological difficulties to the fact that his national allegiances pulled him in two directions.[101] Not only his stories of 1831–2 but his more famous works, *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls*, may be related to his southern background.[102] Gogol was by no means the only Ukrainian writing in Russian on Ukrainian themes, but he was to become the most famous, and even at the beginning of his career he provoked the most wide-ranging discussion.[103] The various reactions to the *Vechera* represented the full extent of contemporary thinking about Ukraine.

Gogol's reviewer in *Severnaia pchela*, the most important journal of the early 1830s, congratulated Ukrainians on abandoning what

he considered to be particularlist tendencies. He felt that the time when Ukrainians were determined "to preserve in all their purity the peculiarities of their dialect and the originality of a long-past life-style" was disappearing, and that the "Little Russian school" had now "left behind this, its too local goal, and turned to deeper thought... the laying bare of national identity (*narodnost*), in all the breadth of that concept."[104] The reviewer was concerned with the wider implications of Gogol's stories. By pointing to the "Little Russian Anecdotes" that had appeared in *Vestnik Evropy* in the 1820s, and to the *Ukrainskie melodii*, which Mykola Markevych had published in 1831, he demonstrated that there were precedents for works on Ukrainian themes appearing in Russian and argued that this was the language Ukrainians ought to adopt in order to achieve their full effect.[105] That effect, he felt, consisted of the contribution Ukrainians could make toward the definition of a Russian national character. Russians sensed that their culture was derivative, but they were finding it difficult to create one of their own:

> The elements of the peculiarly Russian character are still elusive... we are already in a condition to appreciate the artificial nature of our foreign-oriented (*ochuzhezemlennoi*) physiognomy; but to inoculate it with a native vaccine, however gracefully—this wish is in itself not as easy as reprinting in Russian letters an idea of Schlegel, or setting up at a Suzdal factory a machine invented in London.[106]

The reviewer implied that Ukraine offered Russia material with which to begin defining a Slavic character. He first analyzed the various attempts at definition which had been made before the appearance of Gogol's stories, and then set the latter in the context of this wider philosophizing.

The first attempt he chose to consider, that of M. P. Pogodin, indicated precisely the terms in which he was thinking of Gogol, and showed that literature was being received by contemporaries in terms far broader than the purely literary. Pogodin was to become one of the leading philosophers of Nicholas I's doctrine of Official Nationality; to discuss an unknown new writer in conjunction with him was to make fiction responsible for much more than entertainment. The reviewer accused Pogodin of "provincialism." By implication, therefore—since the tendency of the review was

favourable toward the *Vechera*—he thought of Gogol as the reverse, "national" rather than provincial. Pogodin's "garb," wrote the reviewer, "is too contrived." It appeared that he

> hates alien things more than he loves his own: otherwise we cannot explain his too decisive leaning toward provincialism. But what is national does not consist of provincialism . . . or of old linguistic forms preserved amid the people, who in their lfe and in their thinking lag behind the new generation: it is necessary to distinguish what is Russian from Russianism (*Russkoe ot Russitsizma*).[107]

One would have expected such a criticism, perhaps, to have been levelled at Gogol rather than Pogodin, for Gogol lacked Pogodin's broad Slavic vision and extensive historical sweep. The reason it was directed at the future philosopher of Official Nationality may have sprung from a fundamental political disagreement between the reviewer and Pogodin, the one forward-looking, the other highly conservative.[108] Both saw things of value in the provinces, but different things, some tending toward progress, others encouraging reaction. To the reviewer the things that Pogodin thought noteworthy were outmoded, whereas what he saw himself was the potential new life and vigour that could reach the centre from the peripheries.

A second attempt to define Russian nationality in Russian terms—as defined by Gogol's *Severnaia pchela* reviewer—was that of the novelist M. N. Zagoskin, whose first novel *Iurii Miloslavsky*, set in 1612, had appeared in 1829. After Pogodin's "provincialism," this constituted an attempt to affirm Russian national pride by looking to the heroic days of the past. The reviewer felt that the attempt failed, because "in this ardent atmosphere [i.e., of the seventeenth century] it is scarcely possible to modify the roughness of the original physiognomy."[109] Writing in the sophisticated atmosphere of nineteenth-century St. Petersburg, the reviewer perhaps found the thought of seventeenth-century Moscow a little vulgar. Nevertheless, he understood why novelists chose to write about the Russian past. He explained why the inhabitants of St. Petersburg felt the lack of a sense of identity: "In a certain sense, and not without foundation, the character of our capital may seem, so to speak, colonial. Is it not this conception which prompted a pure patriotic soul [Zagoskin] to look for comfort in the epochs of our national glory?"[110] This was particularly

perceptive. St. Petersburg had been founded only at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and its horizons were still changing: the Kazan Cathedral was opened only in 1811, St. Isaac's was still being built. The city was full of recent immigrants, foreigners and men from the provinces. It needed an identity. Zagoskin's novel implied, at least to Gogol's reviewer, that such an identity could be found in the annals of seventeenth-century Muscovy. Perhaps this answer to the problem carried too many reactionary overtones for the intellectuals of St. Petersburg. The "Ukrainian solution," on the other hand, had the merits of freshness, and was likely to appeal widely by virtue of standing outside traditional rivalries.

Before considering what Ukraine had to offer, the *Severnaia pchela* reviewer mentioned a third contemporary attempt to increase Russian self-awareness, the attempt of N. A. Polevoi in his *Istoriia russkogo naroda* (which had begun appearing in 1829). The reviewer treated Polevoi's *Istoriia* as the academic counterpart of Gogol's work in fiction. Speaking of writers who were trying to "present the ancient Russian in his superstitious traditions, oaths and beliefs"—a category which surely included the primitive world of Gogol's *Vechera*—he said that it would be appropriate to refer to "a phenomenon in which is concentrated, and made manifest in the highest degree of exertion, the academic endeavour to create nationality: we mean the *Istoriia russkogo naroda*; but the great significance and value of this work does not permit its comparison with the Tales [of Gogol]."[111] Here the reviewer was making clear where he stood in the contemporary debate about approaches to Russian history. Polevoi, of whom he approved so strongly, was writing his *Istoriia* with the deliberate intention of offsetting the influence of Karamzin's *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*. I shall speak of historical writing in the next chapter, but briefly, Polevoi felt it important to consider not merely the action of central authorities, but also the behaviour of society at large. The *Severnaia pchela* reviewer believed that Gogol's stories contained a "proto-populist" presentation of southern society. Gogol was not approaching the question of Russian nationality in the same literary form as that chosen by Polevoi, but for the reviewer it was in the context of questions raised by Polevoi that Gogol's work should be taken.

Before discussing the content of the stories, the reviewer brought the threads of his argument together. Inspiration of the same order, he felt, was to be found in the heady days of the Russian past, source for historical novels and plays, and in the Ukrainian present.

> Little Russians certainly have their special physiognomy, or at least actively remember it . . . our latest writers, wanting to colour their historical pictures in popular shades, looked for them, as if by arrangement, in Little Russian life. *Dmitrii Samozvanets* and *Iurii Miloslavsky* [historical novels by Bulgarin and Zagoskin], published at the same time, equally laid bare this tendency. . . .[112]

The historical novels and the writers on Ukrainian themes were both concerned to convey the life of the people—but Ukrainian subject matter, in the reviewer's opinion, offered more striking material than history. Gogol's *Vecher na kanune Ivana Kupaly*, he observed, revealed the simplicity of character of the Ukrainian peasant, "from which *we* have so far diverged. . . ."[113] This was the nub of the argument: the desired simplicity of days gone by was still to be found in un-Westernized Ukraine.

The *Vechera* were published anonymously, in the name of a certain "Bee-keeper Rudyi Panko." Polevoi, whose pro-Ukrainian sympathies were clearly known,[114] seems to have thought someone in Moscow was playing a practical joke on him by trying to make him write an enthusiastic review of a work which would turn out to be only imitation-Ukrainian.[115] It was not the fame of the author, then, which earned their stories their widespread notice. It was partly their merit, but mainly the fact that they represented the latest in a stream of works on Ukrainian themes. The earlier examples of the breed, which had already awoken critics to the possibilities inherent in Ukraine, were reviewed by a Ukrainian critic, Andrii Tsarynny, in a lengthy work called *Thoughts of a Little Russian on reading the stories of Bee-keeper Rudyi Pan'ko.*[116]

Tsarynny did not believe the *Vechera* had been written by a Ukrainian. He indicted Gogol, or rather the unknown author of the stories, for failing to grasp the peculiar flavour of Ukrainian life. Only a Ukrainian or someone who had lived in Ukraine could understand its unique character.

> There are of course writers who by their works make difficult the solution of the question: is it absolutely necessary to live in a certain region to know the manners, customs and beliefs of its people? But such phoenixes are the products of centuries' development [*rodiatsia vekami*]. While impatiently awaiting such a genius, it seems that as yet we are unable, without leaving the capital, to study the popular life of the highly varied inhabitants of our extensive fatherland, whose customs constitute a whole course of study, necessary for the cleverest of them [i.e. writers].[117]

The author of the *Vechera*, Tsarynny argued, had taken on too much, as had so many others who had attempted to capture the spirit of Ukraine in literature. "Little Russia, as the old proverb there says—'Catch it or not, there's no harm in chasing'—has attracted into the archive of its traditions and into the vale of its present-day life-style many contemporary poets and prose-writers: but the efforts at descriptive poetry and at the delineation of nationality have not entirely succeeded."[118]

Tsarynny was apparently expressing extreme particularism, virtually denying that it was possible for Russians (among whom he included the author of the stories) to understand Ukraine. In much of the remainder of his review he meted out liberal blame and highly sparing praise to the sundry other works on Ukraine which were appearing at the time. Pushkin's *Poltava* got short shrift; Ivan Kulzhynsky's *Malorossiiskaia derevnia*, an important work of 1827 which claimed to be an accurate social survey, was criticized for technical errors; Ievhen Hrebinka could not be Ukrainian because he called himself by the Russian name Grebenkin, Porfirii Baisky's ode on the capture of Warsaw was in bad Ukrainian, Antonii Pohorilsky's *Monastyrka* had raised hopes but its sequel was yet to appear, and only Vasyl Narizhny's *Bursak* passed muster.[119] Gogol himself, meanwhile, was taken to task on linguistic, sociological and historical grounds.[120] Tsarynny ran through all the contemporary literature on Ukrainian themes and found virtually none of it up to the mark.

Yet Tsarynny, far from being a crude Ukrainian nationalist, was a pan-Slavist. Though his critique of the *Vechera* appears particularist, his vision was broad. Under his real name of Andrii Storozhenko he adumbrated his philosophy in a paper of 1845. "In Europe there are only three main branches of people: the Latins,

the Germans and the Slavs.... At the present time the Slavs and the Germans have begun to seek their national identity (*narodnost*) with indefatigable energy, defining the boundaries between them, opening up and pointing out the places of the former dwellings of their tribes, and eliciting the reasons for the change or the transformation of some into others."[121] Tsarynny's love of Ukraine took on a non-particularist significance in the context of this wider philosophy. He wanted his homeland properly understood, not in order to separate it from Russia, but in order to confirm the Slavic character of the empire as a whole. He envisaged a deeper inter-relationship between the centre and the peripheries. Though he approached the problem differently, he was no less anxious than the *Severnaia pchela* reviewer to enlarge the understanding of Russia's national identity.

In 1839 Storozhenko (Tsarynny) wrote to Mykola Markevych informing the latter that he had recently purchased an estate in Ukraine. He gave his correspondent the details in order to reassure him "that I have never thought of living anywhere in my old age far from our native Little Russia." Storozhenko invited Markevych to visit him on his estate in the summer, promising to tell him "certain historical facts about southern Russia" and to relate "where it is possible to find what is sought in vain in the north." Markevych was preparing his *Istoriia Malorossii*, which was to appear in 1842, and Storozhenko offered him advice on the context in which to set it. He wanted him to get away from Karamzin's picture, in which the south was not given the precedence it deserved. But despite his enthusiasm for Ukraine, Storozhenko was not advocating a particularist presentation. He urged Markevych to set his *Istoriia* in the context of the Slavs at large. "Kiev and the banks of the Dnieper, in my view,—are the cradle of the Slavo-Russians [*Slaviano-Russov*]." Storozhenko went on to speak, not about Ukraine proper, but about the medieval principate or kingdom of Galicia, hitherto seen only as "a fine historical episode," but worthy of a larger place in the history books. He had recently received information on the subject from a scholar in Austrian Galicia, and was clearly casting his net far beyond Dnieper Ukraine. He concluded his letter to Markevych with the recommendation not to publish a history of Ukraine without having been "between the Dnieper and the Elbe."[122] While expressing his local patriotism,

then, Storozhenko spoke also of the Slavs as a whole. Ukrainians were for him indissolubly connected with their Slavic brethren. The antithesis was not between Ukraine and Russia, but between Slavs and non-Slavs; or, more exactly, between those who accurately represented Slavic *narodnost* and those who did not.

Narodnost, "nationality" or "national identity," lay at the heart of the matter for both Gogol's principal reviewers of 1831. They were concerned not so much with the *Vechera* themselves as with the stories' implications for the definition of this vital concept. The reviewers' disagreement about the stories' merit turned on their different views of the extent to which the author succeeded in handling what, to them both, was the central problem. Tsarynny was not, after all, wholly critical of his subject. When, for example, Gogol described the meeting between Rozumovsky's messenger and a Zaporozhian who had sold his soul to the devil, he considered the incident "excellently related, in the expressions of the people (*v vyrazheniiakh narodnykh*), and with the observation of popular beliefs not omitted."[123] Sometimes, then, Gogol came up to the mark, but on the whole Tsarynny was a much sterner judge than the *Severnaia pchela* reviewer, because he had his own much clearer and fuller notion of what *narodnost* meant. For the St. Petersburg reviewer anything which portrayed the empire's grass roots served to offset the pernicious influence of foreigners, and how it was done mattered little. Tsarynny saw a wider range of possibilities in a work treating the life of a particular part of the empire's interior.

Analysis of the wider possibilities which Tsarynny perceived shows that he was hostile to the *Vechera* on social rather than on "Ukrainian-nationalist" grounds. He wanted readers to see the common people in fictional works dealing with Ukraine, in order that they might understand not simply that Russia was different from the West, but in what ways and by virtue of which elements in the community. He criticized Gogol for portraying a world of outdated Polonized aristocrats, rather than the common people who were the true vehicles for the expression of *narodnost*. Ukrainians did not greet one another, as they did in Gogol's stories, with the title *pan*, and if they had once done so, then only long ago and in the aristocratic layer of society, "when Polish customs still remained in the memory, which have now disappeared in a people which

sometimes tries, as we say, to toss off a Muscovite phrase (*zakidyvat po-moskovski*)."[124] The cultural orientation of Ukraine had changed, and Gogol, in Tsarynny's view, was misrepresenting it; the old Polonized aristocratic order had passed. Tsarynny's social insight was greater than that of the Russian critic. The latter saw only the fundamental difference between northern and southern worlds and realized that the south had much to offer the north; Storozhenko was anxious to define more precisely the nature of the southern contribution to Russian culture.

Critics who read Tsarynny's analysis of the *Vechera* were taken aback by the detail he went into. Polevoi, reviewing the second instalment of the stories, mocked the "whole book" that had been published on Gogol's deviations from the truth of Ukrainian life. Others, wrote Polevoi, spoke ill of his uncharitable attitude toward the *Vechera*, but personally he found amusing the accusations of local inaccuracy directed (by Tsarynny) at an author who was not writing a "course of archaelogy" or a "topography of the Little Russian region."[125] The *Severnaia pchela* reviewer, too, while praising the second group of four stories as he had praised the first, joked that it was unnecessary to do more than write briefly. "Not initiated into the mysteries of Little-Russianism," he merely thanked the "Bee-keeper" for his stories, "In the expectation that severe Ukrainian critics will investigate and assess this new production of their fellow-countryman." Despite the undertone of laughter, the reviewer clearly expected detailed treatment of the new work from someone else, and repeated the fundamental point he had made in reviewing the first collection. "We have so little of an even mediocre quality of our own, that what we have which is good we must put higher than what is foreign which is excellent."[126] Gogol's work was worthy of encouragement because it stimulated the growth of a sense of *narodnost*.

To this extent there was agreement among the critics about the significance of *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki*. They had different views about the content of the term *narodnost*, but they were glad that, as a result of the appearance of Gogol's stories, the concept had been brought more firmly into the public eye. N. I. Nadezhdin, later a "westerner,"[127] in the early 1830s still relished the thought that a pristine Slavic culture had been preserved inviolate in Ukraine, and that through the medium of

Gogol's stories it was being made accessible to the empire as a whole. His review of the first part of the *Vechera* summarized why Ukraine played such a prominent part in the thinking of many Russian intellectuals in the first half of the nineteenth century:

> Some sort of secret agreement recognizes her as the Slavic Ausonia [Italy] and senses in her an abundant harvest for inspiration . . . both her geographical situation and historical circumstances have disposed Little Russia to be the most festive expression of the poetry of the Slavic spirit. . . . Little Russia was naturally bound to become the Ark of the Covenant (*zavetnym kovchegom*), in which are preserved the most lively features of the Slavic physiognomy and the best memories of Slavic life.[128]

Chapter Seven

Ukraine and Russian Historical Writing

The Eighteenth Century

Just as Ukrainians enlarged the Russians' understanding of their identity by debating questions of language, publishing folksongs and writing fiction on Ukrainian themes, so they helped to promote and deepen the Russians' historical consciousness. The Ukrainian journalists described in Chapter Five put much of their energy into the publication of historical materials. Events in Ukraine had perhaps given them a stronger sense of change than that possessed by many Russians. They seemed to look to the past for moral support, in order to convince themselves that the Western ethos they found when they came north had not always prevailed in Russia, and that there was a Slavic world whose importance should not be forgotten. The motto of Anastasevych's journal *Ulei* was *Ament meminisse periti*: "Let those who have experienced [a thing] love to remember [it]." For Russians the last great shaking of the foundations had come early in the eighteenth century, with the construction of St. Petersburg and the opening of the "window on the West." For late eighteenth-century Ukrainians the dissolution of the Hetmanate and integration into the Russian social order were recent phenomena. Southerners' interest in history was growing. A stage in their development had come to an end; they were setting it

in order, collecting chronicles and arranging the past, advertising themselves to a Russian community which might not otherwise accord them the respect they deserved.[1]

There was a further reason for their interest in Ukrainian history: it had already attracted the attention of foreigners. Cossacks had become known in Europe in the mid-seventeenth century, when they had risen against Poland. Books on them had appeared then, and more were published in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[2] Much of the literature on all parts of Russia consisted at this time of foreigners' accounts. Russians' work tended to be derivative. "Take any of our histories," wrote Halynkovsky; "you will find in it the pen of a pupil, not of a master. . . ."[3] But Ukrainians had a special reason for attempting to become "masters" in the historical field—the fact that a specific image had been allotted them. Their historiography, therefore, had a twofold significance: local, and as part of a general concern for the correct representation of the Russian Empire in the world. The Russian south, in other words, provided a testing-ground for attempts to solve the greater problem: did Russia have an identity capable of being defended against Western misrepresentation? The affirmative answer, which Ukrainians gave in the historiographical sphere, was the same as that which they offered in other walks of life.

The best example of a Ukrainian leaping to the defence of his homeland, and by implication to the defence of the empire at large, was Mykola Markevych's attack of 1831 on J. B. Scherer's *Annales de la Petite-Russie* of 1788. There were other attempts in the 1830s to correct foreigners' accounts,[4] but Markevych's critique was particularly striking because the work of which he disapproved was one of the few which took a favourable view of Ukrainians. Markevych was not prepared to accept even sympathetic treatment from the pen of a non-native.

Scherer, a German who had served in Russia and who had worked hard at collecting materials,[5] was at pains to defend "Little Russians" and Zaporozhian Cossacks against the "vague ideas" that people had acquired about them from knowledge of earlier troubles in Poland and from the wars in which Russians had been involved. "The Cossacks of Ukraine were a peaceful people . . . seeing in time that others thought only of crushing them, is it surprising that the removal of an unbearable yoke put the sword in their hands and

strengthened them in their taste for independence?" If the Cossacks took revenge for attacks made on their inherited liberty, did they not at the same time "hold back the Crescent and repulse the Tatars?"[6] In looking at the seventeenth-century conflict between Poles and Cossacks, Scherer argued that it was not at all clear who was in the right. The Zaporozhian Cossacks, he said, had disappeared from the stage, and for that reason their depredations had been condemned; "insurrection is a crime," Scherer wrote ironically, "when the forces do not correspond to the undertakings."[7] He was championing a small community against the big battalions. When he came, in the course of his narrative, to describe the abolition of the Zaporozhian Sich, he gave a list, which could hardly be bettered, of the reasons why integration of north and south was difficult.[8]

Scherer's iconoclastic approach to Cossack history endeared him neither to other foreigners nor to Ukrainians. Halynkovsky, admittedly, praised *Annales de la Petite-Russie*.[9] C.-L. Lesur, however, the next foreigner to write at length about the Cossacks, criticized Scherer for dealing only with the Hetmanate and the Zaporozhians, instead of with the Cossacks as a whole. He believed Scherer's work was poorly organized.[10] Markevych criticized Scherer not so much from a historical as from an anthropological and ethnographical point of view. Many Russians, he wrote, "having no better descriptions of Little Russians than that of Scherer," used to ask him whether the German's picture was accurate.[11] In consequence, Markevych started his notes to a volume of "Ukrainian melodies"—Russian poems to the rhythm of Ukrainian folk-tunes—with an extract from Scherer designed to show "how easily [travellers] fall for the stories of tricksters who tease them."[12] Markevych was greatly irritated by Scherer's repeated mistakes about Ukrainian customs. He could imagine the author asking his friends for local colour to dress up the chronicle which had fallen into his hands: "What comes out of it? Europe reads and guffaws. . . ."[13] Scherer thought that Ukrainians were not yet safe from the Tatars and that they were still living in the "Golden Age." Ukraine, Markevych argued, was both more advanced and less fortunate than that. What was needed was more concrete information about her, supplied by men with native understanding.

The most important aspect of Markevych's criticism of Scherer was his concern for Ukraine's place in the European rather than the domestic context. In Markevych's view the two sides at issue were not Ukraine and Russia, but Russia and the West. Arguments about Ukraine exemplified the larger contemporary question of Russia's place in the world. When Markevych came to work on his own history of Ukraine, later in the 1830s, Mykola Rigelman encouraged him by saying that such a history would be of service to "the whole Fatherland," and that Markevych would "deliver us Little Russians from the ridiculous slander with which travellers abuse us in their magazine articles. . . ."[14] The two goals were closely connected: accurate representation of a part of the empire would enhance the prestige of the empire as a whole.

The stimulus provided by foreigners' accounts of Ukraine encouraged Ukrainians to take an interest in their past. But the other stimuli were perhaps of prior importance: the sense of the end of an epoch and the need to make an impression on the Russians. Few historians in the north took an interest in Ukraine in the eighteenth century.[15] The onus rested on southerners to make their case. Ruban and Tumansky were the first to respond to the challenge, and a number of others recognized the need before Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky produced the first substantial history of Ukraine in 1822. Iakiv Markovych's *Zapiski o Malorossii*, which appeared in St. Petersburg in 1798, issued from a strongly Ukrainian circle. Markovych had been patronized by Dmytro Troshchynsky on arriving in the capital,[16] and dedicated his book to him. He received help from the south in the form of material gathered over many years by one of the best-known of the local antiquaries, A. I. Chepa. In the interests, perhaps, of reaching a wider audience and achieving the recognition of Ukraine in Russia, Chepa had been prepared to part with his life's work. When Markovych committed suicide in 1804, Chepa lost almost all of it, and in 1810, when by chance he got two volumes back, he was still fretting.[17] Markovych planned a work in several volumes, and intended to include in each part articles on the history and contemporary condition of Ukraine, explanation of the character of its inhabitants, hydrographic and topographical descriptions, and an enumeration of the different minerals, plants and animals to be found in the various regions.[18] The single volume which appeared, a

hundred pages long, contained elements of all these things and promised well for the future. The prerequisites for a long-term publication—patronage at the centre, information from Ukraine—seemed to be present; but the time, apparently, was not yet ripe. The ideological motivation underlying the work was the same as that influencing other Ukrainian writers. Markovych wanted to remedy ignorance of Ukraine, a land which the foreigner Linnaeus had been surprised to discover had attracted neither scientists nor historians.[19] He insisted on the Slavic rather than the Scandinavian origins of the Rus', distancing himself from the "Normanist" view of the Russian historian I. N. Boltin.[20] Like his distant relation Mykola Markevych, he stressed the internal cultural resources of the Russian Empire. He did not succeed, however, in completing his ambitious publishing project, but new circumstances and a more stable personality enabled the next major Ukrainian historian to make a greater mark.

Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky

Bantysh-Kamensky (1788–1850) was a generation away from his Ukrainian origins, and perhaps for that reason both curious about them and able to see the south in perspective. In writing his *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, first published in 1822 and rewritten for the second edition of 1830, he thought of himself as "Happy, in that I have paid off the debt of gratitude to the country of my fathers!"[21] In discovering the history of Ukraine, he was finding out about his own background. His upbringing had been Moscow-orientated, for his father had come from Kiev to work in the Moscow archive of the College of Foreign Affairs, of which he was the head at his death in 1814. Bantysh-Kamensky's property, at least in 1817, was entirely in the provinces of Moscow and Iaroslav, and he had himself become a servant of the Moscow archive at the age of twelve.[22] Before being appointed in 1816 to the staff of N. G. Repnin, Military Governor of Ukraine, he had seen the world. In 1808 he had been sent to Belgrade by the ministry of foreign affairs, and in 1810 had published a book entitled *Puteshestvie v Moldaviiu, Valakhiiu i Serbiiu*, which was one of the earliest accounts by a Russian traveller of a journey to other parts of the Slavic world.[23] It apparently contained an engraving of one side of the tomb of Prince Iaroslav, and if so showed that Bantysh-Kamensky was already interested in Kiev and its antiquities.[24] He was soon well qualified to set them in a pan-European context. In August 1814 he was sent to Paris with news of the Russian ratification of the peace treaty. From there he went to the Congress of Vienna, where he was in K. V. Nesselrode's retinue. In June 1816 he was attached to the Naples mission, but it seems unlikely that he went there, because two months later he was seconded to the Ukrainian administration, while remaining on the staff of the Foreign Ministry. The preface to the first edition of his study of Ukrainian history was dated "Poltava, 29 July 1817."[25] The work was commissioned by Bantysh-Kamensky's superior, Repnin, who provided him with many sources and participated directly in the first volume, writing the account of the battle of Berestechko himself.[26] Indeed, it may have been solely to fulfil Repnin's desire for a history of the area he

was governing that Bantysh-Kamensky went south, for as soon as the work had appeared, he was declaring his intention of leaving Ukraine.[27]

Because of the involvement of the local governor, Bantysh-Kamensky's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* was almost an official history. He was able to convey the importance of a region of the empire without detracting from the authority of the centre. The first edition earned the approval of V. P. Kochubei, minister of internal affairs (no mean feat in the light of Kochubei's highly ambivalent attitude toward his own Ukrainian origins).[28] It also earned the author promotion to the rank of *statskii sovetnik*.[29] The minister of education accepted a presentation copy with gratitude and passed on two more to the Empress and Empress Dowager.[30] Bantysh-Kamensky was allowed to dedicate the second edition, that of 1830, to the Tsar. "Little Russia," Bantysh-Kamensky wrote to Nicholas I, "has not hitherto received a detailed study in the language of the fatherland." He meant that it had been studied only in Western languages. Presenting its history in Russian was a contribution to the definition of Russia's place in the world. "The interesting but sometimes prejudiced narratives of foreigners," wrote Bantysh-Kamensky, "have been left without investigation of any kind."[31] He saw Ukraine as part of Russia, whose history, properly treated, could add to the vitality of Imperial culture.

At the same time Bantysh-Kamensky did not abandon the sense of Ukraine's uniqueness. On the contrary, he made the point implicitly that Ukraine's uniqueness might provide the empire with something it lacked.

Ukraine deserved separate study because it was

> a land abounding in events, where every town and practically every village speak of the glory of her [Little Russia's] inhabitants, where from of old honour has flowered, in the heart of which repose the ashes of our first Lawgiver and of several wise rulers; a land true to God when in fetters, true to the Tsars in time of enemy invasion; a land which adorned the age of Peter and of Catherine with many worthy sons, and which to this day prides itself on their offshoots.[32]

For Bantysh-Kamensky, then, Ukraine was loyal to the centre, but had a strong and legitimate sense of its own worth.

Bantysh-Kamensky undoubtedly saw himself as one of the "offshoots" of the distinguished Ukrainians of the eighteenth

century. His father, as we have seen,[33] had provided something of a focal point for Ukrainians in Moscow. In a long work published in 1805, but written at the time of the third partition of Poland, Mykola Bantysh-Kamensky had adopted a classic "Ukrainian" stance in the emnity he displayed toward the Uniate Church. "All the Poles' disclaimers, reprimands and excuses," he wrote "do not succeed in justifying them." He described in graphic detail the Uniates' imprisonment of the Orthodox priests, their exhaustion of the common people with taxes and labour services, the cursing of dead bodies and the profanation of the holy mysteries.[34] Bantysh-Kamensky showed his admiration of his father by including Karamzin's praise of him in a footnote,[35] and showed family feelings again when he included his great-uncle Amvrosii, Metropolitan of Moscow, in a survey of eighteenth-century Ukrainian writers, carefully recording his heroic death at the hands of the mob during the plague of 1771.[36] With forebears like this, and relatives still in Kiev,[37] it was hardly surprising that the younger Bantysh-Kamensky felt a "debt of gratitude" to Ukraine, or that he took pains to pay it off.

He drew heavily on the local chronicle-collecting which had preceded him, and his work was on the whole well received by Ukrainians. The *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, therefore, grew out of and was consonant with southern traditions. By producing a second edition in response to the criticisms levelled at the first, meeting those criticisms and making use of new materials, Bantysh-Kamensky showed the extent of his commitment. He was above all a scholar. What annoyed him about Scherer's *Annales* was that the author confused the reader by not making clear what sources he was relying on at a given moment.[38] Bantysh-Kamensky declared that he was more concerned with preserving charters from the ravages of time than with beauty of style.[39] He gave a detailed list of his sources in both editions of his work. He described Chepa, perhaps the most assiduous of all the antiquarians on whom he was dependent, as a personal friend, and he related the sad story, mentioned above, of the fourteen folio books which Chepa lost in St. Petersburg after the death of Iakiv Markovych.[40] Bantysh-Kamensky's source-list was a virtually complete guide to the work which had preceded him, and included both publications by foreigners and work in Ukraine which had remained

unpublished. Evgenii Bolkhovitinov despaired of being able to add anything to it. A new arrival in Kiev as Metropolitan, in his time there he had learnt of only one unpublished work on Ukraine with which he had been unfamiliar; this, the work of Rigelman, was already on Bantysh-Kamensky's list.[41] When, in the 1840s, the Moscow Society of Russian History and Antiquities decided to publish materials on Ukrainian history, it naturally turned to Bantysh-Kamensky for help.[42]

Yet the 1822 edition of the *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* was far from perfect. Criticism of it turned on the fact that it began, in effect, with Bohdan Khmelnytsky's revolt, and dealt only with the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Bantysh-Kamensky's vision of the separate contribution of Ukraine to the empire was limited by his view that before Khmelnytsky "Little Russian history was united totally with Russian and Polish."[43] He therefore devoted only a brief introduction to the earlier period. The chronicles of Ruban and Tumansky, by contrast, had gone back at least as far as the conventional date for the origin of the Cossack host (1506). As Bolkhovitinov put it to Bantysh-Kamensky, "The only regret of all those who have read your history is that your introduction is very short. You could have written a little more on the origin of the Cossacks. . . ."[44] Perhaps Bantysh-Kamensky, who at the time of writing the first edition was head of chancery to the Ukrainian Governor-General, was reluctant to touch upon a subject which was politically contentious. Repnin, deeply involved with the Cossack question himself,[45] may have advised his subordinate not to complicate matters.

Reviewing the 1822 edition, the Ukrainian Oleksa Martos agreed with Bolkhovitinov that Bantysh-Kamensky had not said enough about the Cossacks' origins. He conceded that the *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* would please Ukrainians as the first detailed work of its kind, but believed

> that Ukraine of old, which consisted of more than the provinces of Chernihiv and Poltava, will probably require *another history*, especially up to its fragmentation into parts [i.e., up to the end of the Kievan state]. It will require the reasons and the bases of the reasons for the marvellous composition of the Cossack people to be laid bare. The foreign authors offer an enlightened and hard-working writer a broad field for working upon.[46]

The last sentence of the quotation embodied a criticism other than that concerning the origins of the Cossacks. In feeling that Bantysh-Kamensky had relied too heavily on the native Ukrainian materials and had not ranged widely enough, Martos was trying to set the *Istoriia* in a European context. He accused Bantysh-Kamensky of lacking flair, of including too many things like "the complaint of a certain man of Zvenigorod against a Colonel Kapnist." There was not enough about more striking figures like Prokopovych and Skovoroda. The reviewer wanted more use of the three "fathers of Ukrainian history," the seventeenth-century foreigners Pierre Chevalier, Beauplan and Pastorius ab Hirtemberg.[47]

Bantysh-Kamensky responded to these criticisms in the edition of 1830. He changed his title from *History of Little Russia from the Time of its Attachment to the Russian State under Aleksei Mikhailovich, with a Brief Survey of the Pristine Condition of the Region* to *History of Little Russia.* While keeping the work in three volumes, he now devoted the entire first volume to Ukraine before Bohdan Khmelnytsky. He added nine new manuscript sources (including the *Istoriia Rusov*) and fifteen new printed sources (seven of foreign provenance, including Beauplan and Chevalier; Pastorius had been used in the 1822 edition).[48] Perhaps because he was now free from a sense of responsibility to the official administration of Ukraine, Bantysh-Kamensky was able to enter more fully into the contemporary debate about Russian ethnicity and the empire's cultural identity. Certainly the second edition of the *Istoriia* became one of the focal points of that debate.

Bantysh-Kamensky failed to satisfy the principal reviewer of his second edition, the Russian journalist and historian N. A. Polevoi. However much he had advanced upon the 1822 edition, the proto-Slavophils for whom Ukraine was an inspiration wanted more. Polevoi took a much more "populist" approach to Imperial society than that which he found in Bantysh-Kamensky. Bantysh-Kamensky's account was simply a "year-by-year recitation of events" and gave no sense of the difference between Ukraine and Russia. To read it, argued Polevoi, you would think that "Little Russia" differed from Moscow province no more than a province like Iaroslav or Vladimir; and even this degree of difference, Polevoi continued, came out only in the last chapter of the work, where the

author attempted a general characterization of Ukraine. For Polevoi the differences between north and south were much greater than Bantysh-Kamensky allowed. "The inhabitants of the north will never conceive the sight presented, for example, by the flow of the Psiol, hidden in the green of its banks."[49] Apart from the physical differences, there was a still more important spiritual difference. The minorities, wrote Polevoi, "are ours, but not us." The Russians could impart their culture to the leaders of the provincial communities, but not to whole societies. Ukrainian political institutions had been abolished, but Ukrainian society remained tenaciously distinct, and this, in Polevoi's view, Bantysh-Kamensky completely failed to convey.[50]

If Kochubei, Imperial Chancellor at the time Polevoi was writing, strove to present himself as "more Russian than the Russians,"[51] Polevoi was apparently trying to show that he could be "more Ukrainian than the Ukrainians." Ukrainian nationalism was one of the charges levelled against him by S. S. Uvarov in 1834, when the minister was bent on closing down his journal.[52] In reality, Polevoi did not believe in Ukrainian independence. He was merely using Ukraine as a weapon in a greater battle: the battle with Karamzin over "statist" versus "populist" history. This will be treated more fully in the next section. Polevoi objected principally to Bantysh-Kamensky's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* because it concentrated on political rather than social history. Because, in Polevoi's view, Ukrainian society was so obviously different from that of Russia, its history could not be presented purely in terms of political developments. Polevoi pointed out that "Half of Little Russia, and what is more important the heartland (*gnezdo*) of Little Russia, in ancient times were not Russian provinces."[53] Kiev had not controlled that part of the left bank of the Dnieper which was now at the centre of the province of "Little Russia." Polevoi thought that the Ukrainian society in which he was interested emerged only after the Tatar invasions and the appearance of the Cossacks in response to the need for resistance. The Cossacks were therefore a wholly non-Russian phenomenon. Bantysh-Kamensky took the "official" line when he described Ukraine as true to God even when fettered, and to the Tsars even when occupied by enemies. What annoyed Polevoi about Bantysh-Kamensky's work was that it was "all old hat, all Karamzinian."[54] His review had the same significance as the

reviews of Gogol's *Vechera*; it showed not so much that Ukraine was dear to Russian hearts, but that the principal intellectual debates of the day were being conducted partly on the basis of Ukrainian data. The region was sustaining quarrels which went beyond its intrinsic interest.

Karamzin and Chodakowski[55]

The "southern" element in the response to Karamzin's *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo* placed Ukraine's importance in context. The *History*, which appeared in twelve volumes between 1818 and 1829, was the biggest single publishing event in early nineteenth-century Russia. In 1790 Karamzin had written that "until now we have had no good history of Russia, that is, one written with philosophical understanding, a critical spirit, and noble eloquence."[56] His magnum opus remedied this prime deficiency in native culture. The *History* was an immediate best-seller. The three thousand copies of the first eight volumes, published in 1818, sold out within a month.[57] Pushkin wrote that "Ancient Russia seemed to have been discovered by Karamzin just as Columbus discovered America,"[58] and Prince P. A. Viazemsky called Karamzin's *History* "an epoch-making event [*epokha*] in the civil, philosophical and literary history of our people."[59] Karamzin had contributed significantly to the promotion of Russian national consciousness. He wrote in a draft of his preface that "history is for a people what the Bible is for a Christian,"[60] and in publishing the fruit of fifteen years' work he provided Russians with a "bible" of their past which they had hitherto lacked.[61]

Karamzin's image of the Russian past, however, failed to find universal acceptance. Its nature was summarized in the closing words of his dedication to Alexander I: "the history of the people belongs to the Tsar."[62] Already there were Russians who felt otherwise. The first group of objectors, those who felt Karamzin was simply too conservative, included the future Decembrist Nikita Muravev, who wrote a severe indictment of the *History* which remained unpublished until 1861.[63] Another Decembrist, Nikolai Turgenev, may have been the author of an anonymous epigram of 1823 which vilified Karamzin for demonstrating that "it is possible to think very badly and write very well."[64] Even Pushkin, who spoke in complimentary terms of the *History* and eagerly awaited the volumes which followed those of 1818,[65] said sarcastically that the "elegance and simplicity" of Karamzin's presentation showed "the need for autocracy and the charms of the knout."[66] These statements of straightforward political disagreement with Karamzin

represented the first sort of opposition to his *History*.

A second school of thought considered Karamzin insufficiently scholarly. Viazemsky, on the whole an admirer, felt that Karamzin ought to have studied the language as well as the culture of medieval Russia, in order the more fully to dissipate Russians' ignorance of their native land.[67] N. S. Artsybashev was far more vituperative. Almost immediately after the first eight volumes had been published, he wrote to a friend: "In vain scholars have been trying for a whole century to purify Russian history of absurdities! Idiocy turns up and circulates them once more in the wide world . . . it will take you a long time to enumerate all the ridiculous features of this book, which crop up on page after page."[68] Artsybashev was to be a long-standing adversary of Karamzin.[69] Like M. T. Kachenovsky, another opponent of Karamzin (and the editor of *Vestnik Evropy*), he belonged to the "sceptical" tradition in Russian historiography and was reluctant to accept broad interpretative claims. Karamzin's scholarship has been praised by a modern expert,[70] but in 1818 his antiquarian opponents were not the least of his enemies.

The most interesting early reaction to Karamzin's *History*, however, was that of the Pole Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski. It encapsulated the political and academic reactions, and added a third dimension: the "southern" or provincial approach to the question of defining the empire's cultural identity. Chodakowski believed that Karamzin focused too narrowly on the centre and the upper classes, on Russia and the gentry rather than on the outlying provinces and the peasantry. Although he was Polish, most of the evidence he employed in criticizing Karamzin came from Ukraine. He epitomized the phenomenon of regional interaction which Ukrainians stood for in many areas of Imperial Russian life.

Chodakowski hoped to strengthen the Slavs' sense of their common identity by working from the bottom upward. He saw opportunities for cultural integration in those Slavs who were free from alien sophistication. These in his view were of two types: the community as a whole before its conversion to Christianity; and the contemporary peasantry. To substantiate his beliefs, Chodakowski worked on two sorts of evidence: archaeological evidence provided by the remains of pagan Slavic settlements (*gorodishcha*), and the folksongs of Western Ukraine. In putting this evidence before the

Russian public he broadened the debate about the Slavs' cultural identity. His involvement in the debate was short-lived, but his striking personality and substantial manuscript legacy ensured the perpetuation of his memory.

Chodakowski falsified his biography in a submission of 1820 to the Russian ministry of education,[71] and succeeded in deceiving most of his contemporaries.[72] The true outline of his life was first summarized by A. N. Pypin in 1886.[73] He concealed not only his real name, Adam Czarnocki, but the part of Poland from which he came and the fact that he had deserted from the Russian army. He admitted the true year of his birth, 1784, but changed the day and the month. He claimed to originate in the region of Chełm, not far from Zamość and Lublin, a part of Poland which became Austrian under the third partition, entered the Grand Duchy of Warsaw in 1809, and passed to the Congress Kingdom in 1815. Chodakowski gave no inkling that he had been a Russian citizen since 1793. In reality he came from the part of Belorussia which Catherine the Great acquired under the second partition. He was at school in Slutsk between 1797 and 1801 and then studied law and occupied various private positions in the area of Minsk and Nowogródek. The Russian authorities arrested him in 1809, after intercepting a letter in which he expressed readiness to cross the frontier into the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and fight for the Polish forces sponsored by Napoleon. He was forcibly enlisted into the Russian army. In 1811, finding himself once more near his place of origin, he deserted to the Poles and took with him the plans of the fortress of Bobruisk. He fought against the Russians until 1813, and the following year seems to have taken up the studies which in due course brought him to St. Petersburg.[74] In 1820 he had to invent a curriculum vitae because, although Alexander I had issued an amnesty for those Poles who had fought under the aegis of the French, it hardly included deserters from the Russian army, let alone one who had departed bearing military secrets.

Between 1814 and 1818 Chodakowski collected a mass of ethnographic and archaeological evidence. He roamed Western Ukraine on foot, talking to the peasants, collecting folksongs, and developing a thesis about the origins and vitality of native Slavic culture. In 1817 he acquired the patronage of Prince Adam Czartoryski, in 1818 that of Count N. P. Rumiantsev, and in 1820

the sponsorship of the Russian ministry of education. Between 1818 and 1820 he published three major articles.[75] Denied further official sponsorship in 1823, he spent the remainder of his short life in penury in Moscow and the province of Tver. The subsequent history of his manuscripts, which was complicated and exciting, has been described elsewhere.[76]

Chodakowski made a great impression on his contemporaries. While trying retrospectively to damage his reputation, Ksenofont Polevoi succeeded in the 1850s in conveying a striking picture of his fervour and eccentricity.[77] At the same remove, Ivan Loboiko recalled how Chodakowski had appealed to the imagination of N. I. Grech and Admiral Shishkov.[78] Historians have been equally impressed in recent years. F. Ia. Priima described Chodakowski's name as "half-forgotten" in 1951,[79] but the epithet is no longer applicable. Both in Eastern Europe and in the West Chodakowski has been resurrected. In Poland Julian Maślanka described Chodakowski's place in Polish culture and influence on Polish Romantic literature. Two years later he published some of Chodakowski's essays and much of his correspondence. The editors of Chodakowski's collection of Ukrainian folksongs, published in Kiev in 1974, claimed that he was the greatest Slavic folksong-collector of the Romantic period. Chodakowski was mentioned in the principal English-language account of nineteenth-century Polish history, and in a major Western analysis of popular culture in early modern Europe. Peter Brock made a separate study of him in 1976. His archaeological theories have been accorded more respect than they were in his lifetime. Why was he of such interest? Because the unsophisticated regions of the empire were already in Russians' minds at the time of his appearance, and because he dramatized their importance.[80]

Chodakowski's prime motivation may have been his commitment to the cause of Poland. Maślanka rooted his thinking in the ideas of earlier Polish writers.[81] It seems likely that he was particularly influenced by the activities of Tadeusz Czacki, founder of the lycée at Krzemieniec in Volhynia. In his false autobiography Chodakowski claimed to have studied at Krzemieniec between 1806 and 1810.[82] He was certainly there frequently between 1813 and the end of 1818.[83] The lycée was closed down after the Polish rising of 1830–1, but for the brief period of its existence it was a major

centre of Polish national feeling.[84] By creating a Polish establishment which dwarfed its Russian rivals, Czacki succeeded in making life very difficult for the director of Russian schools in Kiev.[85] He died in 1813,[86] but his name lived on. His work on Polish and Lithuanian law, published at the turn of the century, was much sought after in Vilnius in the 1820s.[87] In 1805 Czacki distributed to the gentry of Volhynia, Kiev and Podillia a paper calling for the scholarly investigation of the western Ukrainian environment.[88] It anticipated the programme later adopted by Chodakowski. Czacki believed that the Crimea, many provinces of European Russia, and even Siberia were familiar to the world, but that the provinces with which he was concerned were not. He urged the study of their flora and fauna. He proposed that the local witches be subjected to scrutiny. Their magical words could elucidate the relationship between languages, and the gods to which they owed allegiance might throw light on the question of pre-Christian religion. Czacki asked what signs were popularly believed to foreshadow changes in the weather. He was interested in legends concerning the use of caves, in idols, burial urns and tombs. He concluded by saying he had put only some of his questions, but would be grateful for any information which could explain "the business of nature, the world and the region (*dela prirody, sveta, i kraiu*)." The similarity between this plan of campaign and the proposal which Chodakowski put before the ministry of education in 1820 was striking.[89] Czacki's programme of 1805 had been condemned by the ministry in 1810,[90] but in effect reappeared ten years later. Chodakowski corresponded with Czacki,[91] and may have been indebted to him, indirectly and in part, for the patronage of Count N. P. Rumiantsev.[92] It seems possible that he was continuing the work of the late educationalist.

If so, the political significance of his activity deserves attention. Czacki was nothing if not a Polish patriot.[93] "Chodakowski's populism," wrote Peter Brock, "was purely cultural,"[94] but Piotr Wandycz argued that early Polish Slavophilism "was not only the reflection of a political desire for a *modus vivendi* with Russia. It also embodied a spirit of competition and a bid for primacy among Slavs."[95] The second view fits Chodakowski better than the first. His belief in the unity of Slavic culture made no claims specifically for the Poles and rested on Ukrainian rather than Polish evidence, but it was a plea on behalf of the regions made at a time when

Alexander I was known to be sympathetic toward the Polish cause. At the beginning of his paper of 1819, his first submission to the ministry of education, Chodakowski made reference to Alexander's recent conciliatory attitude toward his fellow-countrymen.[96] At this time he was making no extravagant claims for the Poles, but practicing discretion in order to strike while the iron was hot. When the iron cooled he showed his true colours. In 1823 he threatened to burn all the material he had accumulated "for the good of Poland"—a clear sign that he thought he was working in the Polish interest. If he could do Poland no practical good, which by then seemed likely, he could at least make a sacrifice in her honour.[97] At the end of the previous year Chodakowski had accused a fellow Pole of being "pretty much a Targowica confederate"; and he had severed relations with K. F. Kalaidovych because of the latter's clear hostility to "everything Catholic, Uniate and Polish."[98] For all his pan-Slav enthusiasm, Chodakowski retained a strong sense of his Polish nationality. Small wonder that he falsified the details of his biography in his dealings with Russians.

While Chodakowski's inspiration and motives remain to a certain extent unclear, his popularity and success in 1819–20 were indisputable. His arrival in the Russian capital coincided with the contemporary interest in Ukraine.[99] Chodakowski enriched and diversified the Ukrainian contribution to current intellectual exchanges. He published the first of his two major indictments of Karamzin in *Vestnik Evropy* in the second half of October 1819.[100] This proposed trying to define a date in history "when the Slavic clan was everywhere and in all respects uniform"—which he felt was before the Slavs were converted to Christianity. He admitted his view sounded dubious, but declared that he was approaching the problem in a way which had not hitherto been thought of:

> After the passing of many centuries, after the efforts of so many learned men, and after the publication of the History of Karamzin, my thought would appear improbable and work fruitless. The only thing that conduces to my good fortune is that until now no one has spent five years travelling solely with this subject in mind, and that even the Russian Plutarch [Karamzin] acknowledges the wretchedness of the materials on these ancient times. In fact, this epoch is virtually excluded from books; it is scattered throughout the whole expanse of our land and requires many more sacrifices and special dedication.[101]

Chodakowski was advocating a new approach to the study of medieval Russia: not a documentary, but an archaeological and ethnographical approach, conducted in the country at large rather than in the study. The principle of investigation on the ground and of using oral evidence preserved in folksongs added a dimension to historical research which was lacking in the work of Karamzin.[102] "It seems improbable," wrote Chodakowski, "that the purposes for which these *Gorodtsy*, *Gorodenki* were designed can now still be explained. I hope, at least, to show from the songs of southern Russia, collected between the Dnieper and the San [in Galicia], that these *Gorodishcha* were holy settlements [*svyatymi ogorodami*] or places of assembly, where marriages, coronations and other pagan rites were celebrated."[103] The "folk" character of the inquiry found many admirers. It promised to return the empire to its people, counterbalancing Karamzin's emphasis on the activities of the state.

The particular issue on which Chodakowski challenged Karamzin was the "Normanist controversy." "If, for example, our notorious [*preslovutyi*] Karamzin had previously known the songs of southern Russia and Mazovia . . . then probably he would not have summoned from beyond the Varangian sea the founder of the city and principate of Tur, and would not have increased for no reason the activity of aliens in our land."[104] Evidence from the south and west of the empire, in other words, militated against the view that the founders of the Russian state were non-Slavs. This, for Chodakowski, was the crux of the matter. The bulk of his paper of 1819 was devoted to detailed consideration of the map of ninth-century Russia which Karamzin attached to his *History*. Karamzin, Chodakowski felt, had distributed the Slavic tribes inaccurately by relying too heavily on the chronicler Nestor. He was wrong, for example, to put the Finns in the north; even in those early days, Chodakowski believed, the lands of Russia were Slavic throughout.[105]

Chodakowski found powerful supporters among Karamzin's "political" and "antiquarian" opponents. Count N. P. Rumiantsev, who will be discussed in the next chapter, made use of him. When the *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo* appeared, Rumiantsev began looking for a champion to challenge its presentation of medieval Russia. He had devoted much effort to supplying Karamzin with

materials, but felt Karamzin had not made the best use of them.[106] Like Chodakowski, he had a strong sense of the importance of the Russian regions. It was probably his secretary, Vasyl Anastasevych, who brought Chodakowski to his attention. Anastasevych was in correspondence with Chodakowski in April 1818. In July Rumiantsev asked Anastasevych to keep his, Rumiantsev's, copy of Karamzin's *History*, because it would be useful "for the necessary collation" when Chodakowski's current whereabouts had been ascertained. Chodakowski was at Sieniawa, the estate of Prince Adam Czartoryski, but by the middle of the following year he had arrived at Homel, Rumiantsev's estate in Belorussia.[107] It was there that he wrote the paper published in *Vestnik Evropy*.[108] The churchman and scholar Bolkhovitinov expressed surprise that this article should have appeared in print at a time when Chodakowski was hoping to secure money from the government to continue his researches.[109] Chodakowski seems not to have intended publication. He had helped Karamzin with the second edition of his *History*; and in November 1819 he apologized to him for the appearance of the article.[110] The fact that someone else wanted to publish it showed that Chodakowski was not alone in his hostility to Karamzin.

The authorities seem not to have been unduly offended by the appearance of Chodakowski's first paper, for in mid-1820 he was granted money by the ministry of education to investigate Russia's *gorodishcha*.[111] Karamzin and Academician Nikolai Fus had been consulted by the ministry, and both, although with reservations, had found in Chodakowski's favour.[112] In order to convince the ministry, Chodakowski had written a second major paper in March 1820, and began publishing it (with official permission) in *Syn otechestva* in August.[113] Less polemical than the earlier essay, it nevertheless expressed equally clearly Chodakowski's essential beliefs. "The epoch preceding the adoption of Christianity is of primary importance for all the Slavic peoples. . . . " Why was there no book covering this period? "Without reproaching anyone, one can nevertheless say that it could never have been written in cloisters devoted to isolation, and nowhere beyond the bounds of the Slavic lands—their pens [i.e., the pens of Russia's historians to date] were the less capable, the more remote they were from the subject."[114] To achieve an understanding of Russia's early history, Chodakowski

proclaimed the need for a journey through the regions of the empire: an early, single-handed, "going to the people."

Chodakowski's publications more or less ended with the paper of 1820. The report he submitted to the ministry of education in the course of his travels in 1821 remained unpublished until the late 1830s.[115] Before his death in 1825 he published one more article, attempting to demonstrate the predominantly religious role of the prince in early Russian history;[116] but he never compiled the major work of synthesis which alone could have silenced his many critics. In 1820 his views provoked a substantial work defending Karamzin,[117] and in 1823 a member of the Rumiantsev circle cast great doubt on his theory of the significance of the *gorodishcha.*[118] Although Chodakowski blamed his failure on the malign influence of Karamzin,[119] the flaw was largely in himself. In grasping at a shadow, he lost the substance. His method of inquiry and the sources of information to which he drew attention promised to enlarge the Russians' historical awareness; but by trying to prove too much, he greatly reduced his chances of finding wide acceptance.

His memory, nevertheless, died hard. Jan Kollár, one of the leaders of the Slovak renaissance, asked what Chodakowski was doing in 1824.[120] The editor of *Vestnik Evropy* showed concern for his manuscript legacy in the later 1820s.[121] Bodiansky, Maksymovych and Gogol all paid respect to Chodakowski in 1834.[122] Pushkin twice mentioned him in the 1830s.[123] Perhaps most significantly, Nikolai Polevoi, the critic of Bantysh-Kamensky's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, took Chodakowski as one of his mentors. Polevoi's *Istoriia russkogo naroda* (1829–33), its title a deliberate response to the *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo,* was based in part on Chodakowski's papers. Through Polevoi, the Pole acquired an importance greater than that of his own publications. In September 1824 Polevoi wrote Chodakowski a substantial letter giving him the literary news of the day and speculating whether the new minister of education, Admiral Shishkov, would once more provide Chodakowski with official financial backing. He complimented Chodakowski on the reception of his recent contribution to *Severnyi arkhiv.* Of K. F. Kalaidovych, who had inveighed against Chodakowski the previous year, he said that "it seems curious, but the historical studies of Kalaidovych are good for

nothing—his mind seems to be governed by catalogues of bishops and appanage princes. . . . " Polevoi hoped Chodakowski would supply Bulgarin with further articles for publication, and asked his advice on the works of Jan Potocki.[124] The closeness of the friendship between the two men, exemplified by this letter, was borne out after Chodakowski's death. In 1826 the Pole's widow, following his instructions, brought Polevoi his papers. Ksenofont Polevoi, narrating the story of the bequest some thirty years later, argued that the papers were of little value and that his brother had made little use of them in his *Istoriia.* He tried to play down Chodakowski's significance: "Nowadays this man is made out to be an unacknowledged genius; I shall describe him as he really was." But Ksenofont Polevoi was anxious to answer charges laid against his brother in the 1820s and 1830s. A. F. Voeikov, N. I. Nadezhdin and Mykhailo Maksymovych had accused the "historian of the Russian people" of plagiarizing the work of Chodakowski. True to his brother's memory, Ksenofont Polevoi did all he could to restore his good name.[125] But he had himself shown affection for Chodakowski in 1824, when he added a postscript to his brother's letter asking Chodakowski not to forget him, "who remembers and loves you."[126] In his reminiscences he conveniently forgot his liking for the Pole.

In the middle years of the nineteenth century Chodakowski's name was rarely mentioned. Ksenofont Polevoi need hardly have bothered to blacken it. But in 1886 A. N. Pypin, Chernyshevsky's cousin, drew attention to Chodakowski as one of the progenitors of the populist tradition.[127] Proto-populism was an essential aspect of the provincial contribution to early nineteenth-century Russian culture. It brought into the public eye parts of the community which had not previously received due weight. It suggested that the common people had as much to offer the empire as its Europeanized gentry. Above all, it introduced Russia to the notion of relying upon Slavs who had not fallen victim to Western influence. The next chapter looks at antiquarians and academics who studied the Russian Empire's Slavic culture more cooly than Chodakowski. They related their studies to similar sorts of study in other parts of Eastern Europe. No less than the journalists, writers

and historians who have appeared in the last three chapters, these scholars derived much of their inspiration from Ukraine. To this extent Ukraine introduced Russians to the full breadth of the concept of Slavdom.

Chapter Eight

Ukraine and Russian Slavic Studies

N. P. Rumiantsev

By the early 1830s writers of many persuasions were promoting or welcoming Ukraine's part in the definition of the Russian Empire's cultural identity. Some contemporaries went further, and set Ukraine in the context of the wider Slavic world. Chodakowski had done so. The young Ukrainian Osyp Bodiansky, later a distinguished professor at Moscow University, alluded to the wider horizons in reviewing a collection of Ukrainian proverbs in 1834. The collection had gone down well in St. Petersburg, where *Severnaia pchela* thanked the author, V. N. Smirnytsky, for enlarging appreciation of the common people.[1] Bodiansky, writing from Myrhorod in Ukraine, approached Smirnytsky's work more critically. His attitude was rather like that of Tsarynny toward Gogol's *Vechera*. While Russians seemed to be undiscriminating in their enthusiasm for Ukrainian material, Ukrainians were concerned about accuracy of detail. Bodiansky's review evoked a reply from Smirnytsky which in turn produced a response from the reviewer.[2] The opening of the first article ranged more widely than what followed. "Who will now say," Bodiansky asked (having alluded to the many recent works on Ukrainian subjects), "that Southern Russia (*Iuzhnaia Rus'*) is stagnating on the path of enlightenment

and is not enthusiastic about its national literature?" Bodiansky believed that "the course of this young literature is instructive." Its prospects were bright because it was beginning without the decades of "futile, harmful imitation" which had so bedevilled "other literatures." Part of the new movement, furthermore, was "dedicating its time to making itself familiar with other Slavic languages and their literature, studying them and in this way trying to make clear . . . the relationship in which their own literature and language must stand to the other Slavic languages related to theirs."[3] The last words hinted at the wider ramifications of Ukraine's cultural awakening. Ukrainians' cultural affinities were not only with the Russians, but with all the Slavs. Ukraine could act as a bridge between Russia and the rest of Eastern Europe. It could confirm Russia's Slavic identity by pointing to the Slavic awakening at large. When, in his second article, Bodiansky alluded sympathetically to Chodakowski,[4] he illustrated that his loyalties lay toward those who were trying to define attributes common to all Slavs.[5]

Later in the 1830s Bodiansky set out on a journey to the non-Russian parts of Slavic Eastern Europe, and came back well-qualified to develop his conception of Slavic inter-relationships. That journey, and similar journeys made by others at the same time, greatly enlarged Russian understanding of the Slavic world. Russian Slavic studies, however, had begun twenty-five years previously. Scholarly interest in the Slavs, evident even in the eighteenth century,[6] grew rapidly in the years following the Napoleonic invasion. It owed its intensity to the commitment of Count Nikolai Petrovich Rumiantsev, who devoted the last years of his life to sponsoring a circle of scholars intent upon the academic investigation of Slavdom. Between 1812 and his death in 1826, Rumiantsev supported a wide variety of intellectual activities and laid the foundations for all subsequent Russian inquiries into the details of Slavic life.[7] Like contemporary writers of fiction and authors of history books, he could not pursue his inclinations without taking Ukraine into account.

The Rumiantsev circle had no general philosophy. It members were more interested in collecting data and defining differences than in sketching grandiose theories. Chodakowski briefly entered their ranks, but by the early 1820s he had fallen out with them.

From the point of view of his contemporaries he undermined his credibility by trying to prove too much too quickly. A Ukrainian member of the circle, Ivan Loboiko, urged caution upon Chodakowski in the analysis of language. He believed Chodakowski was right to attack the simplistic dialectology of Russian archaeologists and linguists, but insisted that "in order to establish a sound view of the subject, it is necessary first to determine the distinguishing features and the character of each dialect, and only then to define their borders." Loboiko was talking about Ukrainian. In arguing that Chodakowski's criteria for identifying it were insufficiently rigorous, and in adding to them, he showed the concern for precision which was typical of the Rumiantsev circle.[8] V. N. Smirnytsky, the publisher of Ukrainian proverbs whom Bodiansky attacked in 1834, was not a member of Rumiantsev's group, but in replying to Bodiansky's critique he described rules of procedure which the group would have accepted. He felt Bodiansky's sweeping criticism was unfair, because collecting proverbs was only a modest objective. Smirnytsky cited Adam Smith's principle of the division of labour. He saw himself as paving the way for future, more wide-ranging publications. To write a history of Ukraine, for example, it was necessary first to publish all the relevant materials, then to work over them, and finally to produce a connected account. Collecting Ukrainian proverbs was not such an easy business as Bodiansky supposed. His advice to "drop into any Little Russian hut" was simply not good enough. One eighteenth-century collector of Ukrainian folksongs and proverbs found he had to dedicate his whole life to the task, disguising himself in peasant clothes and wandering round village inns and markets. Smirnytsky claimed his collection of proverbs was part of a larger linguistic and ethnographical project, but as yet his work was only in its infancy.[9]

While the views of Loboiko and Smirnytsky reflected the preparatory nature of early Slavic studies in Russia, it would be unfair to call the Rumiantsev circle purely antiquarian. In 1822 one member of the group called another a pedant, thus showing his awareness of the need for interpretation as well as scholarship.[10] In their appreciation of niceties, moreover, the Rumiantsev circle offered better prospects for the future than another founder of Russian Slavic studies, Admiral A. S. Shishkov. As minister of

education in the mid-1820s, Shishkov seems to have shown his concern for Slavic studies by warding off an attack on Russia's first journal wholly devoted to the subject.[11] But his patronizing attitude toward non-Russian Slavs was reflected in his view of a proposed Bulgarian grammar in 1836. He saw little need for grammars of the "Slavic dialects." They were useful only for those who wished to make a close study of the dialects. Dictionaries of such languages, on the other hand, might reveal original Slavic roots not present in Russian, the Russian derivatives of which had lost their original meaning.[12] Shishkov wanted to restore the pristine splendour of Russian by purging it of accretions, but he was not interested in the Slavs for their own sake. The members of the Rumiantsev circle were less blinkered. Although their main concern was establishing Russia's Slavic identity, they did not close their eyes to the individuality of other sorts of Slav.

Rumiantsev himself epitomized the way in which certain Russians changed their cultural orientation at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Having received a cosmopolitan education, served for years as Russian emissary in Frankfurt, and taken a pro-French stance as Russian foreign minister, he turned away from the West in his period as a sponsor of academic pursuits. To be more precise, he applied his Western training to the study of Slavic culture.[13] The change of direction was more important than the specific achievements which resulted from Rumiantsev's sponsorship. The members of the circle did little to organize their work into a coherent whole, but the subjects they thought worthy of attention differed strikingly from those which had attracted earlier Russian intellectuals. The subject-matter was new enough to make an impression without the need for elaborate philosophical argument. Rumiantsev's intellectual outlook, insofar as he had one, was buried beneath a magpie-like love of rare coins and newly discovered manuscripts. He found it hard to refuse the inordinate demands made upon his purse. When a Uniate priest supplied him with a poor copy of a Polish document he did not need, "and then occupied me with his own business," he still did his best for him.[14] But there were certain limits to his generosity. He did not collect foreign coins, or at least only those found on Russian soil;[15] and he was not interested in subsidizing the publication of a volume of German poetry, even when it was translated from

Russian and designed, according to its sponsor, "to give the Germans a true notion of the present state of our native literature."[16] He was principally concerned with what was to be found within the confines of the empire, and with making it known to the inhabitants of the empire. Russians, in his view, ought to be mastering their cultural heritage. He deplored the fact that he had learnt from a Polish newspaper of the existence in Kiev of a Gospel written in Belorussian, when "here no one could inform me about it."[17] Perhaps the nearest he came to a general statement of belief is to be found in a letter of 1814 to the Metropolitan of Kiev:

> Every state glories more in its antiquities, the more strongly they show the spirit of the people and the greatness of its feeling. Our blessed Fatherland so far excels all known peoples in spirit and in feelings, that it can glory in and be proud of its antiquities the more particularly. I myself experienced recently in Kiev, the holy city of Olga and Vladimir, how pleasant it is to the heart of a son of the Fatherland to see its celebrated antiquities, treading in the tracks where the great once walked; how pleasant it is even to the most distant descendant to convey himself in thought to their centuries, hidden in the mists of time, bringing to life in his memory their deathless existence.[18]

Romantic patriotism was probably as far as Rumiantsev's philosophy went, and in this respect he differed little from many of his contemporaries. But he differed markedly from them in the way he expressed his patriotism. Where general statements like the one quoted above were common in the press and in correspondence of the early nineteenth century, with Rumiantsev they were rare. What distinguished him from others was his devotion to detail. Antiquarians had long been at work in various parts of the country, but under Rumiantsev their activities were given a degree of unity and the value of antiquarianism became clearer. The material foundation was laid for a new image of Russia. Debates which had hitherto been conducted in terms of moral fervour could now be conducted on the basis of hard evidence. The Rumiantsev circle marked a starting point for the next generation. A. N. Pypin argued that Rumiantsev had no successor,[19] in the sense that his moderation and carefulness were followed by a wave of Slavophile enthusiasts with whom he would have had little in common; but already under the ex-Imperial Chancellor there were signs of the

things to come. He began his career of patronage, while still in office, with a relatively modest end in view: publishing treaties and charters which the Tsars had signed, so that Russia might possess the sort of record which had existed in France for over a century. This was bringing the empire into line with Western Europe, following a Western model in order to eliminate a native sense of inferiority.[20] Before Rumiantsev died the defensive note had begun to disappear. Though personally he may not have been wholly in sympathy with the extravagant views of, for example, Chodakowski, he gave him shelter and enlisted his help. In this and other instances he provided the means whereby scholars of the antiquarian type met ideologues who would base wide-ranging claims on the material they collected. Rumiantsev was thus a significant link between Enlightenment and Romanticism in Russia.

Politically speaking Rumiantsev belonged to the same orientation as the Ukrainians who had come to court under Catherine the Great. Rumiantsev's father, Petr Aleksandrovich, had been that Governor of Ukraine who despatched Bezborodko and Zavadovsky to St. Petersburg. While at court they showed concern for the Governor's sons and sent him information about them.[21] Some material links with that time were preserved in the days of Rumiantsev's devotion to scholarship. Rumiantsev corresponded with Fedir Tumansky's son on the subject of pagan idols in the Crimea,[22] and at a more exalted level he preserved the Ukrainians' association with the Vorontsov family, in the sense that he took advantage of Semen Vorontsov to secure transcripts of British diplomatic documents relating to Russia.[23] More significant than these incidental continuities, however, was the fact that geographically Rumiantsev returned, in the days of his academic pursuits, to a part of the world not far from the scene of his father's triumphs, a region permeated with different interests and a different atmosphere from those of St. Petersburg, and much closer to the roots of Slavic culture. Although a product of Western European enlightenment and a correspondent of Grimm,[24] Rumiantsev used his talents in a cause very different from the causes dear to the *philosophes*. He was interested in the distinguishing features of Russia and the Slavs, not in what made them the same as other European communities. Perhaps it is not too fanciful to see in the academic pursuits which he sponsored the intellectual counterpart

to the political activity of his father's generation. Men of that generation had been concerned to integrate the newly acquired southern lands into the Imperial structure. Their activity had brought Russians into much closer contact with other Slavic peoples, with traditions which could conceivably offer an alternative to the traditions of Western Europe. It was to the understanding of these traditions, not to political integration, that Rumiantsev devoted the bulk of his attention.

Rumiantsev and Ukraine

Rumiantsev's estate was at Homel in Belorussia, and although he travelled a good deal after his retirement from public office, Homel lay at the centre of his world. His brother Sergei, meanwhile, had inherited the Ukrainian part of their father's legacy. Between them, therefore, the Rumiantsevs were deeply involved in the southern and western provinces at a time when those provinces were beginning to make their presence felt in the cultural life of the centre. Sergei, who remained to the end of his life a man of the eighteenth century,[25] was not averse to acting on behalf of his local community. In 1804 he transmitted to the minister of internal affairs, V. P. Kochubei, a letter from a local Marshal of Nobility on the establishment of a gentry school in "Little Russia."[26] Perhaps the Free Farmers' Law which he had sponsored in the previous year was inspired in part by his experience of Ukraine, where the peasantry had not been enserfed as long as in Russia and were more likely to be able to benefit from the new measure.[27]

Nikolai Rumiantsev's interest in Ukraine was more clearcut than that of his brother. He was interested in its significance for the empire as a whole rather than in local improvement schemes; it played a substantial part in his general devotion to the Slavic world. Although he told Vasyl Karazyn that he had been wrong to send him, "as a distinguished landowner of the southern provinces," information about the Kharkiv-based Philotechnical Society (because he did not in fact own property in the southern provinces embraced by the society),[28] Rumiantsev's links with Ukraine were nevertheless considerable. He was well aware, for example, of the academic excellence of Ukraine's educational institutions, and realized their value for the empire as a whole. His connection with the Kharkiv Collegium was more than merely casual, for the Collegium had been founded and patronized by his Golitsyn grandfather and uncle. Rumiantsev had their busts sculpted and placed in the school hall,[29] and continued the patronage which they had begun. He awarded medals to the distinguished students, and it was to him that the Collegium turned in 1814 when it wanted to increase the Greek teacher's salary.[30] He gave his reasons for supporting the Collegium in a letter to the rector written after a

visitation in 1823.[31] Rumiantsev knew that Ukrainians were worth cultivating. He took Ivan Loboiko, a product of the Kharkiv Collegium who appears below, into his own immediate circle of scholars. In the city of Kharkiv Rumiantsev found little to help him in his search for medieval culture, for the bishop informed him that there were no manuscripts there of the type he was interested in.[32] Kiev, however, had a lot to offer. The city which inspired in Rumiantsev a romantic feeling for the past also provided him with material and helpers. Anastasevych, who became his secretary after losing his job under Czartoryski in the ministry of education,[33] was educated at the Kiev Academy. So was the priest at Homel, Ivan Hryhorovych, who played the vital part in Rumiantsev's contribution to the beginnings of Belorussian historiography. One of Rumiantsev's closest associates, Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, became Metropolitan of Kiev in 1822; and long before that, in 1814, Rumiantsev had made contact with Maksym Berlynsky, the Kiev school-teacher whom I shall take as a typical example of the Rumiantsev circle's antiquarianism. Rumiantsev took an interest in the Kiev Academy, just as he did in the Kharkiv Collegium, and gave money for a prize to be awarded there for the best work each year on Russian history. The first award was made in 1830, after Rumiantsev's death, for a work about an ancient Kiev church.[34]

Berlynsky, Rumiantsev's chief informant in Kiev, illustrates the way in which the Ukrainian antiquarian tradition, strong in the eighteenth century, played a significant part in the wider debates about Slavic culture which gathered pace in the post-Napoleonic period. The unimaginative Berlynsky represented the opposite end of the spectrum from, for example, the flamboyant and speculative Chodakowski. Rumiantsev's patronage brought together men of diverse outlooks and provided a link between old and new approaches. Berlynsky and Chodakowski corresponded with each other, although they seem never to have met. Chodakowski wrote to the Kiev antiquarian when on Rumiantsev's estate in 1819, and Berlynsky replied when the Polish folklorist was in St. Petersburg, trying to induce the ministry of education to give him the money for his proposed expedition.[35] Typically antiquarian, the reply contained no discussion of Chodakowski's contentious view of the Russian past. It merely thanked him for sending a heraldic drawing, recommended him to the correspondent's brother in the capital, and

pleaded local difficulties as the reason for the letter's brevity. A "snapper-up of unconsidered trifles," Berlynsky was not attracted by large-scale theories. He reported excitedly, for example, the discovery of some medieval gold and silver goods in Kiev,[36] but unlike Chodakowski he never tried to fuse archaeological evidence into a view of Slavic antiquity.

Berlynsky was in direct line of descent from the eighteenth-century Ukrainian chroniclers whose work the journalists Ruban, Tumansky, Antonovsky and Anastasevych made use of in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. But where earlier antiquarians were shadowy figures, known only to their own circle, their works for the most part unpublished, the most famous of them (the author of *Istoriia Rusov*) to this day anonymous, Berlynsky played a part in the greater intellectual debates of his time. He reached maturity in the 1780s, when the administrative integration of Ukraine into the empire was being completed. Like so many others he was despatched from the Kiev Academy to train as a teacher in the St. Petersburg Teachers' Seminary.[37] Born the son of a priest in 1764, Berlynsky had his horizons broadened early in life. He remained anxious, subsequently, that his work reach a wider audience than that achieved by manuscripts circulating in Ukraine. His two brothers also trained in St. Petersburg, and although Vasyl, like Maksym himself, returned home to teach in Kiev (after spending six years in Vitebsk),[38] the other brother stayed on in the capital, teaching in the institution where he had been trained and providing a useful contact to whom Berlynsky could send, for example, Chodakowski.[39]

After less than two years' training at the St. Petersburg seminary, Berlynsky was appointed to the staff of the secular school which opened in Kiev in 1788. Teaching in one capacity or another, he remained in Kiev until his retirement in 1834 (when for five months, before the appointment of Maksymovych as Rector, he was chairman of the administration of the newly founded Kiev University).[40] A respected teacher, Berlynsky never achieved the highest distinction. He taught at both the secular school and the academy in Kiev, and was inspector of schools for the surrounding country, but never became a provincial schools director. It was proposed that he move to Kherson in this capacity in 1819, but the move did not materialize.[41] Perhaps the time he devoted to scholarly

activity prevented him from reaching the peak of his profession.

His scholarly activity began early, under the aegis of one of the many Ukrainian historians of the eighteenth century whose work appeared posthumously: Petro Symonovsky (1717–95), Director of Kiev schools in the early years of Berlynsky's appointment.[42] In 1792 (under cover of a letter of recommendation from Symonovsky), Berlynsky sent the head of the Schools Commission a historical map he had prepared, promising more if it was received favourably.[43] Formed in the mould of so many Ukrainian writers of the day, Berlynsky went on to write an *Istoriia Malorossii*. He submitted his composition to the Curator of his Educational District in 1803, and the latter wrote to the minister of education asking him to give Berlynsky permission to publish the work and money to do so. Czartoryski (the Curator) explained Berlynsky's reasons for writing the book: that as yet there was no such history of Little Russia in print, "although it has a great bearing on general Russian history as well"; and that "he wanted not less to satisfy the many most distinguished citizens of that region."[44] Zavadovsky (minister of education) cleared the book for publication and awarded Berlynsky five hundred rubles toward the cost,[45] but the *Istoriia* never appeared in full. There was much interest in it, however, among both northern and southern intellectuals. Czartoryski returned the manuscript not to the author but to his brother in St. Petersburg, and there it remained, awaiting the chance of publication. In 1810 Chepa, perhaps the greatest of the Ukrainian antiquarians, wrote to Vasyl Poletyka about the fate of Berlynsky's work. The following year Anastasevych published extracts from the *Istoriia* in *Ulei*, and it seems to have remained in his hands thereafter, for in 1820 Berlynsky mentioned it in that context in his letter to Chodakowski. In the 1840s Anastasevych secured publication of further extracts in the journal *Molodyk*. Briefly, in 1820, it had seemed that Troshchynsky was going to add to the list of his benefactions by publishing the work, which Bolkhovitinov felt would do his patriotism more credit than his "bawling ministry" had done; but forty-five years after the original application to the ministry of education, Berlynsky died with his magnum opus still unpublished.[46] He had made a name for himself with his *Kratkoe opisanie Kieva* (St. Petersburg, 1820), and with occasional articles like that on the history of the Kiev Academy which he published in

St. Petersburg in 1819.[47] He was talked about, although not always in flattering terms,[48] by other intellectuals of the day. But fundamentally, having been bred in the traditions of Ukrainian antiquarianism, he never broke out of them. His talents lay in providing information and acting as contact man, and in these respects he made a perfect cog in Rumiantsev's machine; he left the adumbration of general theories to other members of the circle like Chodakowski.

In Berlynsky, then, Rumiantsev was making use of a typical Ukrainian antiquary, product of a tradition whose existence greatly eased his task. The correspondence of the two men shows the lengths to which they were prepared to go in order to obtain accurate and detailed information about the past. Rumiantsev made Berlynsky's acquaintance during his visit to Kiev in 1814,[49] and the two remained in touch until Rumiantsev's death twelve years later. Their letters concentrated at first upon questions pertaining to the ground-plan of ancient Kiev, which Berlynsky approached by comparing the historical sources with the contemporary ground-plan of the city. Rumiantsev asked him for a copy of the modern ground-plan, and urged, with regard to the building of a new church in Kiev, that every opportunity be taken to excavate the foundations of its predecessor before they were built upon again. "The common people's opinion that relics of Boris and Gleb lie there merits attention. . . ."[50] Rumiantsev urged Berlynsky to look out for coins or manuscripts that might be of interest, asked him to compare the Kiev *Lavra's* Polish version of Nestor's *Paterik* with the Russian version, ordered a copy of the catalogue of the Kiev archives for Hryhorovych at Homel, sent his brother Sergei to see Berlynsky in 1818, sent P. M. Stroev in 1820 and P. I. Köppen in 1821, and asked Berlynsky to negotiate on his behalf the purchase of two eleventh-century gold coins from one Mohyliansky. All these activities were typical of the Rumiantsev circle. They were the base on which more far-reaching speculation and more far-flung exploration were to rest. Kiev and Ukraine, their traditions stretching backward into the mists of time, offered Rumiantsev a fruitful field for the investigations dear to his heart.

Kharkiv and Kiev apart, Rumiantsev had contacts in many other parts of the south. He commissioned one Blovatsky to investigate the library at Reshetilovka, southern estate of Potemkin's

right-hand man, V. S. Popov.[51] Having learned from Köppen, another Kharkiv-born member of his circle, of the existence of a tomb with an inscription on it near a village on the road to Bilhorod, he asked Loboiko if he could find out what it was.[52] In Nizhyn he was able to make use of I. S. Orlai, the sub-Carpathian Ukrainian who had served as a doctor in St. Petersburg, worked for a time on the Troshchynskys' estate of Kybyntsi, and in 1821 became Director of the Nizhyn gymnasium. In 1825 Rumiantsev asked Orlai to persuade one of the Nizhyn Greeks to send him a Greek gold coin he was offering for sale, and inquired whether anyone in Nizhyn possessed old Russian manuscripts he was prepared to part with.[53] Orlai had been at Homel in 1819 and 1820 working as a doctor, and seems to have met Chodakowski there. The two corresponded, and in their broad vision of the Slavic world had a great deal in common.[54]

Rumiantsev's connection with the school at Novhorod-Siversky in northern Ukraine sheds interesting light both on his own outlook and on the way it was received by others. Something has been said of this part of Ukraine in the discussion of Zavadovsky's origins.[55] Rumiantsev, with his concern for the Russian past, thought of it as the focal point of the medieval principate of Siver. The school—founded in 1789 as a *Glavnoe narodnoe uchilishche*, later a gymnasium—was much better than the population and character of the town merited; in 1825 the Curator of Kharkiv educational district described it as occupying, of all the gymnasia in his charge, "in many respects practically the first place."[56] This was in large measure owing to its Director, I. Khalansky, one of the unsung heroes of eighteenth-century Ukraine, who in 1802–3 pressed unsuccessfully for the foundation of the first Ukrainian university in Novhorod-Siversky.[57] Twice, in 1797 and 1805, there seem to have been plans afoot to lower the status or even to abolish the school in Novhorod-Siversky, but on each occasion Khalansky successfully defended his position. Each time Zavadovsky, head of Russian education and a native of this part of Ukraine, took his side—on the second occasion after a personal inspection.[58]

Rumiantsev visited the school in 1816 and was impressed with its character and its Director. He proposed that the teachers write a history of the medieval principate centred on their region, and when they pleaded lack of materials he promised to provide them. There

ensued a correspondence which continued fitfully into the 1820s.[59] The history never appeared, but Illia Tymkovsky shed further light on the seriousness of Rumiantsev's intentions in a letter of 1818. Tymkovsky, who together with Karazyn had been a central figure in the foundation of Kharkiv University and who was to succeed Khalansky as the Director of Novhorod-Siversky gymnasium, was serving as a judge in Hlukhiv.[60] Rumiantsev may have known him through Roman Tymkovsky, his brother, a professor of classics at Moscow University who became a specialist on medieval Russian literature and was a formative influence on Stroev and other members of the Rumiantsev circle.[61] Rumiantsev had written to Illia Tymkovsky raising the subject of the principate of Siver, and Tymkovsky wrote back returning Rumiantsev's memorandum on the subject and promising to attempt to find answers to the problems it raised. The nine years he had spent travelling about the Kharkiv educational district in the course of his work had given him the opportunity to discover many ancient monuments and legends, and now he could set about ascertaining their significance. Tymkovsky connected Rumiantsev's work with that of his father, the Ukrainian governor, who, by creating the Novhorod-Siversky *namestnichestvo* in the early 1780s "was about to call forth the principate of Siver from the ashes of antiquity." Now the younger Rumiantsev was doing the same thing in a different way.[62] This connection between father and son had been a major theme in a speech made to Rumiantsev on the occasion of his visit to the Novhorod-Siversky gymnasium in 1816, and in part explained, perhaps, why he turned to Ukraine for inspiration, and why he was so acceptable there. Makedonsky, the speech-maker of 1816, spoke of the memorial which Rumiantsev had erected to his father in Kiev (where Petr Aleksandrovich was buried), and throughout his encomium claimed Nikolai Petrovich as one of the region's sons.[63] As in the case of the Kharkiv Collegium, therefore, family connection assisted Rumiantsev's enquiries, making Ukraine a natural as well as a fruitful sphere for the expression of his interests.

Rumiantsev and Belorussia

It would be wrong to give the impression that Rumiantsev devoted himself entirely to the exploration of the antiquities of Ukraine. His zest for discovery took in the length and breadth of the Russian Empire. With one correspondent alone he discussed questions pertaining to the Caucasus and Siberia.[64] Perhaps the single biggest discovery made by anyone working under his aegis was that of the *Sbornik Sviatoslava* of 1073—and that was discovered by Stroev and Kalaidovych in a monastery of the Moscow eparchy in 1817.[65] Insofar as Rumiantsev concerned himself with Ukraine, he was not even the first to see it as a prime repository of medieval remains. That honour belonged, perhaps, to K. M. Borozdin, who in 1809 and 1810 took in Kiev, Chernihiv and Nizhyn in the course of an archaelogical expedition through the European parts of the empire. Borozdin tried to draw up a plan of ancient Kiev (before Berlynsky), and made drawings of stone idols which had been brought from the province of Ekaterinoslav to Kapnist's estate in Poltava province.[66] Rumiantsev's principal contribution to the advancement of historical knowledge lay not in emphasizing the importance of Ukraine, but in the catholicity of his interests, in the quantitative advance which his wealth was able to facilitate. He cast the net as widely as possible. He was consciously introducing no new principle of investigation, making special claims for no particular area, but co-ordinating and advancing the work of local antiquarians throughout the empire. Nevertheless, a principle already in the air received support from his investigations—that the localities had as much to offer the empire as the capitals. Although Rumiantsev did not deliberately focus upon Ukraine, the Ukrainian material which came to light through his patronage swelled the stream of Ukrainian stimuli which were making their mark on Russian intellectual life. And since Rumiantsev also fostered the other minority East-Slav culture, Belorussian, his total contribution to the movement away from a monolithic view of the empire was considerable. Looking at his part in the Belorussian "awakening" enhances the impression of his circle's general significance.

A volume which appeared in Moscow in 1824 under Rumiantsev's aegis, *Belorusskii arkhiv drevnikh gramot*, marked a

notable step forward in the understanding and appreciation of a part of the empire which had not long been in Russian hands. A modern scholar opens his study of the historiography of Belorussia with the story of this volume's publication.[67] Hryhorovych, editor of the work and the priest on Rumiantsev's estate of Homel, spoke in his preface of the reasons for undertaking such a novel publishing venture. "From the time of the diffusion of enlightenment in Europe, a need has been felt for the acquisition of all kinds of (*vseobshchikh*) information about States." In Western Europe this need had long been recognized, while "The Poles, zealous lovers of national glory, can boast enormous collections of their ancient rights and the alliances of their fatherland." Russia had long lagged behind, but now, with the appearance of Rumiantsev's *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, a start had been made. This was the context in which the present work fitted. Rumiantsev, Hryhorovych declared, did not believe everything could be covered in the central Moscow archive. Regional holdings were also valuable and Rumiantsev had turned his attention first to those of the region where his own estate was to be found.[68]

The context of Hryhorovych's enterprise, then, was very much that of putting the Russian Empire on a par with the West, and using not only the centre but the evidence of the regions to do it. In the case of Belorussia there was a compelling local reason for establishing lines of demarcation between the empire and outsiders: Hryhorovych was trying to offset the Polish influence in his province. In stressing the religious aspect of the charters he was publishing, the battle between Catholics and Orthodox—in including, for example, at the very end of the book, a charter granted by the Polish king to the great eighteenth-century defender of the Belorussian Orthodox, Hryhorii Konysky—Hryhorovych was claiming Belorussia for the Russians. For all its scholarship, his work had distinct polemical overtones.

Rumiantsev's concern for Belorussia was by no means confined to the sponsorship of this one book. It also took much more material forms. He acted as an intermediary between the local gentry and the ministry of education in 1820, in the matter of a gentry school which it was proposed to create at Homel on the basis of local subscription. He pointed out that neither of the two Belorussian provinces possessed an institution of this kind, and proposed

something on the lines of the *lycées* at Odessa and Tsarskoe Selo.[69] He ran a school based on the Lancastrian model for more than two hundred peasant children at Homel, where they learnt not only reading, writing and arithmetic, but various practical skills. In 1824 his agent was trying to find a master to teach them leather-work for the making of gloves.[70]

These activities were perhaps no more than any improving landlord of the day would have undertaken—the counterpart, for example, of Sergei Rumiantsev's implementation of his own Free Farmers' Law at Tashan—but *Belorusskii arkhiv* was undoubtedly seen by contemporaries as something new, bringing to life a part of the empire hitherto not thought worthy of separate consideration. Loboiko wrote to Rumiantsev from Vilnius describing the local reaction: "Our Poles are extremely delighted and surprised that, among the many subjects to which Your Excellency extends his patronage, even this one has not escaped your penetrating and enlightened insight."[71] Loboiko himself was struck by the novelty of the enterprise. Earlier in the same year, 1824, before Hryhorovych's work had appeared, he wrote to Rumiantsev looking forward to the publication, because then "it will be possible for us to see more clearly what sort of materials are required for [the collection]."[72] Loboiko was engaged in the search for further documents for the planned future volumes, but was as yet uncertain what exactly to look for. Hunting in the archives was an unfamiliar activity for him, although he had been engaged upon it on Rumiantsev's behalf for some time. At the end of 1822 he had written to Chodakowski describing the copying he was doing in the Radziwiłł archive: "I don't yet have a good idea myself of what purpose all this will serve. . . . "[73]

Thorough searching in archives other than the Moscow Archive of the College of Foreign Affairs, where the great eighteenth-century archivists had been, was a principle more or less introduced into Russian historiography by Rumiantsev, and nowhere better illustrated than in his Belorussian investigations. Köppen had begun to look at the region in detail in 1819 (when officially he had been reviewing the post-stations),[74] but the systematic inquiry started in the 1820s. Rumiantsev saw the appearance of part one of *Belorusskii arkhiv* as no more than a beginning. At the time of its publication he wrote to one Ivan

Vasilevich Markov saying that enough material for three parts had already been collected, but that he would still be grateful for Markov's help in enriching the work.[75] In distributing complimentary copies to men in influential positions, he asked them to help make new repositories accessible to him. Governor N. Khovansky, as a result, secured the opening of the archive at Mstislav district court, and Rumiantsev sent his agent Nikolai Gortinsky to make an appreciation of its contents.[76] The latter despaired when he saw the state of the records; "more than seventy-five big fibre-wrapped bundles stuffed full of paper, a great number of documents scattered about the floor, rotten and rat-eaten, the real number of which, and even the right number of bundles, the archivist himself doesn't know."[77] Four months later, when Rumiantsev was rewarding him for his work on such intractable material, Gortinsky replied that he did not feel he had achieved the desired goal, and reported other manuscript repositories nearby, containing documents formerly belonging to the Jesuits and the Uniate Church.[78] The task was unending.

As in Mstislav, so in Polotsk, Rumiantsev had an agent contributing toward the expansion of *Belorusskii arkhiv*: M. Doroshkevych, the local Schools Director. He had worked on the Commission set up to investigate the Jesuits' papers after their expulsion from Russia in 1820,[79] and therefore had some understanding of what documents existed before he was drawn into the Rumiantsev circle. Perhaps the administrative changes in Belorussia in the 1820s, its closer integration into the Imperial structure and the consequent need to go through local papers for official reasons—perhaps these accidentally made the province a particularly fruitful one for Rumiantsev's purposes.[80] The government was looking for documentation of landownership (in order to effect transference from the monasteries to the state), but in the process other sorts of documents came to light. Doroshkevych said as much in an early letter to Rumiantsev,[81] and in later correspondence referred more than once to his work on the Jesuit Commission. He too, however, like Loboiko, and despite his experience in handling local papers, saw the novelty in what Rumiantsev was doing. He thanked the Chancellor for sending him copies of Hryhorovych's first two volumes, because they "gave me a true understanding" of the sort of documents worthy of inclusion in

subsequent volumes.[82] Doroshkevych cast the net wide, and in the two years up to the Chancellor's death was constantly reporting to him new finds in public and private hands. In August 1825, for example, he wrote saying that he had learnt from the prior of a Dominican monastery of the existence of an enormous Sapieha archive in a village in the province of Grodno, housed in two halls, going back to the year 900, containing manuscripts in five languages, and likely to require at least two years for its proper examination.[83] Eighteen months earlier he had been very excited to discover a document describing the famous Kuntsevich murder of 1623—only to learn from Bolkhovitinov, via Rumiantsev, that it was already in print.[84] The hunt for materials was intense in Rumiantsev's last years, the enthusiasm of both leader and led still growing. Rumiantsev was asking about archives no longer just in the vicinity of Homel, but in Volhynia and, as we have already seen, in Kiev.[85] Having begun to spread his wings with the investigation of the monasteries of the Moscow eparchy in the second decade of the century, Rumiantsev was now embracing the length and breadth of the empire. *Belorusskii arkhiv* could have been the prototype for a series of studies bringing to life each of the different regions of Russia.

In the event Rumiantsev's death in January 1826 prevented the publication even of the second part of Hryhorovych's work. If Rumiantsev did indeed send Doroshkevych the first two parts in 1824, the second part must have been in manuscript. It was finished, but owing to the death of the sponsor never appeared in print.[86] Eight years later Hryhorovych was still trying to get financial support for his projects from Rumiantsev's brother, but Sergei refused.[87] Although the priest of Homel managed to put out a volume of the works of Konysky, the great hero of the religious battles in Belorussia in the eighteenth century,[88] *Belorusskii arkhiv* went no further than the volume of 1824.

The principle of archival investigation, however, survived Rumiantsev's death. If, in the short term, Belorussia suffered, in the long term the empire benefited. In 1829 an "archaeographic expedition" was organized to conduct systematic searches of monastic libraries (like that carried out in the Moscow eparchy in 1817–18). Expedition leader Pavel Stroev had been one of Rumiantsev's men, and with Kálaidovych he was one of the

discoverers of the *Sbornik Sviatoslava.* In 1823, when Rumiantsev was still alive, Stroev had made one of the clearest statements of the aims of the circle in his speech on being elected a member of the Moscow Society of Russian History and Antiquities. Now that Rumiantsev, he argued, had published at his own expense more ancient manuscripts than had been published in the entire period from the sixties of the eighteenth century, it was time for the society to expand the range of its activities, to embrace not just Moscow but the whole empire, to gather "all the written memorials of our history and our ancient literatures scattered in the broad expanse from the banks of the White Sea to the Ukrainian steppes, and from the borders of Lithuania and Poland to the Ural chain of mountains."[89] To this end Stroev advocated the preparation of just such an expedition as later took place. He alluded to the finding of Sviatoslav's *sbornik* as an example of the sort of discovery which might be made again. When, therefore, after Rumiantsev's death, the expedition materialized, and when subsequently a commission was set up to publish documents found in the course of the expedition (on which Stroev also served, if briefly, and which used funds left by Rumiantsev for the publication of Russian chronicles), then the work already done by 1826 found its logical sequel.[90] *Belorusskii arkhiv* therefore played a significant part in the development of techniques which were later to be applied on a much larger scale.

In the course of collecting materials for *Belorusskii arkhiv*, Loboiko was struck by the language of the documents he was discovering. In this respect the volume of 1824 had a significance independent of the techniques used in its compilation, a significance directly related to the contemporary interaction of the different sorts of Slavs within the empire. The Rumiantsev circle not only established the principle of looking at local history sources, which was of long-term but rather academic importance; it also contributed immediately, in some of the specific areas with which it dealt, to discussions which were already being approached from other points of view and on the basis of different material. Antiquarians touched upon the same questions as those raised by Ukrainian writers working in the capitals. Loboiko did so consciously. We have already seen him discussing with Ryleev the standing of the Belorussian language.[91] He alluded to this debate in

his long letter to Rumiantsev of March 1824, and said more about his views on Belorussian. "One can see at a glance," he wrote, "that the history of the Russian language, about which we are as yet only beginning to think, will receive a very important boost from this source [the Belorussian charters being published by Rumiantsev]." Loboiko was very much in favour of defining Belorussian, and felt that since it was still spoken, since sermons were still preached in it in village churches, and since Homel was in Belorussia, Rumiantsev was in a good position to attach to his new publication an explanation of the unusual words contained in its various documents. The reason for such a linguistic appendix was not in doubt: "the dictionary may be of great service not only in the reading of Belorussian charters, but also in the reading of the state charters published by Your Excellency in Moscow; not only in the reading of Belorussian books and other memorials of this literature, but also in the reading of Russian chronicles."[92] Loboiko believed, therefore, that knowing more about the other Slavic languages spoken in the empire would accelerate the growth of a national identity. The parallel with contemporary thinking about Ukraine is striking.

Loboiko himself was Ukrainian, professor of Russian at Vilnius University and a committed exponent of central government policies in the western provinces where he worked. He was happy, perhaps, to have found his way out of Kharkiv and into the wider world. In general he probably thought little of his roots and a great deal of the opportunities for improvement offered by the central authority. When such a man, a committed integrator, spoke of the value of Belorussian, he provided a measure of the acceptability of the Russian regions in the movement for defining the Russian Empire's cultural identity in the post-Napoleonic period. The possibilities for cultural enrichment offered by the regions outweighed the thought of political complications.

At least one member of the Rumiantsev circle did not think highly of Loboiko,[93] but his career illustrated strikingly the way in which a Ukrainian, without being touched by political separatism, could acquire and develop a sense of Slavic cultural diversity. Born in 1786, he attended the state school in Kharkiv and the local university (where he made friends with Köppen).[94] After five years in Ukrainian schools, including a year under Khalansky at

Novhorod-Siversky, he left teaching to serve briefly in the Kingdom of Poland, twice in the Department of State Properties, and for six months in the Department of External Trade, before being appointed Professor of Russian at Vilnius in October 1821.[95]

By 1821 he had already become part of the Rumiantsev circle, and in the plans which he submitted to Rumiantsev in 1817 the range of his intellectual interests appears. The professors at Kharkiv University, he wrote, had encouraged him to pursue German literature; "The monastic library in Novhorod-Siversky instilled in me an attachment to church literature and to the knowledge of ancient Slavic books"; Karazyn's library "very nearly made a bibliographer of me"; and Linde's example nearly turned Loboiko into "a passionate Slavic philologist." The difficulty was choosing which path to pursue. Ideally, Loboiko wanted to prepare for publication one of the following: a critical description of all the sources, native and foreign, for Russian history; an account of all the many contributions made by the Academy of Sciences in the fields of Russian history, geography, ethnography, statistics, linguistics, etc.; a chronological glossary of words collected from Russian chronicles and ancient manuscripts, with explanations of their significance worked out with the help of other Slavic dialects. In a note added to the last proposition, Loboiko explained that it would be convenient under this head to collect medieval personal names, the names of peoples, rivers, mountains, towns, etc., and divide them into words of Slavic and non-Slavic provenance; and to compile a geographical *sinonimika*.[96]

Rumiantsev clearly replied to Loboiko advising him not to dissipate his energies, for in a second note, five days after the first, Loboiko expressed a preference for the third of his alternatives, the compilation of a dictionary of medieval Russian; promising, incidentally, to use the works of the Bohemian scholars, leaders of the Slavic renaissance, after he had exhausted the possibilities of research based on purely Russian materials.[97] This showed that he was familiar with contemporary intellectual movements. The reference to the Polish scholar Linde in his first note had already indicated as much; and later, reviewing Kalaidovych's edition of *Ioann eksarkh bolgarskii* (1824), a monument of medieval Slavic literature, Loboiko was to admit that, for the moment at least, the Bohemian scholars would be able to make better use of it than the

Russian.[98] He was aware, then, of the wider context of the Rumiantsev group's activities.

But this was not the most significant aspect of the memoranda of 1817. Their importance lay in where, when pressed, Loboiko placed the emphasis—on the need to compile a dictionary of medieval Russian, to collect medieval names and draw up a geographical *sinonimika*; for what might be made of such material was soon to be shown by Chodakowski. In sensing the need for such work, Loboiko showed his perception. In the event he remained firmly in the antiquarian mould of so many of his contemporaries, a collector rather than an analyst. He published two works in the years of his association with Rumiantsev, but although the first was connected with the sources for Russian history, the second, despite being dedicated to Linde, was not concerned with Slavic philology and opened with an almost apologetic letter to its dedicatee.[99] So Loboiko never grasped the nettle or saw what might follow from the intelligent suggestions he was making, but at least he had a notion of what was needed, and perhaps for this reason he established close relations with Chodakowski, whose wide-ranging imagination we saw at work at the end of the last chapter.

A Wider World

In his critique of Karamzin's *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, Chodakowski brought out more clearly than any of his contemporaries the fundamental differences between south and north and the way in which the culture of the south could change the direction of Russian culture. He extended the range of a debate already in progress, by setting "south Russia," which for him meant Western Ukraine, in the context of the Slavic world as a whole. In the late eighteenth century, Ukrainians had come to St. Petersburg in the wake of administrative changes, hoping to take advantage of the new career prospects offered by the integration of the empire. By the early nineteenth century they were beginning to be sufficiently self-confident to point out to northerners the differences between north and south, and the advantages to be derived from an appreciation of the empire's cultural complexity. By casting the net wider, taking in the whole Slavic world, Chodakowski made plain the full implication of what was originally a mere geographical shift. There were others in the Chodakowski mould: Slavs from outside the Russian Empire who had affinities with Ukraine and stressed them when they came to Russia, and Ukrainians who perceived the diversity of cultures at home, travelled in Eastern Europe, and on their return impressed upon the Russians the vitality of other Slavs. In the 1820s and 1830s these played a leading part not only in internal cultural developments in Russia, but in opening up wider geographical perspectives.

As early as 1788 the author of a description of the province of Kharkiv had spoken of the unity of all "south Russians." "The inhabitants of South Russia," he wrote, are "separated from one another by distance, by alien government, by different ranking systems, by civic customs, by speech, some even by religion (the Union)," but "When they come to worship in Kiev, from the Volga and the Don in the east and Galicia and Lodomeria in the west . . . , they look at each other not as foreigners but as men of the same stock. . . . "[100] This was a standpoint much more widely adopted in the early nineteenth century, and publicized above all by two sub-Carpathian Ukrainians working in Russia, Ivan Orlai and Iurii Venelyn. They were by no means the only sub-Carpathian

Ukrainians in Russia. The first Rector of St. Petersburg University, Mykhailo Baludiansky, and the father of playwright Nestor Kukolnyk also came from beyond the Carpathians.[101] Orlai, in fact, who had arrived in Russia in the 1790s, had been instrumental in the summoning of a number of his fellow-countrymen in 1803, when the Russian government was looking for Slavic-speaking teachers to staff the new universities.[102] At that time he had written papers explaining to the ministry of education why sub-Carpathian Ukrainians were particularly well-suited for Russian service. One of these papers, published in Martynov's *Severnyi vestnik*, marks perhaps the earliest substantial attempt to explain to Russians that "south Russians" did not mean simply Ukrainians living within the confines of the empire.[103] Orlai was a relatively well-known figure, and well-known, above all, as an enthusiastic advocate of Slavic culture. At the personal level, his enthusiasm manifested itself in the way he persuaded Chodakowski to write to him in Ukrainian.[104] At the public level, when he was head of the Nizhyn gymnasium, his abortive attempt to reduce the amount of foreign language teaching evoked comment on his support for everything Slavic.[105]

Iurii Venelyn pushed the southern or "Slavic" case far harder than Orlai. By the time of his death in Moscow in 1839 he had earned nation-wide popularity. The obituary in *Severnaia pchela* gave a good account of his views. "Mr. Venelyn used to assert that not only the Huns, but even the Germans and the Franks were Slavs." The writer of the obituary said Venelyn was convinced that the founder of the Merovingian dynasty was a Slav, because his name could be derived from the Slavic word *mirovoi*. These ideas, according to the obituary, appealed to many; and for all his eccentricity Venelyn was at least committed to scholarship.[106] The outlandish extremes to which southerners were going by the 1830s had not put them beyond the pale of the intellectual world.

The one substantial work on which Venelyn's reputation rested at the time of his death was the first volume of his *Drevnie i nyneshnie Bolgare*, published in Moscow in 1829. M. P. Pogodin, who later published Chodakowski's literary remains, had urged Venelyn to go into print.[107] The book's argument extended far beyond consideration of the Bulgarians. In his preface Venelyn said he envisaged a five-volume study of the inter-relations of the various Slavic peoples. By the mid-1830s a Moscow reviewer had heard that

the figure had risen to eight.[108] Venelyn's starting-point was the desire to attain a better understanding not of Bulgarian, but of Russian history; and to use the Bulgarians to do it. Historians, Venelyn argued, had hitherto approached the origins of Russia by looking at the Varangians and Khazars, but they had reached no firm conclusions. "And so I chose the nearest point to the Khazars; that is, the Bulgarian people.... This people seemed to me the soundest and the most reliable guide to the antiquity of the whole of Eastern Europe."[109] Venelyn admitted that the ethnic composition of the Bulgarians in itself posed many problems, but the essential part of his thesis was clear: that it was necessary to bypass the Normanist controversy and concentrate wholly on the Slavs' contribution to history. "I have tried to open up a new field for young and future Russian investigators, a field which is incomparably more fruitful than barren Scandinavia."[110] The construction of Venelyn's first volume made plain that his principal concern was not Bulgaria, but its relevance to Russia. After discussing the Bulgarians' early history, he entitled the penultimate chapter of the volume, "Application of the notions laid out in the foregoing chapters to notions of the origin and dwellings of the ancient Russians"; and he called the last chapter "The military-political role played by Russia in Europe during the rule of Attila, and her superiority over the other States."[111]

Since, as we have already seen, Venelyn thought the Huns (and therefore Attila) were Slavs, the last chapter of his first book was in effect arguing that there had been a medieval precedent for the growing nineteenth-century dominance of Russia in Eastern Europe. That the government realized this is apparent from the official response to Venelyn's application for money to travel to Bulgaria in 1829. A. S. Shishkov put the request to the minister of education, and the internal ministerial memorandum which resulted, after restating the points of the proposed programme, described Venelyn as "intending in this way to look at all the places in Moldavia and Wallachia, and those in Bulgaria and Rumelia which are occupied by our troops...."[112] Russia was at war with Turkey in 1828–9, and anything which offered the prospect of justifying the occupation of new territories was likely to be favourably received. Not surprisingly, Venelyn's proposals were accepted.

Shishkov's letter of 1829, setting out what Venelyn wanted to do on his travels, brought out the specifically "south Russian" origins of Venelyn's inspiration. It described him as intending, among other things, to investigate the relationship between modern Bulgarian and "the Little Russian, Carpatho-Russian and Great Russian dialects."[113] Only a sub-Carpathian Ukrainian, perhaps, would have perceived the unity of an area stretching from Bulgaria in the south, via Ukraine, to Russia. Venelyn was enlarging the "Ukrainian theme" in Russian cultural life. Because the theme was present already, he had a launching-pad for the exposition of his views. The best expression of them appeared in an essay on the 1834 edition of Maksymovych's *Ukrainskie narodnye pesni.*[114] Because the songs were already being widely discussed, Venelyn was able to add to the discussion his novel point of view, which was that "the south Russian dialect" was improperly called "Little Russian," that it was in fact spoken by twenty million inhabitants of Russia, Poland, Galicia and northern Hungary—nearly as many as spoke Russian—and that therefore the songs under review were even more important than was already accepted, and should be set in a still wider context.[115] This was the crest of the Ukrainian wave. Venelyn took advantage of an interest in Ukraine which had been growing in Russia for decades, and added a new dimension to it, the dimension of the Slavic world at large. The Ukrainian theme, Ukrainian connections, intellectuals in Russia who were already aware of Ukraine's ideological potential—all these provided Venelyn with the entrée he needed. Sub-Carpathian Ukrainians were not the only variety of non-Russian Slav to come to Russia in the early part of the nineteenth century—the Serb Vuk Karadžić came in 1819, the Pole Adam Mickiewicz in 1826–7—but the impression made by Orlai and Venelyn dovetailed particularly effectively with the movement, already in existence, for the development of a Slavic consciousness in Russia through the medium of Ukraine.

While sub-Carpathian Ukrainians came to Russia, certain Ukrainians born within the Russian Empire were travelling outside it and looking at Slavic Eastern Europe. These journeys broadened their minds; and the fact that they were made confirms the notion that the inspiration provided by Ukraine was instrumental in the Russian discovery of the Slavs. Three figures in particular, P. I. Köppen, Osyp Bodiansky and Izmail Sreznevsky, came from

Ukraine, had a strong sense of its difference from Russia, travelled extensively in other Slavic lands and wrote about their journeys. Only one, Bodiansky, was in fact truly Ukrainian, for Köppen's first language was German and Sreznevsky was ethnically Russian, but all three were brought up in Ukraine (Bodiansky in Poltava, Köppen and Sreznevsky in Kharkiv), and all three were deeply influenced by its culture.

Köppen has already appeared in this chapter, as a friend of Loboiko at Kharkiv University and an early traveller in Belorussia. Between 1821 and 1824 he made the first great journey by a Russian citizen through the Slavic parts of Eastern Europe, and on his return founded a journal, *Bibliograficheskie listy* (1825–6), which despite its dull title and relatively brief duriation brought together everything which the Rumiantsev group stood for, the domestic antiquarian interests and the links with the wider Slavic renaissance.[116] Köppen's first loyalty was to Ukraine. His son described him as "an enthusiastic Ukrainian patriot," quoting his travel diary at the point when he reached the first Ukrainian village on his way south in 1821: "From here everything takes on a different aspect. The land becomes classical."[117] On his way west across Volhynia into Slavic Eastern Europe, he made notes on Ukrainians and other Slavic languages and dialects.[118] In Lviv in early 1822 he discussed the works of Kotliarevsky, Pavlovsky and Tsertelev with a local priest, and beyond the Carpathians he visited the Ukrainian-speaking Baludiansky family, relations of the Rector of St. Petersburg University.[119] In his journal of 1825–6 Ukraine appeared relatively frequently. Drawing up a plan of campaign for those thinking of visiting Slavic Eastern Europe, Köppen included a recommendation to compare the *Rusniatskii iazyk* of Galicia with "Little Russian."[120] He reviewed the works of Ryleev and Hnidych, and in speaking of Ryleev's *Dumy* expatiated (somewhat irrelevantly) on the sub-Carpathian Ukrainians and their relations to Ukrainian.[121] Discussing a question of Russian orthography, he felt that the matter could be solved by looking at Ukrainian.[122] Considering a master's thesis on water communications in Russia, he took the opportunity to advocate the joining of the Donets and the Dnieper in order to make his native Kharkiv more prosperous.[123] That Köppen took far more than a casual interest in things Ukrainian is shown by his attempt to get a Ukrainian dictionary

published by one of the St. Petersburg Academies. Having asked Pavlovsky to begin the work in 1816, he presented the first part to Shishkov for his opinion, only to be told, apparently, that the academy had already bought a Ukrainian dictionary and had entrusted its publication to Hnidych, Kapnist and Tsertelev.[124] When Rumiantsev died in January 1826, and with him, in effect, both his circle and Köppen's journal, it was not long before Köppen withdrew from St. Petersburg to the south.

Here then was a man who was central in developing Russia's Slavic awareness, but whose roots were firmly in Ukraine. Interest in cultural variety within the empire tended to inspire interest in similar sorts of cultural variety beyond the empire's frontiers. In his travels of 1821–4, Köppen made contact with all the great figures of the Slavic renaissance and brought back knowledge of them to Russia. It was through him that Shishkov tried to get P. I. Šafařík, Václav Hanka and Jernej Kopitar to come to Russia and serve as professors in 1826–7;[125] through him, possibly, Kollár was made aware of the travels of Chodakowski.[126] He was a prime intermediary between Russia and the Slavs. He published a bibliography of Slavic books printed between 1476 and 1600, and devoted a whole number of his journals to extracts from Josif Dobrovský's *Cyrill und Method*.[127] These were subjects of broad significance. That Köppen came from Ukraine, retained his interest in it, and took up subjects ranging far beyond its borders, indicated that Ukrainian origins facilitated participation in contemporary debates. They gave a citizen of the empire awareness of its cultural variety and vitality, and led him to look for further sources of vitality in the differences between other sorts of Slav.

Bodiansky and Sreznevsky belong to the post-Rumiantsev period. Both were appointed professors of the non-Russian Slavic languages when Chairs in this subject were finally set up in Russian universities in the second half of the 1830s, and both, before they took up their posts, spent some years travelling in Slavic Eastern Europe.[128] In time they became two of the most famous Slavic philologists of nineteenth-century Russia.[129] Their roots, like those of Köppen, lay in Ukraine. Bodiansky, who appeared at the beginning of this chapter, engaged in debate with V. N. Smirnytsky over the latter's collection of Ukrainian proverbs. Even after five years' foreign travel, he still concentrated on publishing material relating

to Ukraine in his first period as secretary of the Moscow Society of Russian History and Antiquities (1845–8).[130] Sreznevsky, perhaps, had less to do with Ukraine in later life, but in the 1830s he was a fervent advocate of all things Ukrainian. His *Zaporozhskaia starina*, published in Kharkiv between 1833 and 1838, was one of the most substantial publications of Ukrainian songs and *dumy*. Later, Sreznevsky's son stressed his father's Russianness, contrasting him, for example, with the more nationalist Mykola Kostomarov. The line of argument, however, seems a little forced.[131] At the end of the nineteenth century it was politic to defend Sreznevsky from the charge of Ukrainian nationalism, but in the 1830s the lines of political demarcation were still being laid down, and feeling for Ukraine could be fruitful in an Imperial context, flowing over into feelings for the Slavs as a whole.

The most striking thing about the first four professors of Slavic languages in Russia was that none of them was really Russian. Sreznevsky was, but his father had been made a professor at Kharkiv early in the century. Bodiansky was Ukrainian, V. I. Hryhorovych Polish, and P. I. Preis from the Baltic. That two of the four should have had Ukrainian affiliations indicates that the Russian government knew where to turn after the Czech teachers had failed to materialize.[132] The Czechs were leading the Slavic renaissance, but within the Russian Empire Ukrainians tended to be its principal advocates. In the early nineteenth century, their role in the promotion of academic study of the Slavs was no less important than their contribution to new trends in Russian literature and Russian historical writings.

Chapter Nine

The Divergence of Ukraine and Russia

Official Nationality

This book has tried to show that Ukraine was important outside its frontiers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Writing from a Ukrainian standpoint toward the end of the nineteenth century, Mykhailo Drahomanov described the entire period when Ukraine was ruled by Russia as a "lost epoch";[1] but for part of that period Ukrainians and ideas inspired by Ukraine helped to shape the thought patterns of cultivated Russians. They were able to do so because at the beginning of the nineteenth century the concept of *narodnost*, "nationality," was coming to the forefront of intellectual exchanges in Russia. The word *narodnost*, coined by Prince P. A. Viazemsky in 1819,[2] appeared in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars, at a time when the idea of the Russian Empire's distinctive identity had become fashionable among intellectuals. Ukraine played a part in defining the word's content. Russians perceived what Ukraine could offer; Ukrainians redoubled their efforts to impress the character of the south upon the north. Ukrainians began setting Ukraine in the context of the Slavic world as a whole, travelling to other Slavic parts of Eastern Europe and developing a broader vision of the vitality of Slavic culture. The eighteenth-century administrative integration of the empire seemed

to be finding a nineteenth-century philosophical counterpart.

Ukraine, however, soon terminated its positive contribution to the development of Russia. The concept of *narodnost* became less open-ended and attracted a narrower range of thinkers. Mistrusting an idea which had arisen outside official circles, the authorities placed their own interpretation upon it. In a memorandum to the Tsar of late 1832, S. S. Uvarov, deputy minister of education, spoke of instilling in the young "the truly Russian protective principles of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality, which constitute the ultimate anchor of our salvation and the truest guarantee of the strength and grandeur of our Fatherland."[3] It was novel to include the pursuit of "nationality" (*narodnost*) in a list of governmental priorities. The regime had long been committed to Orthodoxy and autocracy, but nationality caught the eye. Uvarov had not chosen the goal by chance, for, as the Soviet expert on the subject points out, "At the beginning of the 1830s, nationality can hardly be said to have been only a word."[4] In March 1833, having been promoted minister, Uvarov dispatched a circular to the heads of educational districts in which he declared: "Our common obligation consists in this, that the education of the people be conducted, according to the Supreme intention of our august Monarch, in the joint spirit of Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality."[5] Nicholas I had clearly given his seal of approval to the programme which Uvarov outlined a few months previously. The Tsar and his minister were establishing an official context for the redefinition of *narodnost*.

By associating nationality with Orthodoxy and autocracy, the authorities created more problems than they solved. On the one hand, official approval of *narodnost* seemed to encourage the continuation of cultural development in the regions, for the term implied support for all sorts of native culture. Ukrainian matter certainly continued to appear in the Russian press in the 1830s and 1840s. An early twentieth-century student went so far as to date "the dawn of the Ukrainophile movement" from the moment when the government began to sponsor the concept of nationality.[6] In the first half of the 1840s the officially oriented St. Petersburg journal *Maiak* (*The Beacon*) looked with great favour upon Ukraine.[7] In reality, however, the official understanding of *narodnost* did the regions of the empire no good, for by linking nationality with

Orthodoxy and autocracy, Uvarov and Nicholas I set constraints upon the concept. Where once it had been wide-ranging in its implications, it became narrowly defined and oppressive. The term "Official Nationality," coined in the 1870s by the populist historian and critic Aleksandr Pypin, has become synonymous with the severe conservatism of Nicholas I's regime.[8] Having briefly offered the Slavs of the Russian Empire the chance of harmonious co-existence, *narodnost* became a Russian cudgel; for only certain sorts of provincial culture met with central government approval. The last section of Chapter Two included an instance of the way in which the official view of *narodnost* militated against the Poles.[9] That Poles should be kept firmly in their place was predictable, given their readiness to take up arms against St. Petersburg; but in 1847 members of a Ukrainian body, the Cyrillo-Methodian Society, were arrested for deviating to a lesser extent from the official view of nationality. Although the Cyrillo-Methodians were non-violent in their outlook, and advocated a federation of Slavic peoples rather than outright Ukrainian independence, their views went much too far for the government. Nicholas I's regime was becoming increasingly cautious in the 1840s, more reluctant than ever to sanction change. Uvarov's reaction to the arrests of 1847 was to contract his tripartite formula of 1833. In a circular occasioned by the proscription of the Cyrillo-Methodians, he explicitly rejected the subversive implications of the rise of non-Russian Slavs. "At the end of the last century," he wrote,

> the thought arose among people related to us in the west, namely in Bohemia, that all the peoples of Slavic origin, scattered about Europe and subjected to different sceptres, must sometime merge into a single whole and form a Slavic State. This thought gradually took hold of all the branches of the Slavic tribe, first in the literary, then in the political sense.... [U]nfortunately...the development of the separate Slavic branches did not long stay within the peaceful confines of learning; soon it fell prey to distortion, partly from the influence of general, disquieting political ideas, partly from the incitement of religious prejudices, partly from the particular misunderstandings of each tribe.... Russian Slavdom, in its pure form, should express unconditional attachment to Orthodoxy and autocracy; but everything that goes beyond these confines is the admixture of alien concepts, the play of fantasy, or a mask behind which the ill-intentioned try to ensnare inexperience and entice

dreamers.[10]

With the passage of time, then, the Russian government had discovered that *narodnost* did not go well with Orthodoxy and autocracy. It was a centrifugal rather than a unifying concept, and could not easily be subjected to official management. By redefining *narodnost*, the authorities made it difficult for Ukrainian culture to find loyal expression within the empire.

Westernizers and Slavophiles

It took more than official disapproval, however, to stamp out philosophical currents in Imperial Russia. If the definition and pursuit of *narodnost* had remained a primary concern of Russian intellectuals outside the realms of government, Ukrainians might still have found cultural outlets in the north. But thought patterns were changing in unofficial circles as well as in the councils of state. In 1831 N. I. Nadezhdin had spoken of "some sort of secret agreement" about Ukraine, meaning that intellectuals of many kinds were enthusiastic about this "most festive expression of Slavic spirit."[11] In the course of the 1830s, however, new intellectual currents altered the complexion of philosophical exchanges in Russia. The general concern for Slavic culture was succeeded by renewed interest in the relationship between Russia and the West. Intellectuals formed themselves into camps, some deploring the extent to which the empire lagged behind Europe, others lamenting the Westernizing process which had occupied the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The pro-Western faction had priorities other than the pursuit of native culture, while even the "Slavophiles" were more interested in broad generalizations than in the detail of Slavic interaction. In the changed context, Ukraine received less attention than in the recent past.[12]

With one important exception, Westerners were not positively anti-Ukrainian. Timofei Granovsky, whose lectures on the medieval history of Western Europe attracted huge audiences at Moscow University in the first half of the 1840s, was Ukrainian on his mother's side and showed kindness toward Opanas Markovych, one of the Cyrillo-Methodians arrested in 1847.[13] Aleksandr Herzen showed his benevolent disposition toward Ukraine in a number of ways. He spoke well of a Ukrainian medical student's self-sacrifice in the fight against the 1831 cholera epidemic; he called his circle of dissident friends a "Zaporozhian Sich"; he implied that the Governor of Perm was kind toward internal exiles because he was Ukrainian; he hinted that literature in Ukrainian had forward-looking connotations, and he lamented the death of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko.[14] Herzen's close friend, Vadim Passek, wrote an account of Ukrainian history and culture in which

he pointed out that Ukraine came into contact with European powers before the rest of the empire, and that it arrested the "destructive influx of the first Tatar hordes."[15] Westerners, however, did not pay great attention to Ukraine, because they were not interested in strengthening the empire's sense of its Slavic identity. They believed that the empire's identity was strong enough, and that what the country needed was progress along Western lines. As Herzen put it, "For us to prove our distinctive identity (*nashu narodnost*) would be still funnier than for the Germans to prove theirs; even those who abuse us do not doubt that our distinctive identity exists—they hate us because they are afraid of us, but they do not deny our existence as Metternich denied that of Italy."[16] Herzen believed that *narodnost* made a good rallying-cry when peoples were struggling for independence from foreign rulers, but that in other contexts—certainly in the Russian context—it was stultifying. He respected his intellectual adversaries, the Slavophiles, but held that they were tarnished by their association with the official view of nationality propounded by the government. The association was involuntary—"the two had nothing in common but words"[17]—but it invalidated the Slavophiles' position. Herzen did not deny that Slavic culture had its merits, but the Slavophile approach could not make the most of them. "Only the powerful thought of the West . . . is capable of fertilizing the seeds which lie dormant in the Slavs' patriarchal way of life."[18] Given his commitment to the West, Herzen was unlikely to attach much importance to the distinction between Ukrainians and Russians. Whatever their relations, neither could become modern without help from outside the empire.

While Herzen expressed himself with moderation, the literary critic Vissarion Belinsky made Ukraine the butt for savage condemnations of Slavic backwardness. Herzen believed that Belinsky, the most outspoken of the Westerners, was responsible for the clearcut distinction between Westerners and Slavophiles. Before he appeared on the scene, "with a volume of Hegel in his hands and [consumed] with youthful impatience," the two groups differed subtly rather than fundamentally.[19] Committed to Western ideals, Belinsky saw Ukraine as a backwater. Victor Swoboda has analyzed in detail his hostility to the most famous of writers in Ukrainian, Taras Shevchenko.[20] He was no less hostile to Mykola Markevych's

Istoriia Malorossii, which appeared in Moscow in 1842 and 1843. Although Markevych's work lacked sophistication, it hardly deserved the broadside to which Belinsky subjected it.[21]

Markevych was well qualified to write the history of Ukraine. Born in 1804, he was a distant relation of Iakiv Markovych, the early Ukrainian historian whose *Zapiski o Malorossii* had appeared in 1798.[22] His grandfather has been well received in the capital by Bezborodko, and Viktor Kochubei was his grandmother's cousin. Through his mother, a Hudovych, he was related to some of the empire's most distinguished soldiers. His father was close to N. P. Rumiantsev.[23] These connections helped to determine the form that Markevych's literary inclinations were to take. His interest in the history of Ukraine began in 1820, when, on returning south from St. Petersburg as a sixteen-year-old schoolboy, he was given the books and papers left by his grandfather. The following year, having received two huge trunks containing the papers of the early eighteenth-century Hetman Ivan Skoropadsky, he "developed no mere dilettantish passion for manuscripts." In 1822 he acquired some of the papers of P. A. Rumiantsev and others belonging to the Rozumovsky family. By 1830 he owned the library of the eighteenth-century poet Bohdanovych, the manuscripts of the former Rector of the Kiev Academy, Samiilo Myslavsky, and materials pertaining to the Hudovych and Kochubei families.[24] In 1825 Markevych complimented the Russian poet, Kondratii Ryleev, on his treatment of Ukrainian subject matter.[25] In 1831 he displayed an interest in publicizing the recently discovered *Istoriia Rusov*, in the belief that it might fill out Bantysh-Kamensky's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*.[26] By the time he published his own *Istoriia*, Markevych's concern for evidence had reached such a pitch that documents filled three of his five volumes; he was of use to Osyp Bodiansky when the latter was publishing Ukrainian historical documents in the second half of the 1840s.[27]

While thanking him for his extensive publication of documents, Belinsky felt that the end product of Markevych's scholarship lacked a sense of perspective. He devoted most of his lengthy review of the *Istoriia Malorossii* to an exposition of the Westerners' interpretation of recent developments in intellectual life. "One of the most characteristic features of our time," he began, "is the way in which hitherto disparate aspects of intellectual life aspire to unity

and affinity." Diversity had been inevitable earlier, but its time had passed. So far as nations were concerned, the new understanding of unity "takes the form of subordinating the great idea of national individuality to the still greater idea of humanity." Belinsky was inveighing against the narrow concern for Russian nationality which preoccupied the Slavophiles of the 1840s. "Nowadays," he asserted, "only weak, limited minds can think that the successes of humanity are detrimental to the successes of nationality, and that Chinese walls are necessary for the protection of nationality." Countries stood to gain, not to lose, by opening their frontiers. Academic disciplines, like countries, were best served by breadth of outlook. History was usually divided into the history of mankind and the history of individual countries, but the distinction was artificial: "he who... thinks of individual peoples as independent entities, not directly related to mankind as a whole, is in no position to write a good history of any one people." Belinsky advocated the division of history by topic rather than by geographical area. Universal history, in other words, would in the future be constructed out of lesser histories of religion, art, law, trade and other separate aspects of communal life.[28]

This philosophy of history left little room for a lengthy study of Ukraine. As Belinsky put it, turning to the book which occasioned his essay, "Everything we have said can apply only *negatively* to Markevych's *Istoriia Malorossii.*"[29] In Belinsky's view, Ukraine would not have found a place even in the writing of country-by-country history, for

> Little Russia was never a state, and consequently had no history in the strict sense of the word. The history of Little Russia is no more than an episode from the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich.... The history of Little Russia is a tributary flowing into the great river of Russian history. Little Russians were always a tribe, never a people, even less a state. They could fight bravely and die splendidly for their motherland, they found it perfectly normal to overcome a strong enemy with few resources—but they could never make use of the fruits of their victories....

Apart from the fact that it did not constitute a separate country, Belinsky had a second objection to Ukraine. Insofar as it had a history, that history lay outside the European mainstream and militated against the European cultural unity to which Belinsky had

devoted the opening of his review. Not only did Ukrainians lack a state; they were "some sort of strange commune in the Asiatic manner. Their real adversaries, the ones worthy of them, were the Crimean Tatars, and the Little Russians fought them splendidly, in the spirit of their nationality." This second indictment of Ukraine was the mainspring of Belinsky's objection to Markevych's book. Before Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Ukraine was "a parody of a republic, or in other words a Slavic republic." It possessed a certain order, but that order was based not on law but on custom, "the cornerstone of all Asiatic peoples." Khmelnytsky did well to put Ukraine under Russian tutelage, for by means of the merger Ukraine received the chance of "civilization, enlightenment, art and learning, from which she was previously cut off by the insurmountable obstacle of her semi-barbaric life-style." Markevych's mistake, according to Belinsky, was to believe that he was writing "the history of a people and a state, which in different, happier circumstances might have developed into something great and eternal." In the opinion of Russia's leading Westernizer, Ukraine could never have developed along these lines while it lay beyond the pale of Western European culture. It could get access to that culture only by subordinating itself to Russia; and historians need turn aside from Russian history only briefly, in order to look at the seventeenth-century process of subordination.

As believers in native culture, Slavophiles ought to have looked more favourably upon Ukraine than did their adversaries, the Westernizers. They were certainly free from Belinsky's extreme antipathy. S. T. Aksakov learned much from Gogol, and admired the actor Shchepkin's ability to convey the Ukrainian identity on the Russian stage; P. V. Kireevsky's enthusiasm for native folklore received a considerable fillip from Gogol's passion for Ukrainian songs; Aleksei Khomiakov welcomed the preaching of sermons in Ukrainian.[30] But because Slavophiles were anxious above all to counteract the Westernizers' insistence on European values, and because their best chance of finding an effective counterweight to those values lay in stressing the unity of Slavic culture, it was not in their interest to place undue emphasis on the dissimilarities between the various Slavic peoples. Slavophiles found it difficult to agree on an all-embracing philosophy which would be strong enough to meet the threat of Westernization. Throughout the period of their

existence, they questioned one another's priorities. In the late 1830s Ivan Kireevsky argued with Khomiakov about the latter's essay "On the the Old and the New," while a decade and a half later, in 1852, Khomiakov responded at length to Kireevsky's equally seminal paper entitled "On the Character of Europe's Enlightenment and Its Relationship to Russia's Enlightenment."[31] At the time of Moscow's seven-hundredth anniversary, in 1847, Kireevsky lamented the many differences of opinion among Slavophiles. The occasion should have facilitated an expression of solidarity, but Kireevsky pointed out that Slavophiles could not agree on the essence of the Slavic identity. For one it meant a common language and Slavic ethnic unity; for another it meant resisting the West; for a third it meant the pursuit of *narodnost*, which itself was subject to different interpretations; while for a fourth it meant stressing the Orthodox religion.[32] Beset by these differences of opinion on questions of broad principle, Slavophiles had little time for questions of detail; and when they found the time, they had little inclination to add to their disagreements by making much of side issues. Ukraine, for them, was a side issue. They knew it was different from Russia, but believed the differences were unimportant, ephemeral and sprang from quirks of fate. They chose to see Ukraine as simply part of "Rus'," that variegated abstraction which was united under the Russians and needed only proper direction to fulfil its destiny.

The Aksakov brothers, Ivan and Konstantin, were respectively the most open-minded and the most reactionary of the Slavophiles, yet their views on Ukraine were remarkably similar. Ivan, the more liberal of the two, wrote a prize-winning economic study of Ukrainian fairs, in the preface to which he spoke briefly of Ukraine in general. He asserted unequivocally that, with the completion of Khmelnytsky's revolt, "[Ukraine's] danger passed; and with the passing of the danger the call to independent historical action also came to an end, and the glorious Cossacks lost all real practical significance, all legal right to historical existence." Ukraine, in Aksakov's opinion, remained different from Russia, but it did so only because Russia had strayed from the true Slavic path when Peter the Great introduced reforms derived from Western Europe. The Ukrainian people "made up its mind to suffer and wait, until its adversities passed." According to Ivan Aksakov, then, Ukraine's fate depended on that of Russia. A critic took him to task in 1862

for his hostility toward the Ukrainian language.[33]

The older Aksakov, Konstantin, spoke less clearly than his brother about the Ukrainian-Russian relationship. In his reflections on Gogol's *Dead Souls* he seemed anxious to present the author as quintessentially Russian, but reluctant to assert that Ukraine had been Russianized. Making play with the metaphysical concept Rus', he depicted the empire as a community led, but not oppressed, by the Russians. Gogol, in Aksakov's presentation, belonged to this broad community but retained his specific identity. The argument, however, ultimately claimed Gogol for the north:

> The Gogol phenomenon embodies one more important factor: he is from Little Russia.... but Little Russia is a living part of Russia, which has been formed by the mighty Great Russian spirit. Under the aegis of that spirit, Little Russia can display its character and become a living element of the general life of Rus'. Rus' embraces all its component parts equally, and is not called Great Russia, but simply Russia. If it were called Great Russia, it would be one-sided, and the other parts would relate to it like the vanquished to the victor. Of course, unity stemmed from the Great Russian element. The Great Russian element bestows the general character and has the honour of having created the whole. It provides the scope for everything, every area, to develop freely—and it has retained its legitimate supremacy, like that of the head in the living human body. But the body as a whole bears the name of the man, not of the head; so Russia is called Russia, not Great Russia. Of course, a Little Russian poet can appear only if he writes in Russian (i.e., Great Russian). He can and must be only Russian, a typical citizen of that Russia which is common to all, bestowing upon it his own flavour and pouring new life into its separate parts.... Gogol is Russian, wholly Russian, and this is particularly apparent in his poem, in which he is preoccupied by the substance of Rus', Rus' in its entirety....[34]

Gogol himself was less certain that he was "wholly Russian,"[35] but Konstantin Aksakov was prepared to argue away problems of detail. Like all the Slavophiles, he was trying to construct a Slavic edifice which could serve as a bastion against encroachments from the West. Cracks in that edifice had to be papered over.

Cultural Changes in Ukraine

The Slavophiles' non-admission of the separate standing of Ukraine was reasonable only so long as Ukrainians were looking voluntarily to the Russians for leadership. For the bulk of the period covered by this book they continued to do so, but toward the middle of the nineteenth century some of them began turning away from Russia and thinking for themselves. The slow genesis or revival of Ukrainian autonomist sentiment provided the most telling reason for the gradual divergence of the northern and southern parts of the Russian Empire. Its origins were complex. In part it sprang from nostalgia for the Hetmanate,[36] but to a greater degree it arose out of the very Imperial integration which should, at first sight, have prevented it. The introduction of Russian institutions into Ukraine and the participation of Ukrainians in the cultural and political life of the north might have been expected to eradicate all particularist feeling in the minds of southerners. In fact, however, these developments only partially erased memories of the Hetmanate, while at the same time encouraging Ukrainians to start building their own identity. New educational facilities in Ukraine, and exposure to Western Romanticism, fostered independent patterns of thought.

The opening of Kharkiv University in 1805 marked the beginning of a new phase in Ukrainian history. The university, founded as part of a general reorganization of the empire's educational system, came to provide eastern Ukrainians with a means of self-expression which they had not previously possessed. Vasyl Karazyn, the local patriot who espoused the cause of the university in the capital, had to work hard to achieve his ends. In March 1801 he wrote Alexander I a letter expressing great enthusiasm for the prospects offered by the new reign, but three and a half years later he was worn out by the political manoeuvring in which he had had to engage. By then, however, the groundwork had been laid for the opening of the empire's first southern university. Professors had been appointed, and one of them given special responsibility for the development of the Kharkiv region's educational infrastructure. Karazyn himself had gone south to encourage the local gentry to press for and support the new arrangements. Illia Tymkovsky, the

professor entrusted with fostering schools subordinate to the university, worked tirelessly between 1803 and 1811. A Russianized Swiss who had first seen Kharkiv in 1787 assigned its radical transformation, in the next thirty years, to the foundation of the university. In 1817 he felt that one could apply to the city the words of the Emperor Augustus: "I found Rome brick and left it marble." Karazyn pointed out in 1820 that the number of pupils in all Kharkiv schools was exceeded only in the provinces of St. Petersburg and Moscow, and equalled only in the provinces on the south coast of the Baltic. The new university and the schools for which it was responsible had clearly taken root.[37]

Neither the founders of Kharkiv University nor those who benefited from it in its early years were remotely separatist in their view of Ukraine. Karazyn lived into the 1840s and knew the next generation of Ukrainian intellectuals, but remained strongly pro-Russian in his political orientation. He regretted that a Kharkiv almanac of 1843 came out under the Ukrainian title *Molodyk*, and argued that the history of eastern Ukraine (excluding the Hetmanate) contained no signs of disobedience toward the central authorities.[38] Although a staunch advocate of the regions, Karazyn defended them against the misleading accounts of foreigners rather than against the centre.[39] His outlook was strongly provincial, but never particularist. Tymkovsky, who did so much to improve educational facilities in eastern Ukraine, published a textbook of Russian in 1811.[40] Education in Ukrainian was not yet possible, and even if the time had been right it is unlikely that Tymkovsky would have taken advantage of the fact, for he and his family were prime beneficiaries of an Imperial system which gave them opportunities for advancement both inside and outside Ukraine.[41] At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Ukrainians who devoted themselves wholeheartedly to the development of Ukraine did so for the sake of the empire as a whole.

In their early days, periodicals which appeared in Kharkiv also looked mainly to the north. While giving local writers a chance to publish their work, they tended to imitate journals which came out in Moscow and St. Petersburg. The editor of *Kharkovskii Demokrit*, a short-lived publication of 1816, hoped to attract northern as well as southern readers.[42] *Ukrainskii vestnik*, which lasted from 1816 to 1819, was broadening its horizons throughout

the brief period of its existence.[43] In late 1819 it attracted the hostility of the Russian minister of education, but on the grounds of irreligion, not regionalism.[44] *Ukrainskii zhurnal*, published in 1824 and 1825, seemed to compensate for the criticism levelled at its predecessor by devoting much space to moral and ethical problems.[45] But although these early journals tended to reflect literary developments elsewhere, their effect was not simply to accelerate Ukrainian integration into Russia. Their mere existence fostered a sense of local pride; their inclusion of translations from Western Romantic literature stimulated specifically local reflections on the individual and the nation; insofar as they allotted space to local subject-matter, they gave content as well as form to the notion of a distinct Ukrainian identity. Both *Ukrainskii vestnik* and *Ukrainskii zhurnal* included a good deal of locally orientated material. Having opened with a study of Khmelnytsky, the editors of *Ukrainskii vestnik* published a general account of Ukrainian history, a particular study of the period between Khmelnytsky's death and the battle of Poltava, and material relating to the eighteenth-century Ukrainian writer and philosopher Skovoroda.[46] The editor of *Ukrainskii zhurnal* affirmed his commitment to local interests and included many articles on Ukraine past and present, among them Ivan Kulzhynsky's "Remarks concerning the History and Character of Little Russian Poetry."[47] Since the early Kharkiv periodicals printed little in Ukrainian, and since the literary use of the language was still in its infancy, Kulzhynsky's essay was ahead of its time. The author wrote in Russian, but asserted the antiquity of Ukrainian and argued that it still contained many ancient words which were not to be found in any Slavic books. Kulzhynsky felt that Ukrainians could claim as their own the author of the medieval *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, and regretted that politics had interrupted the development of the local gift for poetry. He deplored the corruption of Ukrainian by Tatar, but believed that the language owed much of its "tenderness and musicality" to Polish. By concluding his essay with reference to the folksongs of the Zaporozhian Cossacks and the poetry of Skovoroda and Kotliarevsky, Kulzhynsky implied that Ukrainian was far from dead and could provide his fellow-countrymen with a means of strengthening their identity.

Literary activity in Kharkiv in the years immediately following the Napoleonic Wars was relatively small-scale, but marked an increase in Ukrainian self-confidence. By the 1830s certain Ukrainians were going further. In effect, they were acting on Kulzhynsky's essay of 1824, by publishing more extensively in Ukrainian. The slim miscellany *Ukrainskii almanakh*, which appeared in Kharkiv in 1831, contained original and imitation Ukrainian folksongs alongside Russian prose and poetry, while the second volume of *Utrenniaia zvezda*, published in Kharkiv three years later, was devoted almost entirely to prose and verse in Ukrainian.[48] A "Kharkiv school" of Romantic writers was beginning to establish itself, one of whose objectives was to develop the Ukrainian language. To say that the members of the "school" were Ukrainian nationalists *avant la lettre* is to go too far, since most of them wrote in Russian as well as Ukrainian and many of them made successful careers in Russian service; but their activities, nevertheless, introduced a new dimension into the cultural relationship between northern and southern parts of the empire. Some Ukrainians were beginning to think that their culture was worth promoting for its own sake, not merely for the prospect of enrichment that it offered to Russian culture; and certain Russians, aware of the changing balance, were anxious to keep Ukrainians in their place.[49]

Russian and Ukrainian views of literature began to diverge. While Russian critics had welcomed Gogol's *Vechera* in 1831, they expressed doubts about other sorts of Ukrainian literary activity. Although N. I. Nadezhdin was almost as enthusiastic about *Ukrainskii almanakh* as he was about the *Vechera*,[50] the Russian press began responding less favourably to Ukrainian literature. Gogol wrote in Russian, but Ukrainians' popularity declined as they began to place more emphasis on their native language. In the 1820s they had not stressed it unduly. At that time, the author of an essay "On the Antiquity and Distinctive Nature of the South Russian Language" had published it in Polish translation rather than in the original Russian. A decade later, when Ukrainians were becoming more assertive, the essay was published in Russian.[51] Osyp Bodiansky, meanwhile, had published a review of scholarly opinion concerning the languages spoken in medieval Rus', in which he held that the language of the "southern Russians (*iuzhnye russy*)" was

as old as that of the northerners. In the remote past the two languages may not have been very different from each another, but with the appearance of the Cossacks in the south, all classes began to speak the language of the commoners. From then on the languages of north and south could no longer be dovetailed.[52] Bodiansky's belief in the independence of Ukrainian was becoming common ground among his fellow southerners in the second half of the 1830s. Mykhailo Maksymovych pointed out in 1838 that he had been asserting for ten years that Ukrainian was distinct from Russian.[53] In 1839 Amvrosii Metlynsky prefaced a volume of Ukrainian folksongs (published in Kharkiv) with a paean of praise to the Ukrainian language.[54] P. P. Biletsky-Nosenko expressed similar enthusiasm in reflections of 1841.[55] These opinions were not well received in the north. A St. Petersburg reviewer, for example, took exception to Metlynsky's publication and spoke slightingly of the contemporary Ukrainian revival. "Little Russians," he wrote, "or South Russians (*Malorossiiane, ili Iuzhnorussy*) collect and publish the memorials of their language with great enthusiasm, despite the fact that the language is increasingly forgotten and finds few keen followers or zealous defenders."[56] Two years previously, the Russian critic N. A. Polevoi said much the same thing, more moderately, in a lengthy review of a minor Ukrainian writer.[57] Polevoi spoke of two sorts of nationality, one higher than the other and attained only by peoples who achieved statehood. Ukrainians had attained only the lesser sort. Their culture was colourful, but ought to be kept in perspective. Kotliarevsky (and the work under review) expressed its essential quality, but less gifted Ukrainian writers "revealed . . . the falsity of sham Little Russian literature, a pure anachronism in terms of the way we live now."[58] Polevoi clearly wanted to keep the Ukrainian revival within bounds. He was not as hostile to Ukraine as Belinsky, but like many Russian critics of the 1830s he was reluctant to countenance undue deviations from the mainstream of literary development within the empire. The northern reviewer of a play published in Kharkiv in 1831 asked whether employing turns of speech in use among the common people (in this case, among Ukrainians) served the general cause of the Russian drama.[59] The negative answer, which the critic implied, would have been given by many Russian contemporaries.

Yet the Ukrainian revival went on, sustained partly by continuing activity in Kharkiv, partly by the emergence of Kiev as a centre of activity, and partly by sympathetic elements in Russia who still saw Ukraine as a useful contributor to Russian culture. The key figures in mid-nineteenth-century Ukrainian affairs, Taras Shevchenko, Panteleimon Kulish and Mykola Kostomarov, began to make a mark in the early 1840s. Shevchenko, liberated serf, poet, pupil of the St. Petersburg painter Karl Briullov, published his Ukrainian-language collection of poetry *Kobzar* in 1840; Kulish published his Russian-language novel *Mikhailo Charnyshenko, ili Malorossiia vosemdesiat let nazad*, in Kiev in 1843; Kostomarov, also in 1843, contributed to the new Kharkiv miscellany, *Molodyk*. In the next few years these three became the major representatives of the Ukrainian "awakening" and took it on to a new plane, with the result that in 1847 they fell foul of the tsarist political system. Although, in a sense, the authorities had formerly encouraged Ukrainophilism, now they took the view that cultural advance in Ukraine had gone far enough. Perhaps, given their resolute opposition to change, they were right to intervene. The Ukrainians who came to be known as Cyrillo-Methodians were not acting very differently from those who preceded them in the Ukrainian revival, but they probably had a clearer notion of the possible political consequences of their largely cultural activity. Almost imperceptibly, they were crossing the boundary between literature and politics.

The circumstances surrounding the arrest of the Cyrillo-Methodians were described in detail in a police report to the Tsar.[60] On 17 March 1847 the head of the notorious Third Section of the Imperial Chancellery, Count A. F. Orlov, received information about the existence in Kiev of a certain "Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius." Aleksei Petrov, a student at Kiev University, had infiltrated the society and reported on it. A significant number of arrests ensued, including those of Kostomarov (by then a professor at Kiev), Shevchenko (described as a painter attached to the St. Petersburg Academy of Arts), and Kulish (who, having been a teacher at a St. Petersburg gymnasium, was on the point of going abroad). Further investigation revealed that the original denunciation had been unduly alarmist. The "Ukraino-Slavic Society," as the official report called it, had existed

for no more than a few months, at the end of 1845 and the beginning of 1846. Moreover, it had had only three members—Mykola Hulak, Vasyl Bilozersky and Kostomarov. The three had aimed at the unification of the various Slavic peoples, but under the Russian crown. They had not contemplated changing the Russian Empire's system of government, but hoped that newly acquired Slavic territories would be run along the lines of the Tsar's Kingdom of Poland. They believed that only the Tsar could bring about the Slavic unification which they had in mind, but since he was unlikely to take part in the process, "they hoped to achieve the unification of the Slavs by their own means." These means were purely cultural and literary, and the members of the society came to appreciate that it would be hundreds or thousands of years before they bore fruit; so Hulak, Bilozersky and Kostomarov gave up the pursuit of their goals and went their separate ways. The others who had been arrested were guilty only by association—because they had the same general interests as the principals or because they were acquainted with them. Shevchenko and Kulish were put in a category of their own; not members of the society, they were deemed to be guilty of similar crimes by virtue of their own independent activities. Shevchenko's penalty was the most severe: dispatch into a remote army regiment and an injunction to stop writing and painting. The *Kobzar* collection was banned (as were various works of Kulish and Kostomarov), but most of the accused were punished relatively lightly (by the standards of the period). The informant Petrov was taken on to the staff of the Third Section and his mother's pension was doubled.[61]

Although the Third Section's report on the Cyrillo-Methodians made them sound relatively insignificant, the "conspiracy" prompted Uvarov, minister of education, to write the lengthy and reactionary disquisition on the Slavic renaissance that I quoted near the beginning of this chapter.[62] He wrote it because he had perceived the long-term implications of *narodnost* ("nationality"). In a review of Ukrainian literature published in 1843, Kostomarov had said that "the *narodnost* of Little Russia is special, distinct from Great Russian *narodnost*."[63] He adhered to this view throughout his life. In politics it never led him beyond Slavic federalism, but the government realized that it could sustain the idea of Ukrainian independence. The possible effects of the Cyrillo-Methodians'

activities were more far-reaching than they appreciated. As the Third Section said in its analysis of Shevchenko, poetry in Ukraine could inspire reflections on "the illusory beneficence of the period of the Hetmanate, on the virtue of bringing back that period, and on the possibility of Ukraine existing as a separate state."[64] The Russian authorities knew something that the young Ukrainians either failed to grasp or chose to ignore: that in the Russian Empire the boundary between literature and politics was ill-defined and easily crossed. As Leszek Kołakowski put it, the empire was "a country in which . . . there was no clear-cut dividing line between literary criticism and assassination."[65] Direct action was far from the minds of the Cyrillo-Methodians, but never far from that of the central government.

The Ukrainians arrested in 1847 got little sympathy from contemporary Russian intellectuals. Belinsky, not surprisingly, was scathing in his condemnation of Shevchenko and Kulish. Noting that Shevchenko had been compelled to become a soldier, he said that he was not sorry for him and would have given him a sentence no less harsh. In the case of Kulish, he lamented that a certain Kulish publication had been found to be dubious only after having passed the censor, with the result that the censor concerned, "an excellent censor because a noble man," had become more cautious and had eventually resigned. Belinsky's complaint, in both cases, was that the Ukrainians were making life difficult for intellectuals in the north. By irritating the authorities, they induced drastic measures which damaged the cause of "literature and enlightenment." By implication, the Ukrainians' own concerns were not worthy of inclusion under these headings.[66]

The leading Slavophile, Aleksei Khomiakov, was even more outspoken than the Westernizer Belinsky in his condemnation of the Cyrillo-Methodians. He had a telling reason for his hostility. One of those rounded up when the Kiev affair came to the notice of the central authorities was Fedor Chizhov, a Slavophile who had spent most of the 1840s in Italy and the Slavic parts of Eastern Europe. After a lengthy interrogation, Chizhov was cleared of involvement with the Cyrillo-Methodians and allowed to continue his literary activity, but he was ordered to put Slavophile ideas behind him and to submit his future work to the censorship of the chief of police. Although the report on the Cyrillo-Methodians did not say so, he

was also (somewhat ironically) exiled to the province of Kiev.[67] Having met Chizhov in St. Petersburg, Khomiakov reported his departure for Ukraine in a letter to Iurii Samarin. In the letter he was clearly worried by the thought that, as a result of the discovery of the Cyrillo-Methodians, other sorts of Slavophile had become highly suspect in the eyes of the government. This impression was well-founded, for the police report on the Ukrainians concluded with the promise of a forthcoming report on the Slavophiles.[68] Khomiakov rebuked the Ukrainians for undermining causes other than their own. "When the social question (*obshchestvennyi vopros*) has only just been formulated," he wrote to Samarin, "and when it is not only unresolved but not even approaching resolution, people who are supposed to be intelligent take up politics! I don't know to what extent the poor Little Russians' delusion was criminal, but I know that their wrongheadeness is very clear. The time for politics has passed."[69] Khomiakov's comments were doubly unfair. The Ukrainians' commitment to politics was not so strong as he supposed, and insofar as it existed, it showed that their assessment of the way to achieve change was more realistic than his. As Peter Christoff points out in connection with Khomiakov's attitude to Ukraine, the Slavophile "either did not or could not see that the social and political questions were inseparable."[70] Khomiakov's reaction, however, completes the picture of the Ukrainians' isolation. They were proscribed by the government and opposed by a leading Westernizer and a leading Slavophile; the cause of the Ukrainian renaissance seemed hopeless.

Yet it survived the troubles of 1847. One Ukrainophile, Osyp Bodiansky, even escaped the government's clutches. In the wake of the Cyrillo-Methodians' prosecution, officials in Ukraine were instructed to "pay attention to those who make special study of Little Russian antiquities, history and literature";[71] but in Moscow, Bodiansky went on working in precisely these fields. He had become secretary of the university's Society of Russian History in 1845, and between then and 1848 he published large quantities of Ukrainian material in the society's journal (including, in 1846, the violently anti-Russian *Istoriia Rusov*).[72] At about the time the Cyrillo-Methodians were being prosecuted, Bodiansky published an unfinished essay by Iurii Venelyn, the sub-Carpathian Ukrainian who died in Russia in 1839 and whose views were discussed in the

last chapter. The essay, reviewing a book which came out in 1832, appeared under the title "On the Controversy between Southerners and Northerners in Respect of their Russianness."[73] Venelyn's language was more outspoken than in anything which he published during his lifetime. His essay opened by claiming that very few readers understood the true meaning of the terms Ukrainian, Cossack, Little Russia and Little Russians. For the most part, Venelyn said, people thought of Little Russians as the inhabitants of Chernihiv and Poltava, of Cossacks as mounted soldiers, and of Ukraine as the province of Kharkiv or that of Poltava. All these groups and areas, however, together with five million inhabitants of the Austrian Empire, belonged to the southern branch of the "Russian" people, which was almost as large as the northern branch and had a better claim, historically, to the title "Rus'." The southerners had always lacked an educated gentry and for that reason had repeatedly fallen prey to alien incursions; but this was no reason, Venelyn implied, to accord them less respect than they deserved. Venelyn's article had a dual significance. Its content suggested that Ukrainians writing in the 1830s were less loyal to the empire than their contemporary publications implied; and the fact of its appearance in 1847 showed that at least one advocate of the Ukrainian cause survived the proscription of the Cyrillo-Methodians. Bodiansky did not last long, for in October 1848 he was dismissed on grounds not connected with Ukraine;[74] but he showed that the government could not wholly suppress Ukrainophilism even when it was trying to do so.

When Alexander II succeeded Nicholas I in 1855, the intellectual atmosphere improved, the key Ukrainian figures of 1847 reappeared, and Ukrainophilism revived. Shevchenko wrote poetry, Kulish published a Ukrainian-language novel, and Kostomarov injected new life into Russian historiography with studies of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Stepan Razin. All these brought Ukraine into the public eye. Shevchenko died early in 1861, but by then the ex-Cyrillo-Methodian Vasyl Bilozersky was editing *Osnova*, a Ukrainophile journal which appeared in St. Petersburg for most of 1861 and 1862. Kostomarov and Kulish contributed largely to the journal's contents, and showed their faithfulness to the ideals of the 1840s.[75] In an essay entitled "Two Russian Nationalities" (*Dve russkie narodnosti*), Kostomarov restated the views which he had

expressed in his 1843 survey of Ukrainian literature. The title of the new essay really meant "The Two Nationalities that make up Rus'." Kostomarov still saw the empire as an alliance of equals. Northerners and southerners were different, but complemented one another. Southerners placed great emphasis on individual liberty, whereas northerners preferred communal organization. Southerners had therefore been obliged to defer to the northerners when the two peoples' joint task was the making of a state, but now that statehood had been consolidated, it was natural for Ukrainians to come into their own and offer their inspiration to the Russians.[76] Kostomarov was certainly asking for an improvement in the lot of Ukrainians, for without a Russian change of heart, the south would not have been able to make a mark on the north; but he was asking only for a reorientation of the existing system, not for the separation of north and south.

Ukrainophilism, clearly, would not lie down. It never became one of the principal solvents of the tsarist order, but it did not disappear. Its problems in the last half-century of the Imperial regime were legion. By decrees of 1863 and 1876, the use of the Ukrainian language was severely restricted. The Russian revolutionary movement of the 1870s paid very little attention to the national question, despite the fact that it numbered Ukrainians among its ranks. "The average peasant in the Ukraine," wrote a commentator in the British Foreign Office in May 1918, "simply does not think of nationality in the terms familiar to the [Ukrainian] intelligentsia." Yet for all these difficulties, the federalism of Kostomarov survived and found expression in Ukraine in 1917; while across the Russian Empire's frontier, in Galicia, a different Ukrainian movement had been developing which enlarged the Ukrainian question. North and south were never to be wholly reconciled.[77]

Conclusion

Mykhailo Hrushevsky, doyen of Ukrainian historians, wrote in his most famous article that it was time "to do away with the current eclectic character of 'Russian history,' to cease patching up this history with episodes from the histories of various nationalities, and consequently [to] reorganize the history of the East Slav nationalities."[78] It is hard to apply his instructions to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, because Russia and Ukraine were converging. Although Ukraine, or at least part of Ukraine, had had an autonomous administrative system in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and although in the second half of the nineteenth century it had the beginnings of a nationalist movement, in the interim educated Ukrainians were trying to benefit from involvement with Russia. They spoke Russian, served the empire, and profited from involvement in a larger community. Russian history was bound up with Ukrainian history, and Ukrainian with Russian. Russians moved south and Ukrainians moved north. Ukraine supplied Russia with civil servants, and helped to introduce Russia to the wider world of Slavdom. At the beginning of the period Ukrainians tended to be better educated than Russians, whereas by the nineteenth century Russians were establishing universities in Ukraine. Neither people scorned the other.

But even in the early nineteenth century Ukrainians were not indistinguishable from Russians. Thinking of them as Russians by another name is like thinking of Dylan Thomas as an Englishman or Samuel Beckett as a Frenchman. Ukrainians made a difference in Russia. They strengthened the notion that the empire had a Slavic identity and a culture of its own. Only when the government saddled this idea with the full weight of autocracy did Ukrainian allegiance to the centre diminish. Slavic culture was one thing, but Slavic culture under strict Russian control was another. As the nineteenth century went on, Ukrainians began to think less about co-existence and more about Ukraine. Russia was in a quandary. Neither an eastern nor a western power, it discovered that the south, too, might not be dependable.

List of Abbreviations

AHR	*American Historical Review*
AKV	*Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova* [Archive of Prince Vorontsov]
AUAAS	*Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States*
CGV	*Chernigovskie gubernskie vedomosti* [Chernihiv provincial news]
ChOIDR	*Chteniia v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drvenostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* [Readings at the Imperial society of Russian history and antiquities attached to Moscow University]
CMRS	*Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*
CSP	*Canadian Slavonic Papers*
d.	*delo* [dossier; usually subdivision of an *opis*]
dop.	*dopolnitelnaia* [supplementary (of archival unit)]
ed. khr.	*edinitsa khraneniia* [archival unit (often subdivision of a *delo*)]
ESR	*European Studies Review*
f.	*fond* [fund (general archival classification)]
GBL	*Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka imeni Lenina, otdel rukopisei* [Lenin State Library, manuscript

	department]
GPB	*Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka imeni Saltykova-Shchedrina, otdel rukopisei* [Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, manuscript department]
HUS	*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*
IRLI	*Institut russkoi literatury Akademii nauk SSSR (Pushkinskii Dom), otdel rukopisei* [Institute of Russian Literature of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (Pushkin House), manuscript department]
IZ	*Istoricheskie zapiski* [Historical notes]
JFGO	*Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*
k.	*kartonka* [box (of manuscript material)]
KS	*Kievskaia starina* [Kievan antiquity]
l., ll.	*list, listy* [folio, folios]
LGIA	*Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv* [Leningrad State Historical Archive]
op.	*opis* [subdivision of a *fond* (see above)]
OSP	*Oxford Slavonic Papers*
PSS	*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete collected works]
r.	*razriad* [category (archival bench-mark)]
RA	*Russkii arkhiv* [Russian archive]
RBS	*Russkii biograficheskii slovar* [Russian biographical dictionary]
RS	*Russkaia starina* [Russian antiquity]
SEEJ	*Slavic and East European Journal*
SEER	*Slavonic and East European Review*
SIRIO	*Sbornik Imperatorskogo rossiiskogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* [Collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society]
SR	*Slavic Review*

TODRL	*Trudy Otdeleniia drevnerusskoi literatury Instituta russkoi literatury AN SSSR* [Works of the Old Russian literature section of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of Literature]
TsGADA	*Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov* [Central State Archive of Ancient Acts]
TsGALI	*Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva* [Central State Archive of Literature and Art]
TsGIA	*Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv* [Central State History Archive]
TsGVIA	*Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi voenno-istoricheskii arkhiv* [Central State Military-Historical Archive]
UIZh	*Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal* [Ukrainian historical journal]
VE	*Vestnik Evropy* [Herald of Europe]
VI	*Voprosy istorii* [Questions of history]
ZhMNP	*Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* [Ministry of Education journal]
ZIFV (V)UAN	*Zbirnyk istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu (Vse) Ukrainskoi Akademii nauk* [Collection of the historical-philological section of the (All-) Ukrainian Academy of Sciences]
ZNTSh	*Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeny Shevchenka* [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society]

Notes

Chapter One

1. S. Potter, *Some Notes on Lifemanship*, 41.
2. G-n Dmitriukov, "Nravy, obychai i obraz zhizni v Sudzhenskom uezde, Kurskoi gubernii," 375.
3. P. Sumarokov, *Dosugi Krymskogo Sudi, ili vtoroe puteshestvie v Tavridu* 1: 45.
4. V. Maslovich, *Zamechaniia i chuvstvovaniia ili puteshestvie, kakikh malo, ili kakikh ochen mnogo, iz Kharkova do Sankt-peterburga*, 70, 72–3.
5. G. S. Vinsky, *Moe vremia*, 28.
6. N. V. Gogol, "O Malorossiiskikh pesniakh," *PSS*, 8: 96.
7. S. M. Soloviev, *Zapiski*, 49–51.
8. *Mikhail Semenovich Shchepkin 1788–1863g.: Zapiski ego, pisma, rasskazy, materialy dlia biografii i rodoslovnaia*, 286–7. For Shchepkin's Ukrainian connections, see S. Durylin, "M. S. Shchepkin i I. P. Kotliarevsky," in N. K. Gudzii, ed., *Russko-ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi*, 79–107 (reprinted in O. I. Biletsky and M. K. Hudzii, eds., *Rosiisko-ukrainske literaturne iednannia*, 77–110), and the letters he received from Shevchenko, in T. Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u shesty tomakh*, 6: 181, 200–3.
9. N. S. Leskov, "Administrativnaia gratsiia," *Sobranie sochinenii v odinnadtsati tomakh*, 9: 390.
10. I. N. Medvedeva, *Gnedich v obshchestvennoi i literaturnoi borbe*

pervoi chetverti XIX veka, 2: 475 (reprint of an article written by Hnidych in 1814). For Hnidych this description of Ukraine was presumably not derogatory, but for A. B. Kurakin, Russian governor of Ukraine, it was. "Not for nothing," he wrote in 1804, "are [Ukrainians] called the Russian Italians: everything they do and say is insincere or has a personal interest behind it" (F. A. Kurakin, ed., *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 342).

11. Ia. Markovich, *Zapiski o Malorossii, eia zhiteliakh i proizvedeniiakh*, vii.
12. Vinsky, *Moe vremia*, 23.
13. D. M. Griffiths, "The Rise and Fall of the Northern System: Court Politics and Foreign Policy in the First Half of Catherine II's Reign"; D. L. Ransel, *The Politics of Catherinian Russia: The Panin Party*, 194–200.
14. F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 1: 191.
15. For an illuminating example of the way in which the late eighteenth-century development of the Black Sea littoral facilitated increased exports from Ukraine, see W. Kirchner, "Ukrainian Tobacco for France"; for a broader view, see V. A. Zolotov, *Vneshniaia torgovlia iuzhnoi Rossii v pervoi polovine XIX veka*.
16. E. I. Druzhinina, *Severnoe prichernomore 1775–1800gg.*, 256; G. L. Arsh, *Eteristskoe dvizhenie v Rossii*, 141; P. Herlihy, "Odessa: Staple Trade and Urbanization in New Russia."
17. The most important works on the development of the south are probably N. D. Polonska-Vasylenko, "The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine (1750–75)"; F. A. Redko's two articles, "Dzherela do istorychnoho atlasa pivdennoukrainskykh zemel druhoi polovyny XVIII st.," and "Istoryko-heohrafichna kharakterystyka nyzhnoho podniprovia 70–80kh rokiv XVIII st."; Druzhinina, *Severnoe prichernomore*, and the same author's two later volumes, *Iuzhnaia Ukraina v 1800–1825gg.* and *Iuzhnaia Ukraina v period krizisa feodalizma 1825–1860gg.*; Zolotov, *Vneshniaia torgovlia*; H. Auerbach, *Die Besiedelung der Südukraine in den Jahren 1774–1787*; V. M. Kabuzan, *Zaselenie Novorossii (Ekaterinoslavskoi i Khersonskoi gubernii) v XVIII—pervoi polovine XIX veka (1719–1858gg.)*; and R. P. Bartlett, *Human Capital: The Settlement of Foreigners in Russia 1762–1804*.
18. G. V. Esipov, "Puteshestvie Ekateriny II v iuzhnuiu Rossiiu"; P. Dobrovolsky, "Puteshestvie imp. Ekateriny II chrez Chernigovskii krai"; I. de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great*, 369–73.
19. R. H. Lord, *The Second Partition of Poland: A Study in*

Diplomatic History, 512–6.

20. M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question 1774–1923: A Study in International Relations*, 17–20.
21. H. L. Dyck, "Pondering the Russian Fact: Kaunitz and the Catherinian Empire in the 1770s"; K. A. Roider, *Austria's Eastern Question 1700–1790*, esp. 112–3.
22. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 66, d. 47, l. 2.
23. On the expansion see W. M. Pintner and D. K. Rowney, eds., *Russian Officialdom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century*, 192; on the particular difficulties of provincial administration, which were not confined to shortage of personnel, see S. F. Starr, *Decentralization and Self-Government in Russia, 1830–1870.*
24. R. Pipes, "Catherine II and the Jews: The Origins of the Pale of Settlement"; J. D. Klier, "The Ambiguous Legal Status of Russian Jewry in the Reign of Catherine II"
25. R. G. Suny, "Georgia and Soviet Nationality Policy," 219.
26. See the first section of Chapter Six, below.
27. I. P. Eremin, "K istorii russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei v XVII veke"; P. Lewin, "Polish-Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations of the Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries: New Approaches," esp. 261; F. Sysyn, review of V. P. Kolosova and V. I. Krekoten, *Ukrainska poeziia: Kinets XVI—pochatok XVII st.* (Kiev 1978), in *Kritika* 16, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 24–40.
28. K. V. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn*; S. Liubimov, "Borba mezhdu predstaviteliami velikorusskogo i malorusskogo napravleniia v Velikorossii v kontse XVII i nachale XVIII vekov"; A. Sydorenko, "Kievan Scholars in Muscovy."
29. G. G. Grabowicz, "The History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective," 115–20; H. F. Babinski, *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism*, esp. 130; A. N. Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, 3: 223–58; V. A. Iuzvenko, *Ukrainska narodna poetychna tvorchist u polskii folklorystytsi XIX st.*; B. S. Popkov, "Ioakhim Lelevel i Ukraina."
30. See, for example, the title of the work published by P. A. Kulish in 1856–7: *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi.* In the epilogue to his novel *The Black Council*, published in 1857, Kulish spoke of "*Iuzhnaia Rus'*," or, as it is usually called, "Little Russia" (*Chernaia rada: khronika 1663 goda*, 339)—a form of words which clearly indicated that, in mid-nineteenth century Russia, *Iuzhnaia Rus'* was not the everyday term for Ukraine. In using the term, Kulish was making a statement to the effect that, whereas he found *Iuzhnaia Rus'* inoffensive,

"Little Russia" was derogatory. Before Kulish, the Ukrainian song collector, Amvrosii Metlynsky, used adjectival forms derived from *Iuzhnaia Rus'* in the works *Iuzhnyi russkii zbornik* and *Narodnye iuzhnorusskie pesni*. Earlier still, in 1835, Osyp Bodiansky used both *Iuzhnaia Rus'* and its derivatives in his important philological article, "Rassmotrenie razlichnykh mnenii o drevnem iazyke Severnykh i Iuzhnykh Russov." All these authors were prominent in the mid-nineteenth-century Ukrainian "awakening" and appear again below, notably in section three of Chapter Nine.

31. Even without the qualifying adjective "southern," the term Rus' had anti-governmental implications in the nineteenth century. Of ancient origin, it resurfaced in opposition to the term *Rossiia*. Intellectuals tended to think of *Rossiia* as the word for the ultra-conservative Russian state, and of Rus' as the word for the empire's frustrated population. For Konstantin Aksakov's confused attempt to conflate the terms *Rossiia* and *Rus'* (in 1842), see the extended quotation at the end of Chapter Nine, section two; for the words' contradictory implications in the nineteenth century, see the penetrating discussion by the post-1917 émigré Aleksandr Saltykov: "Dve Rossii i Ukrainskii vopros," 112–17.
32. As Omeljan Pritsak noted recently, "it is unfair to say that those who defended the old name *Rus'* [in Eastern Ukraine in the late nineteenth century] were Muscophiles. I think they were perhaps better [Ukrainian] patriots than those who were so eager to change the name [to Ukraine]": P. R. Magosci, ed., *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States: A Symposium*, 70. For the history of the term "Ukraine," see B. Barvinsky, *Zvidky pishlo imia 'Ukraina'?*; J. B. Rudnyckyj (Ia. B. Rudnytsky), *Slovo i nazva 'Ukraina'* (reviewed by G. Y. Shevelov in his *Teasers and Appeasers: Essays and Studies on Themes of Slavic Philology*, 199–206); and G. W. Simpson, "The Names 'Rus',' 'Russia,' 'Ukraine' and Their Historical Background." In the first half of the nineteenth century, the term "Ukraine" tended to refer only to the territory centred on Kharkiv (east of the Hetmanate); see Hryhorii Kvitka's 1841 essay "Ukraintsy" in which "Ukrainians" are distinguished geographically from "Little Russians."
33. V. I. Lenin, "Ukraina," 342.
34. For the anti-populist or "statist" school, see F. Sysyn, "The Problem of Nobilities in the Ukrainian Past: The Polish Period, 1569–1648," 73. On Ukrainian historiography in general, see D. Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," and O. Ohloblyn, "Ukrainian Historiography 1917–1956."
35. N. I. Kostomarov, "Pavel Polubotok," 689. On the genesis of

Kostomarov's historiographical views, see L. K. Polukhin, *Formuvannia istorychnykh pohliadiv M. I. Kostomarova.*

36. P. Kulish, introducing the elder Gogol's play *Prostak*, in *Osnova*, 1862, no. 2 (February): 20. Defining Kulish's historical views is extremely difficult, and implying that he was simply "populist" in his sympathies is a gross oversimplification. George G. Grabowicz, for example, places the emphasis on his concern for order: "Three Perspectives on the Cossack Past: Gogol', Ševčenko, Kuliš," 189–94. For some of the work on Kulish, see I. Kyryliuk, "Bibliohrafiia prats P. O. Kulisha ta pysan pro noho," 80–105.
37. For the difference between Maksymovych and Kulish, see the former's essay, "Ob istoricheskom romane G. Kulisha 'Chernaia Rada,' 1857g. (Pismo k G. P. Galaganu)," which amounted to a defence of Gogol against the charge of undermining Ukrainian literary development. On Maksymovych as historian, see M. I. Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia (z davnikh chasiv do seredyny XIX st.)*, 194–246.
38. A. M. Lazarevsky, *Zamechaniia na istoricheskie monografii D. P. Millera o malorusskom dvorianstve i o statutovykh sudakh*, 15.
39. His articles in this field included "Ocherki stareishikh dvorianskikh rodov Chernigovskoi gubernii," "Ocherki malorusskikh familii," and "Liudi staroi Malorossii"; he also edited the papers of Ukrainian families in *Sulimovskii arkhiv*, *Motyzhinskii arkhiv* and *Liubetskii arkhiv.*
40. A. M. Lazarevsky, *Opisanie staroi Malorossii: materialy dlia istorii zaseleniia, zemlevladeniia i upravleniia*, 1 (part 1): ii. Kulish expressed a similar view in the appendix to his first novel: *Mikhailo Charnyshenko, ili Malorossiia vosemdesiat let nazad*, 3: 217.
41. Lazarevsky, *Opisanie*, 1 (part 1): ii.
42. Ibid., iii.
43. M. Grushevsky, "Razvitie ukrainskikh izuchenii v XIXv. i raskrytie v nikh osnovnykh voprosov ukrainovedeniia," *Ukrainskii narod v ego proshlom i nastoiashchem*, 1: 29–30. For articles on Lazarevsky, a bibliography of his works, and a wealth of documents related to his career, see *Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi zbirnyk*, 2 (1927): i–lxxx, 1–394. See also M. I. Marchenko and L. K. Polukhin, *Vydatnyi istoryk Ukrainy O. M. Lazarevsky*, and V. H. Sarbei, *Istorychni pohliady O. M. Lazarevskoho*. For the understandable acceptability of Lazarevsky in the Soviet Union, see J. Pelenski, "Soviet Ukrainian Historiography after World War II," 414.
44. A. Efimenko, "Malorusskoe dvorianstvo i ego sudba: istoricheskii ocherk."

45. D. P. Miller, *Ocherki iz istorii i iuridicheskogo byta staroi Malorossii: Prevrashchenie kozatskoi starshiny v dvorianstvo.*
46. Lazarevsky, *Zamechaniia*, 3–27.
47. V. A. Miakotin, "Prikreplenie krestianstva levoberezhnoi Malorossii v XVIII stoletii"; *Ocherki sotsialnoi istorii Ukrainy v XVII–XVIIIvv.*; "Prikreplenie krestianstva levoberezhnoi Ukrainy v XVII–XVIIIvv."; V. A. Mjakotin, "La fixation des paysans ukrainiens à la glèbe aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles." Miakotin did for Ukraine what his friend, the Russian historian V. I. Semevsky, did for the study of peasants in other parts of the eighteenth-century Russian Empire; see Semevsky's *Krestiane v tsarstvovanie Imperatritsy Ekateriny II* (St. Petersburg 1881–1901), 2: xliv.
48. M. Hrushevsky, "Zvychaina skhema 'russkoi' istorii i sprava ratsionalnoho ukladu istorii skhidnoho slovianstva," translated in M. Hrushevsky, *The Traditional Scheme of 'Russian' History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the East Slavs*, ed. A. Gregorovich.
49. Hrushevsky, *Traditional Scheme*, 13–14, 16. For modern discussion of the problems raised in Hrushevsky's article, see S. M. Horak, "Periodization and Terminology of the History of Eastern Slavs: Observations and Analyses"; Horak, "Problems of Periodization and Terminology in Ukrainian Historiography"; and especially P. R. Magosci, *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848–1948*, 114–18.
50. For the richness of Soviet Ukrainian historiography in the 1920s, see the bibliographies compiled by D. Bahalii, *Bibliohrafiia istorii Ukrainy, Rosii ta ukrainskoho prava, kraieznavstva i etnolohii za 1917–1927 roky*; M. Korduba, *La littérature historique soviétique-ukrainienne: Compte-rendu 1917–1931*; and D. M. Shtohryn, *Kataloh vydan Ukrainskoi Akademii nauk 1918–1930.* On the increasing difficulties which Ukrainian historians had to face, see J. E. Mace, "Politics and History in Soviet Ukraine, 1921–1933."
51. O. Ohloblyn, *Liudy staroi Ukrainy* (and see the review by V. Svoboda in SEER 41, no. 1 [1962]: 271–4).
52. I. L. Rudnytsky, "The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine," 1381, 1383.
53. I. L. Rudnytsky, "Reply," 256–7.
54. Z. E. Kohut, "The Abolition of Ukrainian Autonomy (1763–1786): a case study in the integration of a non-Russian area into the Empire," esp. 281–385; O. Pelech, "Towards a Historical Sociology of the Ukrainian Ideologues in the Russian Empire of the 1830's and 1840's." See also Kohut's articles, "A Gentry Democracy within an Autocracy: The Politics of Hryhorii Poletyka (1723/25–1784)," and

"Problems in Studying the Post-Khmelnytsky Ukrainian Elite (1650s to 1830s)."

55. Shevchenko's poem *Haidamaky* (1841) turned on the events of 1768 in Western Ukraine (on which see J. Blum, *The End of the Old Order in Rural Europe*, 344–5); for Shevchenko and the gentry chroniclers, see Ia. I. Dzyra, "Taras Shevchenko i ukrainski litopysy XVII–XVIII st."
56. The Martos family: see Iu. D. Margolis, *Istoricheskie vzgliady T. G. Shevchenka*, 79. For the nostalgia expressed by I. R. Martos in a letter of 1824, see section two, Chapter Two. P. I. Martos, prime mover in the sponsorship of *Kobzar*, sent a copy of the work to Mykola Markevych in 1840, clearly in the belief that it would please this equally backward-looking gentry historian: IRLI, f. 488, ed. khr. 62.
57. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 155; Kohut, "Abolition," 284, fn. 6; Pelech, "Towards a Historical Sociology," 75, fn. 9.
58. E. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 335 (9 March 1820).
59. M. M. Shtrange, *Demokraticheskaia intelligentsiia Rossii v XVIII veke*, esp. 25–7, 144.
60. W. B. Edgerton in SR 34, no. 1 (March 1975): 189.
61. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko*, 11–12.
62. A. Shtromas, "The Legal Position of Soviet Nationalities and Their Territorial Units According to the 1977 Constitution of the USSR," 267. The "new historical community" has occasioned much scholarly activity in the Soviet Union; see especially M. I. Kulichenko, "Osnovnye zakonomernosti formirovaniia i razvitiia novoi istoricheskoi obshchnosti—sovetskogo naroda"; Iu. V. Bromlei, ed., *Aktualnye problemy natsionalnykh otnoshenii v svete konstitutsii SSSR*; and, on the "errors" of Western scholars, Z. S. Chertina, "Burzhuaznye istoriki o novoi istoricheskoi obshchnosti—sovetskii narod."
63. See, for example, M. Iavorsky, *Narysy z istorii revoliutsiinoi borotby na Ukraini*, the articles of I. Rybakov ("1825-i rik na Ukraini" and "Do kharkaterystyky doby kryzy Ancienne [*sic*] Régime na Ukraini"), and P. Klepatsky, "Holos kapitala z Ukrainy pershoi polovyny XIX st."
64. J. Barber, *Soviet Historians in Crisis, 1928–1932*, 41–6; L. Okynshevych, "Natsional-demokratychna kontseptsiia istorii prava Ukrainy v pratsiakh akad. M. Hrushevskoho"; Mace, "Politics and History."
65. For relatively subtle attempts, in the 1930s, to relate the "superstructure" of Ukrainian culture to its socio-economic "base," see V. Maslov, "Ukrainska etnohrafiia pershoi polovyny XIX

stolittia (Sotsialno-ekonomichne tlo etnohrafichnykh studii)," and N. Piksanov, "Ukrainskie povesti Gogolia"; by 1963 H. S. Sukhobrus was showing much less subtlety in his *Ukrainsko-rosiiski folklorni zviazky v osvitlenni vitchyznianoi nauky pershoi polovyny XIX st.* (esp. Chapter One).

66. Pelenski, "Soviet Ukrainian Historiography," 403–4. In a later article, Pelenski showed that Soviet Ukrainian historiography became more stimulating under Petro Shelest: "Shelest and his Period in Soviet Ukraine (1963–1972): A Revival of Controlled Ukrainian Autonomism," 287–9. The intellectual history of nineteenth-century Ukraine received some attention under Shelest, to judge by the appearance of two-volume selections from the work of Mykola Kostomarov and Mykhailo Drahomanov (in 1967 and 1970 respectively). For the historiographical consequences of Shelest's fall, see Sysyn, review of Kolosova and Krekoten, *Kritika* 16, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 25–6; for a good cross-section of books about Ukraine which the Soviet authorities were prepared to sanction in 1980, see *Novye knigi SSSR*, no. 40 (October 1980): 7–10, 59–66.
67. M. F. Kotliar, "Ideia davnoruskoi iednosti v istorychnomu rozvytku rosiiskoho, ukrainskoho i biloruskoho narodiv."
68. Whence the titles of two works published to mark the three-hundredth anniversary of the treaty: P. P. Gudzenko et al., eds., *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: dokumenty i materialy v trekh tomakh*, and A. I. Baranovich et al., eds., *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: sbornik statei.*
69. D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, 474; compare J. Pelenski, "The Origins of the Official Muscovite Claims to the 'Kievan Inheritance'."
70. In the field of literature, see Gudzii, *Russko-ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi*; Biletsky and Hudzii, *Rosiisko-ukrainske literaturne iednannia*; I. A. Dzeverin, ed., *Edinenie literatur*; and N. I. Kravtsov, "Russko-ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi." In the more general field of "culture," see L. N. Pushkarev, "Kulturnye sviazi Ukrainy i Rossii posle ikh vossoedineniia (vtoraia polovina XVII v.)," and N. K. Gudzii, "Kulturnye sviazi ukrainskogo i russkogo narodov do kontsa XVIII v." In the ethnographic sphere, see E. M. Kravets, "Iz istorii russko-ukrainskikh sviazei v oblasti etnografii v XIX veke"; and in the realm of ideas see V. M. Nichik, ed., *Ideinye sviazi progressivnykh myslitelei bratskikh narodov (XVII–XVIIIvv.)*, and P. T. Manzenko, ed., *Ideinye sviazi ukrainskikh i russkikh revoliutsionnykh demokratov.*
71. Ia. D. Isaievych, *Bratstva ta ikh rol v rozvytku ukrainskoi kultury XVI–XVIII st.*; Isaievych, *Dzherela z istorii ukrainskoi kultury*

doby feodalizmu XVI–XVIII st.; Isaevich, "Ukrainskaia kultura XVIII stoletiia."

72. So far as the eighteenth century is concerned, see N. A. Shyp on education, "Rol vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv Moskvy ta Peterburha v rozvytku rosiisko-ukrainskykh zviazkiv (druha polovyna XVIII st.)"; the title implies that Russia was leading Ukraine, but the article's content implies the reverse. On eighteenth-century medicine, see M. K. Borodii, "Uchast vykhovantsiv Kyivskoi akademii v rozvytku vitchyznianoi medytsyny XVIII st."
73. Iu. Iu. Kondufor, R. G. Simonenko, I. S. Khmel, "Kritika sovremennykh burzhuazno-nationalisticheskikh falsifikatsii istorii druzhby i bratstva russkogo i ukrainskogo narodov"; V. Iu. Ievdokymenko, V. O. Ihnatov, *Natsionalizm i natsii*, 126–51; Manzenko, *Ideinye sviazi*, 272–310; I. S. Khmel, ed., *Pravda istorii protiv falsifikatorov (Kritika burzhuaznykh i burzhuazno-nationalisticheskikh falsifikatsii istorii Ukrainy).*
74. See, for example, the dust-jacket of a recent two-volume work, Iu. Iu. Kondufor, ed., *Druzhba i bratstvo russkogo i ukrainskogo narodov*: "The thread linking all the sections [of the work] is the idea of the great Russian people's role in the historical fates of the peoples of former Tsarist Russia."
75. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie.*
76. Among pre-revolutionary scholars, one should add V. N. Peretts, *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovaniia i materialy*, 1, part 1 ("Nachalo iskusstvennoi poezii v Rossii: Issledovaniia o vliianii malorusskoi virshevoi i narodnoi poezii XVI–XVIIIv. na velikorusskuiu"); among Soviet scholars, A. I. Komarov, "Ukrainskii iazyk, folklor i literatura v russkom obshchestve nachala XIX veka"; and among émigré writers, F. B. Korchmaryk, *Dukhovi vplyvy Kyieva na Moskovshchynu v dobu hetmanskoi Ukrainy.*
77. N. M. Mogiliansky, "Tragediia Ukrainy (Iz perezhitogo v Kieve v 1918 godu)," 75, fn. 1.
78. F. Savchenko, "Novi vidomosti pro neopublikovanu istoriiu Ukrainy Oleksy Martosa," 13; the censor was the Russianized Ukrainian Oleksander Nykytenko.

Chapter Two

1. For the many different interpretations of the treaty which brought Russia and the Hetmanate together, see J. Basarab, *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study.*
2. O. Subtelny, *The Mazepists: Ukrainian Separatism in the Early*

Eighteenth Century.

3. Kostomarov, "Polubotok"; A. M. Lazarevsky, "Pavel Polubotok: Ocherk iz istorii Malorossii XVIII veka"; M. T. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*, 1: 339, fn. 4.
4. On the early history of the Ukrainian Cossacks see G. Vernadsky, *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*, 249–68; C. Lemercier-Quelquejay, "Un condottiere lithuanien du XVIe siècle le prince Dimitrij Višneveckij et l'origine de la Seč' Zaporogue d'après les Archives ottomanes"; and E. Lassota von Steblau, *Habsburgs and Zaporozhian Cossacks: Diary*. On the Zaporozhians throughout their history see V. A. Golobutsky, *Zaporozhskoe kazachestvo*; on their last years, see V. A. Golobutsky, "Sotsialnye otnosheniia v Zaporozhe v XVIII v.," and N. D. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Zaporizhzhia XVIII stolittia ta ioho spadshchyna*. For a short account of the different attitudes adopted toward Cossacks from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, see V. O. Holobutsky, "Problema kozatstva v ukrainskii ta inozemnii istoriohrafii XVI—pershoi polovyny XVIII st."
5. The best general work on the Ukrainian Hetmanate is that of L. Okinshevich (Okynshevych), *Ukrainian Society and Government 1648–1781*, which summarizes the author's many publications in Ukrainian. See also H. Schumann, "Der Hetmanstaat (1654–1764)," and (more limited in their topical or chronological coverage) M. E. Slabchenko, *Malorusskii polk v administrativnom otnoshenii*; K. A. Sofronenko, *Malorossiiskii prikaz Russkogo gosudarstva vtoroi poloviny XVII—nachala XVIII veka*; I. Dzhydzhora, *Ukraina v pershii polovyni XVIII viku*; V. A. Diadychenko, *Narysy suspilno-politychnoho ustroiu Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy kintsia XVII—pochatku XVIII stolittia*; A. I. Pashuk, *Sud i sudochynstvo na Livoberezhnii Ukraini v XVII–XVIII st.*; A. P. Tkach, *Istoriia kodyfikatsii dorevoliutsiinoho prava Ukrainy*; O. I. Hurzhii, "Riadove kozatstvo i ioho mistse v klasovo-stanovii strukturi suspilstva livoberezhnoi Ukrainy pershoi polovyny XVIII st."; and A. I. Gurzhii, "Formirovanie krupnogo feodalnogo zemlevladeniia kazatskoi starshiny na Levoberezhnoi Ukraine (Vtoraia polovina XVII–60–e gody XVIIIv.)." Works of reference which deal wholly or partly with the Hetmanate include Isaievych, *Dzherela*, M. A. Lytvynenko, *Dzherela istorii Ukrainy XVIII st.*, and G. Gajecky, *The Cossack Administration of the Hetmanate*.
6. The social structure which had obtained before 1648 was only modified, however, not completely supplanted: see Okinshevych, *Ukrainian Society*, 41–5, and Kohut, "Problems," 108. On the

tight-knit character of the Ukrainian ruling group, see A. M. Lazarevsky, "Ocherki iz byta Malorossii v XVIII veke: III, Sotniki," 383n., which explains how the parvenu Rozumovsky family became related to most of the *starshyna* by virtue of a single well-judged marriage.

7. Lazarevsky, "Sotniki."
8. On the Rozumovsky family see A. A. Vasilchikov, *Semeistvo Razumovskikh.*
9. See her instructions to Prince A. I. Shakhovskoi, effective ruler of Ukraine after Apostol's death, in SIRIO, 108: 24–6, and her 1737 edict on Ukrainian property inheritance in SIRIO, 117: 567.
10. Catherine II, "Sobstvennoruchnoe nastavlenie kniaziu Viazemskomu," 348.
11. Catherine II, "Nastavlenie, dannoe grafu Petru Rumiantsovu," 376.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 377–89.
14. Ibid., 382.
15. See Kohut, "Abolition," passim, and Madariaga, *Russia*, 308–15. The following works remain useful: G. A. Maksimovich, *Deiatelnost Rumiantseva-Zadunaiskogo po upravleniiu Malorossiei*; N. V. Storozhenko, "Reformy v Malorossii pri gr. Rumiantseve"; and A. M. Lazarevsky, "Po povodu sta let ot dnia smerti grafa P. A. Rumiantseva."
16. I. F. Timkovsky, "Zapiski," 1394.
17. See A. M. Lazarevsky and N. Konstantinovich, *Obozrenie rumiantsovskoi opisi Malorossii*; D. I. Bagalei, "Generalnaia opis Malorossii: epizod iz deiatelnosti pervogo pravitelia Malorossii, gr. P. A. Rumiantseva-Zadunaiskogo"; I. S. Kovalsky, "Heneralnyi opys 1765–1769 rr.—dzherelo dlia vyvchennia sotsialno-ekonomichnykh vidnosyn na livoberezhnii Ukraini u druhii polovyni XVIII st."
18. On the gentry see Miller, *Prevrashchenie*, Efimenko, "Malorusskoe dvorianstvo," and O. Putro, "Vlada heneralnoi viiskovoi starshyny na livoberezhnii Ukraini u druhii polovyni XVIII st."; on the peasantry see A. M. Lazarevsky, *Malorossiiskie pospolitye krestiane (1648–1783)*, and the many works of Miakotin; on the Cossacks see N. S(torozhenko), "K istorii malorossiiskikh kozakov v kontse XVIII i v nachale XIX veka."
19. A. L. Kovalevsky, "Nekotorye podrobnosti, kasaiushchiesia uchrezhdeniia Malorossiiskoi (Chernigovskoi) gubernii v 1796–1797 godakh," and P. Kititsyn, "Malorossiiskaia gubernia." For lists of Ukrainian office-holders in 1798 and 1800 see I. Smolensky, "Biurokratychna verkhivka na Ukraini naprykintsi XVIII i na

pochatku XIX st."

20. See Chapter Four, below.
21. See I. F. Pavlovsky, *Ocherk deiatelnosti malorossiiskogo general-gubernatora kniazia A. B. Kurakina (1802–8gg.)*.
22. Ibid., 22.
23. Ibid., 41–2, and A. Khanenko, *Istoricheskii ocherk mezhevykh uchrezhdenii v Malorossii*, 114–16.
24. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 346.
25. Kohut, "Abolition," 280.
26. Anon., "Rech o popravlenii sostoianiia Malorossii"; on this speech see Kohut, "Abolition," 84, n. 41.
27. Anon., "Proshenie malorossiiskogo shliakhetstva . . . o vosstanovlenii raznykh starinnykh prav . . . v 1764 godu"; see Kohut, "Abolition," 85.
28. G. N. Teplov, "Zapiska chlena Malorossiiskoi kollegii." Because it indicted the *starshyna*, Teplov's memorandum appealed to populist-inclined Ukrainian historians of the next century. See Kohut, "Abolition," 92–6, for the dating of the memorandum and an explanation of Teplov's purpose in composing it.
29. Kohut, "Abolition," 90–2; Anon., "Proshenie," 325–6.
30. K. Fitzlyon, ed., *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkov*, 108.
31. "At the trial, Myrovych claimed that the Hetman gave him the idea for the coup": Kohut, "Abolition," 100. For documents related to the Myrovych affair, see P. Bartenev, ed., *Osmnadtsatyi vek*, 3: 357–87; M. Horban, "Lyst Petra Myrovycha do batka-mazepyntsia"; A. I. Sulotsky, "Starinnyi tobolskii uchitel Silvestrovich i uchenik ego V. Mirovich"; and V. Kashpirev, ed., *Pamiatniki novoi russkoi istorii*, 1: 307–11.
32. See N. P. Vasylenko, "Zbirka materiialiv do istorii Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy ta ukrainskoho prava XVII–XVIII vv.," 147–61.
33. Kohut, "A Gentry Democracy," 516–18.
34. V. Gorlenko, "Iz istorii iuzhno-russkogo obshchestva nachala XIX veka (pisma V. I. Charnysha, A. I. Chepy, V. G. Poletiki i zametki k nim)," 56–7.
35. I. H. Rozner, "Omelian Puhachov i Ukraina," 72.
36. M. Lazarevsky, "Pamiati moi," 24–6; D. Hrakhovetsky, "Odruzhinnia Semena Horkushi."
37. D. S. Babkin, "V. V. Kapnist i A. N. Radishchev," 270; Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 60; Madariaga, *Russia*, 649, n. 27.
38. V. V. Kapnist, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2: 317.
39. O. Ohloblyn, "Berlinska misiia Kapnista 1791 roku: Istoriohrafiia i metodolohiia pytannia (Z pryvodu novoi "teorii" Prof. Viliama Edzhertona)." Ohloblyn was replying to W. B. Edgerton, who

argued that Mykola rather than Vasyl Kapnist went to Berlin: "Laying a legend to rest: the poet Kapnist and Ukraino-German intrigue." The Soviet historian L. A. Kovalenko, among others, thinks that the third brother, Petro Kapnist, undertook the mission: *Velyka frantsuzka burzhuazna revoliutsiia i hromadsko-politychni rukhy na Ukraini v kintsi XVIII st.*, 101–4. Madariaga, *Russia*, 315, inclines toward Vasyl. For a general account of Vasyl Kapnist as a "progressive," see T. Hromova, "V. V. Kapnist u suspilno-literaturnomu zhytti Ukrainy kintsia XVIII—pochatku XIX st."

40. O. Ohloblyn, "American Revolution and Ukrainian Liberation Ideas During the Late Eighteenth Century."
41. L. Kovalenko, "O vliianii frantsuzskoi burzhuaznoi revoliutsii na Ukrainu," and *Velyka frantsuzka burzhuazna revoliutsiia.*
42. In 1794 Opanas Lobysevych sent Archbishop Heorhii Konysky some Virgil translated into Ukrainian: see F. Eleonsky, ed., *Arkheograficheskii sbornik dokumentov, otnosiashchikhsia k istorii severo-zapadnoi Rusi*, 2: 147, and O. Ohloblyn, *Opanas Lobysevych 1732–1805*. I. P. Kotliarevsky's *Eneida*, which traditionally marks the beginning of modern Ukrainian literature, first appeared in 1798.
43. IRLI, f. 488, ed. khr. 38, l. 54–5.
44. (M. P. Myklashevsky), "Iz bumag senatora M. P. Miklashevskogo," 530. Kochubei was writing on 6 May 1800; on 31 May, Myklashevsky was dismissed "for feeble execution of his duties" (V. L. Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 3: 490). On Myklashevsky see also Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 150–67.
45. P. Maikov, ed., *Pisma grafa P. V. Zavadovskogo k feldmarshalu grafu P. A. Rumiantsevu, 1775–1791 godov*, 10–12; A. Khanenko, "Rasskazy o starine," 1076.
46. N. S(torozhenko), "Poltavskii gubernskii marshal S. M. Kochubei," 139.
47. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 290, 332, 391.
48. See the section on Troshchynsky in Chapter Four, below.
49. I. Borshchak, "Franco-Ucrainica XVI–XIX st."
50. S. V. Kapnist-Skalon, "Vospominaniia," 320.
51. For the complex publishing history of Lesur's work, see É. Bortchak, "Napoléon et l'Ukraine," 34–8; É. Borschak, *Le mouvement national ukrainien au XIXe siècle*, 14–15; Anon., "Une histoire ou plutôt un conte à propos de l'Histoire des Kosaques, par C. L. Lesur." For quotations from the work, see V. Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions from the VIth to XXth Century*, 177–8.
52. TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 667, l. 9, letter of 29 October 1816;

the daughter was married to Prince N. G. Repnin.

53. A. I. Mikhailovsky-Danilevsky, "Iz vospominanii . . . 1827 god," 224.
54. Kapnist-Skalon, "Vospominaniia," 366–7.
55. See the section on Kochubei in Chapter Four, below.
56. "Zapiska iz dela . . . kasatelno prav na dvorianstvo byvshikh Malorossiiskikh chinov."
57. J. G. Kohl, *Russia: St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkoff . . .*, 527.
58. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 355.
59. Lazarevsky, "Po povodu," 2.
60. TsGIA, f. 1088, op. 1, ed. khr. 241, l. 21, letter from O. K. Rozumovsky to N. P. Sheremetev reporting the wedding.
61. See the Kochubei section in Chapter Four.
62. Lazarevsky paints a glowing picture of Rumiantsev in "Po povodu." O. Ohloblyn goes further in "Ukrainian Autonomists of the 1780s and 1790s and Count P. A. Rumiantsev-Zadunaisky." See TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 208, 227, 234, 271, for letters from various Ukrainians to N. G. Repnin, dated 1835 and 1842, thanking him for his work on their behalf in Ukraine. I. F. Pavlovsky studied Repnin's governorship in *K istorii Malorossii vo vremia general-gubernatora kn. N. G. Repnina.*
63. See the second section of Chapter Seven, below.
64. D. Doroshenko, "Kn. M. Repnin i D. Bantysh-Kamensky (Storinka z ukrainskoho hromadskoho zhyttia pershoi chetvertyny XIX stolitiia)."
65. N. G. Repnin, "Kratkaia zapiska o malorossiiskikh kozakakh."
66. N. V. Storozhenko, "K portretu kniazia Nikolaia Grigorevicha Repnina," 8.
67. N. G. Repnin, "Donesenie o vooruzhenii malorossiiskikh kozakov protiv Polshi," 176–7.
68. His policy was described admiringly by one Bulgakov in "Zapiska . . . o sformirovanii . . . vosmi Malorossiiskikh kazachikh polkov."
69. TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 222, ll, 77–9, Kochubei to Repnin, 4 May 1831.
70. P. A. Rumiantsev, "Perepiska o vosstanii v Ukraine 1768g.," 254–5. On the rising of 1768 see Z. E. Kohut, "Myths Old and New: The Haidamak Movement and the Koliivshchyna in Recent Historiography," and J. Pelenski, "The *Haidamak* Insurrections and the Old Regimes in Eastern Europe."
71. Catherine II, "Manifest k pravoslavnomu naseleniiu Polshi, vydannyi 9 iiulia 1768g."
72. In 1789, for example, when he stayed near the scene of military

action in the south after being relieved of command. Zavadovsky wrote to warn him of Imperial displeasure: Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 102.

73. Repnin changed his name from Volkonsky in honour of his maternal grandfather, N. V. Repnin.
74. See IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 50a, ll. 113–4, A. A. to D. P. Troshchynsky, 11 March 1827; compare the section on Troshchynsky in Chapter Four.
75. N. G. Repnin, "Rech . . . pri otkrytii dvorianskikh vyborov v Chernigove, 25 sentiabria, 1823g."
76. L. Makhnovets, "Epistoliarnyi dokument 1824 roku pro Skovorodu," 40.
77. M. M. Kiriiakov, "O rode Kiriiakovykh," 110.
78. F. M. Iskritsky, "Semeinaia khronika," 158–9.
79. Ibid., 162, 164.
80. V. P. Kochubei regretted the decay in a letter to Repnin of 5 January 1821; TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 222, ll. 33–4. See also I. V. Inozemtsev, "Baturinskie pamiatniki," and G. K. Lukomsky, *Baturinskii dvorets, ego istoriia, razrushenie i restavratsiia.*
81. O. Riabynyn-Skliarevsky, "Zaporozka kozachchyna i I. P. Kotliarevsky"; W. T. Zyla, "A Ukrainian Version of the *Aeneid*: Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida*."
82. Gorlenko, "Iz istorii iuzhno-russkogo obshchestva," 54 (letter from Adriian Chepa to Vasyl Poletyka, 6 May 1809).
83. M. Lazarevsky, "Pamiati moi," 35.
84. Kohut, "Abolition," 319–33.
85. I. Telichenko, *Protest slobodskoi starshiny i kozakov protiv reformy 1765g.*; V. N. Karazin, "Vzgliad na ukrainskuiu starinu (1842g.)," 604.
86. V. G. Avseenko, *Malorossiia v 1767 godu: Epizod iz istorii XVIII stoletiia.*
87. B. S. Abalikhin, "Ukrainskoe opolchenie 1812g." and "Istoriohrafiia ukrainskoho opolchennia vitchyznianoi viiny 1812r."
88. Rybakov, "1825-i rik na Ukraini," 16.
89. On the role of Ukraine in Decembrist thinking see O. Hermaize, "Rukh dekabrystiv i ukrainstvo," and Sukhobrus, *Ukrainsko-rosiiski folklorni zviazky*, 40–57.
90. G. Luciani, *La société des slaves unis (1823–1825)*, 64–5, and I. I. Gorbachevsky, *Zapiski, pisma*, esp. 257–306.
91. See T. Slabchenko, "Do istorii 'Malorossiiskogo Obshchestva'," for the wrongful arrest of one Alekseev in 1826 in connection with the suppression of a Masonic lodge in Poltava. One of the members of

the lodge was still under surveillance in 1850: M. Buzhynsky, "Do biohrafii V. L. Lukashevycha."

92. For further bibliography on the subject see L. V. Oliinyk, "Dekabrystskyi rukh na Ukraini v radianskii istoriohrafii."
93. S. L. Peshtich, "Sinopsis kak istoricheskoe proizvedenie," esp. 293.
94. J. L. Black, "The Search for a 'Correct' Textbook of National History in 18th Century Russia," 4; S. Maslov, "K istorii izdanii kievskogo 'Sinopsisa'."
95. M. S. Grushevsky, "Ob ukrainskoi istoriografii XVIII veka: neskolko soobrazhenii," esp. 216; Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia*, pt. 1.
96. A. M. Lazarevsky, "Otryvki iz semeinogo arkhiva Poletik," 40–2.
97. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 61 dop., l. 70 (letter from Rumiantsev to Ivan Loboiko).
98. O. Ohloblyn, *Spysky "Istorii Rusiv"*, 7.
99. This is the view, for example, of A. Yakovliv in his article "'Istoriya Rusov' and its Author," and of M. Vozniak, *Psevdo-Konysky i psevdo-Poletyka ("Istoriia Rusov" u literaturi i nautsi)*. For reference to some of the other views on the question, see I. Ia. Kaganov, "G. A. Poletika i ego knizhnye interesy," 138; see also the section on Bezborodko in Chapter Four.
100. Kohl, *Russia*, 528.
101. Those of Maksym Berlynsky and Oleksa Martos: see A. I. Chepa, "Dva pisma," 368, and A. M. Lazarevsky, "Prezhnie izyskateli malorusskoi stariny," 130–2. On Ukrainian gentry historians see also L. A. Kovalenko, "Rol revoliutsioneriv-dvorian i prohresyvnykh dvorianskykh istorykiv u rozrobtsi istorii ukrainskoho narodu."
102. I. M. Dolgorukov, "Dnevnik puteshestviia v Kiev 1817 goda," 191.
103. See section three of Chapter Nine, below.
104. Anna Ioannovna, "Imennoi ukaz A. I. Shakhovskomu," 26.
105. M. A. Briskman, *V. G. Anastasevich*, 120–233; N. A. Nikiforovskaia, *Bibliograficheskoe opisanie v Rossii*, 94–106; M. T. Choldin, "Three Early Russian Bibliographers," 16–25.
106. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 289.
107. P. N. Berkov, *Russko-polskie literaturnye sviazi v XVIII veke*, 43–5; TsGIA, f. 777, op. 1, d. 571, ll. 10–13 (Anastasevych's service record for 1826); Briskman, *Anastasevich*, ch. 2; and see below, last section of Chapter Five.
108. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 69, d. 1, l. 27; for the views of Czartoryski and Kochubei, see ibid., ll. 1, 15. See also the anti-Polish views of the Civil Governor of Kiev, P. P. Pankratev, in his "Zamechanie o Kievskoi akademii," 168; and compare Kh. Titov, *Stara vyshcha osvita v kyivskii Ukraini XVI—poch. XIX v.*, 269–72.

109. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 50, l. 40.
110. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 615–16.
111. See the third section of Chapter Four and the last section of Chapter Five.
112. F. Ia. Priima, "'Slovo o polku Igoreve' v otsenke 1814g. V. G. Anastasevicha"; L. I. Rovniakova, "Russko-polskii etnograf i folklorist Z. Dolenga-Khodakovskii i ego arkhiv," 73–4; Briskman, *Anastasevich*, 235; N. K. Zamkov, "'Ulei,' zhurnal V. G. Anastasevicha: Bibliograficheskoe opisanie," 55, n. 1.
113. A. Andrievsky, ed., *Istoricheskie materialy iz arkhiva Kievskogo gubernskogo pravleniia*, 4: 1–62 ("Provedenie gosudarstvennoi granitsy mezhdu Rossiei i Polshei v 1783 godu") and 1: 103–27 ("Pogranichnye s poliakami otnosheniia v 1789 godu"); I. Kamanin, "Iz istorii mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii Polshi i Rossii" (in the eighteenth century).
114. In 1820 Odessa and Gdańsk (Danzig) were still rival outlets for the produce of Western Ukraine: O. Senkovsky, "Otryvok iz puteshestviia," 27.
115. See the first section of Chapter Three. In 1766 E. M. Rumiantseva asked her husband, the Ukrainian governor, to get French and German tutors for their children from Poland; she said that that was what had always happened under Hetman Rozumovsky (E. M. Rumiantseva, *Pisma k eia muzhu*, viii–ix).
116. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 571, passim. For the pension award of 1824, see TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 752. The director's Ukrainian origins are made clear in TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 257, l. 9, where he refers to his "small inherited Little Russian property" (in a letter of 1813). Sokhovych went from the Kiev Academy to the St. Petersburg teachers' seminary in 1790: TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 50, l. 135.
117. See Chapter Three.
118. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 69, d. 796, ll. 1–6.
119. Ibid., l. 4 (from the Gymnasium Curator to his immediate superior).
120. Ibid., l. 12.
121. L. Sinitsky, "Malorossiia po rasskazam puteshestvennikov kontsa proshlogo i nachala nyneshnego stoletiia"; Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments*, esp. 171–212; V. Sypovsky, "Ukraina v rosiiskomu pysmenstvi: Chastyna I (1801–1850 rr.)," 15–57.
122. For the eighteenth-century "topographical descriptions" in general, see N. L. Rubinshtein, "Topograficheskie opisaniia namestnichestv i gubernii XVIII v.—pamiatniki geograficheskogo i ekonomicheskogo izucheniia Rossii." The studies which dealt with the Ukrainian provinces of the empire were: A. F. Shafonsky, *Chernigovskogo*

namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie; N. Zagorovsky, *Topograficheskoe opisanie Kharkovskogo namestnichestva*; and the unpublished study of the province of Kiev, a copy of which is to be found in GPB, f. 683, ed. khr. 18. The author of the Kharkiv study was long thought to be I. A. Pereverzev, but V. F. Horlenko demonstrates the authorship of Zagorovsky in *Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi etnohrafii ta rosiisko-ukrainskykh etnohrafichnykh zviazkiv*, 116.

123. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 315, l. 3. (memorandum of 10 April 1829). The author of the travelogue was Pavel Sumarokov, whose book on the south, *Dosugi Krymskogo Sudi*, was published in two parts in St. Petersburg in 1803 and 1805.
124. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 315, l. 16.
125. See F. W. Thackeray, *Antecedents of Revolution: Alexander I and the Polish Kingdom, 1815–1825.*
126. A. A. Kizevetter, "Imperator Nikolai I, kak konstitutsionnyi monarkh."
127. TsGIA, f. 499, op. 1, d. 215 (a check on two Poles in May 1831).
128. See the second section of Chapter Three.
129. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 341 (dealing with the years 1835–40).
130. Ibid., ll. 5–6 (a letter of A. G. Stroganov, Curator of the Moscow district).
131. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 66, dd. 151–2.
132. N. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia*, 103–4.
133. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 66, d. 172, l. 1.
134. Ibid., l. 8.
135. Ibid., ll. 121–2.
136. Ibid., l. 35, from a paper by Uvarov.
137. For a fuller discussion of the genesis of Ustrialov's textbook, see D. B. Saunders, "Historians and Concepts of Nationality in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia," esp. 58–61.
138. See the second sections of Chapter Five and Seven.
139. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 18, ll. 132–3.
140. M. A. Maksimovich, "O prichinakh vzaimnogo ozhestocheniia poliakov i malorossiian, byvshego v XVII veke (pismo k M. A. Grabovskomu)," 248; compare Basarab, *Pereiaslav*, 101.
141. Panteleimon Kulish was more conciliatory toward Grabowski: *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi*, 2: 291–340, and O. Iurovska, "Kulish i Grabovsky."
142. See the last section of that chapter.
143. A. Storozhenko, "Ubezhdenie."
144. Discussed below, in the third section of Chapter Nine.

145. I. Kulzhinsky, *O znachenii Rossii v semeistve evropeiskikh narodov.*

Chapter Three

1. Shafonsky, *Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie*, 35.
2. Ibid., 34–5. N. L. Rubinshtein singled out Shafonsky's survey of Chernihiv from the run of eighteenth-century "topographical descriptions": "Topograficheskie opisaniia," 77–8. On the genesis and significance of Shafonsky's work, see N. Storozhenko, "Istoriia sostavleniia 'Topograficheskogo opisaniia chernigovskogo namestnichestva' Shafonskogo (Epizod iz iuzhno-russkoi istoriografii)"; M. Berezhkov, *A. F. Shafonsky i ego trud: Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie (Zametki k istorii Chernigovskoi gubernii i Malorossii voobshche)*; and O. M. Apanovych, "Znachennia pratsi O. F. Shafonskoho 'Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie' dlia vyvchennia istorii livoberezhnoi Ukrainy druhoi polovyny XVIII st."
3. V. Pliushch, *Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi medychnoi nauky ta osvity*, 1: 128–30; V. A. Nevsky, "A. F. Shafonsky—odin iz pionerov otechestvennoi sanitarii (Kratkaia biograficheskaia spravka)"; A. Shafonsky, *Opisanie morovoi iazvy, byvshei v stolichnom gorode Moskve s 1770 po 1772 god*; J. T. Alexander, *Bubonic Plague in Early Modern Russia: Public Health and Urban Disaster*, esp. 122.
4. M. Horban, " 'Zapiski o Maloi Rossii' O. Shafonskoho," esp. 144 ("In our most auspicious times all these obstacles [to the advancement of Ukraine] have been dissipated by the establishment of uniformity in the Russian Empire").
5. A. Shafonsky, *Chernigovskogo namestnichestva*, publisher's foreword.
6. He was present in 1796 and 1801 at the public examinations in the main Chernihiv school: TsGIA, f. 730, op. 2, d. 1714, ll. 4, 20.
7. As well as in Pskov and Penza: TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 86.
8. See above, second section of Chapter Two, and Isaievych, *Dzherela*, 69.
9. A. Tsarynny (A. Storozhenko), *Mysli malorossiianina po prochtenii povestei Pasichnika Rudogo-Panka*, 57; compare the last section of Chapter Six.
10. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 50, l. 124; quoted more fully (but without reference to the source and dated incorrectly) in S. F. Zbanduto, "Kievskaia akademiia XVI–XVIII vv.," 74.
11. TsGADA, f. 18, ed. khr. 2 dop., ll. 141, 144.

12. V. T. Narezhny, "Bursak, Malorossiiskaia povest," 9.
13. Ie. Hrebinka, "Putevye zapiski zaitsa," 165–6.
14. O. Lototsky, "Suspilne stanovyshche biloho (svitskoho) dukhovenstva na Ukraini i Rosii v XVIII v.," 45–6; on the parish clergy in the empire's central provinces, see G. L. Freeze, *The Russian Levites: Parish Clergy in the Eighteenth Century*.
15. I. F. Timkovsky, "Zapiski," 1387, 1395.
16. A. Lazarevsky, "Statisticheskie svedeniia ob ukrainskikh narodnykh shkolakh i gospitaliakh v XVIII veke."
17. G. A. Maksimovich, *Obuchenie gramote i voinskoi ekzertsitsii v staroi Malorossii v kontse XVIII veka*, 30; compare V. V. Panashenko, "Navchannia kozatskykh ditei hramoty ta viiskovoi spravy na livoberezhnii Ukraini v XVIII st."
18. I. F. Pavlovsky, "Prikhodskie shkoly v staroi Malorossii i prichiny ikh unichtozheniia."
19. A. N. Bogoliubov, "Rossiiskaia nauka XVIII veka," 91.
20. See Isaievych, *Bratstva*.
21. S. M. Horak, "The Kiev Academy: A Bridge to Europe in the 17th Century," 122 and 126, n. 29.
22. Apart from the works of Zbanduto and Horak, cited above (nn. 10, 21), the most important of the many studies of the Kiev Academy are as follows: V. Askochensky, *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem Akademieiu*; A. Jabłonowski, *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilańska*; Titov, *Stara vyshcha osvita* (text in Russian); Z. I. Khyzhniak, *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia*; F. B. Kortschmaryk, *The Kievan Academy and Its Role in the Organization of Education in Russia at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century*; and A. Sydorenko, *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. These studies are devoted chiefly to the period before 1750. For the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the period of most importance here, see V. Serebrennikov, *Kievskaia akademiia s poloviny XVIII veka do preobrazovaniia eia v 1819 godu*, and N. I. Petrov, *Kievskaia Akademiia v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II (1762–1796 gg.)*. For documents and sources, see especially N. I. Petrov, ed., *Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi akademii: Otdelenie II (1721–1795 gg.)*, and Isaievych, *Dzherela*, 51–109.
23. It was written by a Portuguese Jesuit and first published in 1572: M. J. Okenfuss, "The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education," 112.
24. Serebrennikov, *Kievskaia akademiia*, 147.
25. N. V. Kukolnik and N. Lavrovsky, *Gimnaziia vysshikh nauk i Litsei kniazia Bezborodko*, 14–15.
26. Andrievsky, *Istoricheskie materialy*, 3: 128.

27. This was the view espoused by minister of education Zavadovsky: see the last section of the preceding chapter and the references cited there in n. 108. According to A. Andrievsky, Kiev was in fact becoming much more clearly "Ukrainian" in the late eighteenth century: "Arkhivnaia spravka o sostave Kievskogo 'obshchestva' v 1782–1797 godakh."
28. See the table covering the years 1744–1811 in Serebrennikov, *Kievskaia akademiia*, 202, and compare Khyzhniak, *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia*, 115.
29. Serebrennikov, *Kievskaia akademiia*, 215–16, gives a table and an explanation of the numbers of students in each class at the Kiev Academy between 1760 and 1814, on which my remarks are based.
30. Ia. Galinkovsky, "Rassmotrenie Rossiiskoi istorii," 149–50.
31. As they did in signficant numbers: see F. P. Shevchenko, *Rol Kyieva v mizhslovianskykh zviazkakh u XVII–XVIII st.*, and his article, "Zakarpattsi—studenty Kyivskoi akademii XVIII st."
32. M. P. Alekseev, "Maksim Berezovsky"; Askochensky, *Kiev*, 2: 276–9; Khyzhniak, *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia*, 86–7.
33. See Veikart, "Iz zapisok," 256–8. J. T. Alexander plays down the nationalist element in disputes among doctors in eighteenth-century Russia: *Bubonic Plague*, 48.
34. S. L. Sobol, *Istoriia mikroskopa i mikroskopicheskikh issledovanii v Rossii v XVIII veke*, 263 (a facsimile of the title-page of Terekhovsky's thesis); see also Pliushch, *Narysy*, 192–202.
35. N. Penchko, ed., *Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Moskovskogo universiteta vtoroi poloviny XVIIIv.*, 1: 198.
36. Serebrennikov, *Kievskaia akademiia*, 145–52, 157–60, covers Myslavsky's two periods of reform.
37. Ibid., 65.
38. Ibid., 160–1.
39. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 4, l. 176.
40. Petrov, *Akty i dokumenty*, 4: 300–23 (Falkovsky's memoirs for 1762–83); Khyzhniak, *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia*, 78.
41. Briskman, *Anastasevich*, 8.
42. *Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik* 5 (1780), 319.
43. *Ulei* 3 (1812), 145–8.
44. V. Ruban, *Pismo . . . Samuilu, Mitropolitu Kievskomu i Galitskomu, . . . iz Sanktpeterburga, 20 avgusta 1795 goda.*
45. Kaganov, "G. A. Poletika," 139–40; see also Kohut, "A Gentry Democracy," 511.
46. G. N. Moiseeva, "M. V. Lomonosov na Ukraine."
47. This paragraph and the next are based largely on N. Stelletsky, "Kharkovskii kollegium do preobrazovaniia ego v 1817 godu"; see

also A. S. Lebedev, "Kharkovskii Kollegium kak prosvetitelnyi tsentr slobodskoi Ukrainy do uchrezhdeniia v nei universiteta."

48. On Prokopovych see I. Ia. Kahanov, "Shcho chytaly suchasnyky H. Skovorody," 80.
49. Stelletsky, "Kharkovskii kollegium," 336.
50. Freeze, *Russian Levites*, 106.
51. On the hardship of student life in Kiev, see D. K. Vishnevsky, "Iz byta studentov staroi Kievskoi akademii." Freeze (*Russian Levites*, 102) says that Russian seminaries "enrolled only the clergy's children"; this was not true of Kiev and Kharkiv.
52. Isaevich, "Ukrainskaia kultura," 87.
53. See Isaievych, *Bratstva*, and in respect of the philosophical outlook of Ukrainian teachers, B. N. Mitiurov, *Razvitie pedagogicheskoi mysli na Ukraine v XVI–XVIIvv.*
54. On Konysky, see (most recently) M. V. Kashuba, *Georgii Konissky*; on Kozelsky see Iu. Ia. Kogan, *Prosvetitel XVIII veka Ia. P. Kozelsky*, esp. 52, 58, 64; for the quotation related to Skovoroda see F. P. Lubianovsky, *Vospominaniia (1777–1834)*, 22, and for Skovoroda's Ukrainian roots see N. I. Petrov, "Pervyi (malorossiiskii) period zhizni i nauchnofilosofskogo razvitiia Grigoriia Savicha Skovorody."
55. Lubianovsky, *Vospominaniia*, 22.
56. N. I. Petrov, *Ocherki iz istorii ukrainskoi literatury XVII i XVIII vekov*, 367.
57. Peretts, "Issledovaniia o vliianii malorusskoi poezii," 422.
58. Eleonsky, *Arkheograficheskii sbornik*, 147. On the interludes in eighteenth-century Ukrainian plays, see Lewin, "Polish-Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations," 266; see also Ohloblyn, *Lobysevych.*
59. G. J. Marker, "Publishing and the Formation of a Reading Public in Eighteenth Century Russia," 378.
60. Isaievych, *Dzherela*, 111, 132.
61. One mid-eighteenth-century enthusiast paid sixty rubles for a copy of Hryhorovych-Barsky's travels: V. Grigorovich-Barsky, *Puteshestvie k sviatym mestam*, iii (from the editorial preface to the first published edition). Adriian Chepa, whose antiquarian interests were long-standing, had not seen or read the chronicle of Samiilo Velychko in 1810 (when he was nearly fifty): Gorlenko, "Iz istorii iuzhno-russkogo obshchestva," 60.
62. Kahanov, "Shcho chytaly" (analyzing a catalogue of 1753), and I. Ia. Kaganov, "Katalog biblioteki kharkovskogo kollegiuma 1769 goda (Iz istorii ukrainskoi knizhnoi kultury XVIII stoletiia)."
63. I. Ia. Kahanov, "Problemy vyvchennia ukrainskoi knyzhkovoi

kultury XVIII storichchia," 233–5.

64. V. V. Golubtsov, "K biografii grafa P. V. Zavadovskogo: zametki," 124–5. See Kaganov, "G. A. Poletika," for the books collected by one of the most important eighteenth-century Ukrainians; and for the library of the poet Hnidych see P. Rotach, " 'Biblioteku moiu zaveshchaiu . . . ': Dar N. I. Gnedicha Poltave." Study of the availability of books in the eighteenth-century provinces is in its infancy; for a model of what can be done, based on evidence from Vologda, see I. F. Martynov, "Provintsialnye knigoliuby XVIII veka."
65. M. Tyshchenko, "Z istorii torhivli knyzhkamy u XVIII storichchi," 39.
66. M. N. Bryl, "Heohrafiia rozmishchennia knyhovydavnychoi spravy i knyhotorhovelnoi merezhi v Ukrainskii RSR," 264.
67. See J. Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great*, and his article, "Did Feofan Prokopovich Really Write *Pravda Voli Monarshei*?"; and on Iavorsky, I. S. Zakhara, *Borba idei v filosofskoi mysli na Ukraine na rubezhe XVII–XVIII vv. (Stefan Iavorsky)*.
68. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie*, vi–vii.
69. Petrov, *Kievskaia Akademiia*, 118.
70. M. J. Okenfuss, "Education and Empire: School Reform in Enlightened Russia," 67.
71. I. de Madariaga, "The Foundation of the Russian Educational System by Catherine II," 387–8.
72. F. Rozhdestvensky, "Samuil Mislavsky, mitropolit Kievskii," 317, 319.
73. For a more jaundiced view of eighteenth-century Ukrainian education, in which neither the church schools nor their successors come out well, see O. Hrushevsky, "Zminy shkilnoi systemy na Livoberezhzhi v XVIII v."
74. B. H. Sumner, *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire*, 18, n. 2. On foreign settlement in general see Bartlett, *Human Capital*.
75. A. P. Bazhova, *Russko-iugoslavianskie otnosheniia vo vtoroi polovine XVIII v.*, esp. 136.
76. I. S. Sventsitsky, *Obzor snoshenii Karpatskoi Rusi s Rossiei v pervuiu polovinu XIXv.*, and *Materialy po istorii vozrozhdeniia Karpatskoi Rusi*, 1.
77. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 97, l. 126.
78. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 86, l. 86–7.
79. Financial considerations undoubtedly played a part in the decline of the teachers' seminary, on which see Madariaga, "Foundation," 394.
80. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 48, ll. 672–713.

81. There are 446 separate entries on the list, but two names in the first part (1782–6) are duplicated (nos. 60 and 149, 99 and 147).
82. Southerners may simply have been keener to go to St. Petersburg than their counterparts elsewhere in the empire. In 1783 the Archbishop of Moscow held up the despatch of twenty students for three reasons—because they wanted to become priests rather than secular schoolteachers, because they did not know what their circumstances would be in St. Petersburg, and because they did not want to abandon their parents: TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 4, l. 57.
83. Rozhdestvensky, "Samuil Mislavsky," 319.
84. Examples all from TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 48, ll. 672–713.
85. Above, n. 35.
86. See Borodii, "Uchast vykhovantsiv"; Pliushch, *Narysy*; Alexander, *Bubonic Plague* (esp. 38); O. Puchkivsky, "Try fundatory rosiiskoi meditsiny"; I. Losky, "Ukraintsi na studiiakh v Nimechchyni v XVI–XVIII st.," 108; A. O. Kowal, "Danilo Samoilowitz: An Eighteenth-Century Ukrainian Epidemiologist and His Role in the Moscow Plague (1770–2)."
87. Gl. L., "Spisok doktorov meditsiny iz malorossov, praktikovavshikh v Rossii v XVIII stoletii."
88. B. N. Palkin, *Russkie gospitalnye shkoly XVIIIv. i ikh vospitanniki*, 203–43.
89. Ibid., 29. The two Myrovych brothers associated with Pavlo Polubotok were punished in 1724 by being obliged to leave Ukraine and study medicine in St. Petersburg: Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 3: 551.
90. Rozhdestvensky, "Samuil Mislavsky," 318.
91. Ibid., 318–9.
92. I. I. Martynov, "Zapiski," 75.
93. GPB, f. 653, ed. khr. 1, ll. 30–1 (a letter from a beneficiary making arrangements to receive his bequest).
94. M. I. Antonovsky, "Zapiski," 150.
95. Ibid., 156–7. On Antonovsky himself, see the fourth section of Chapter Five.
96. I. F. Timkovsky, "Zapiski," 1428.
97. N. V. Sushkov, *Moskovskii universitetskii blagorodnyi pansion*, 30, 89.
98. Quoted by I. N. Medvedeva in her instruction to N. I. Gnedich, *Stikhotvoreniia*, 8.
99. Martynov, "Zapiski," 77–8.
100. On the school see V. Chaslavsky, "Pervaia zemledelcheskaia shkola v Rossii (1797–1803)," and on the Kharkiv summons see N. Stelletsky, "Protoierei A. A. Samborsky," 360, n. 3.

101. Shyp, "Rol vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv," 127–8.
102. T. V. Alekseeva, *Vladimir Lukich Borovikovsky*, 24–6.
103. For a brief account of music in Ukraine, see O. Shreier-Tkachenko, "Rozvytok ukrainskoi muzychnoi kultury v XVI–XVIII storichchiakh."
104. A. Rumiantsev, "Order ob ustroistve pevcheskoi shkoly v Glukhove."
105. TsGIA, f. 499, op. 1, d. 248, l. 12; compare dd. 201, 212, 341, for similar accounts of talent-spotting for singers in early nineteenth-century Ukraine.
106. On the outstanding composer of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russia—a Ukrainian—see M. Rytsareva, *Kompozitor D. Bortniansky*.
107. See P. K. Simoni, *Kamer-guslist V. F. Trutovsky i izdannyi im pervyi russkii notnyi pesennik*, esp. 7, and also the third section of Chapter Six. A symphony based on Ukrainian folksongs appeared in Russia as early as 1790 (G. Seaman, "Folk-song in Russian Opera of the 18th Century," 149). That Ukraine went on inspiring Russian composers is apparent from the title of Tchaikovsky's second symphony, the "Little Russian"; Tchaikovsky himself was Ukrainian by descent (Borodii, "Uchast vykhovantsiv," 102).
108. D. P. Miller gave a picturesque account of the first Rozumovsky's career in *Aleksei Grigorievich Razumovsky: istoricheskii rasskaz*.
109. Penchko, *Dokumenty i materialy*, 3: 22.
110. Gl. L., "Spisok doktorov," 101.
111. A. G. Kross, "Russkoe posolstvo v Londone i znakomstvo anglichan s russkoi literaturoi v nachale XIXv.," 101–2.
112. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 378, l. 2.
113. Shtrange, *Demokraticheskaia intelligentsiia*, 144; on I. H. Tumansky, see also E. S. Kuliabko, *Zamechatelnye pitomtsy akademicheskogo universiteta*, 192–4.
114. Petrov, *Akty i dokumenty*, 5: 488–505.
115. V. N. Gettun, "Zapiski, 1771–1815gg.," 45–6.
116. Ibid., 46–7, 53, 59, 273, 289–91, 292.
117. Martynov, "Zapiski," 95–6.
118. A. V. Kochubei, *Semeinaia khronika*, 32.
119. Lubianovsky, *Vospominaniia*, 10, 38–9, 205.
120. A. M. Lazarevsky, "Prezhnie izyskateli," 114–15.
121. E. P. Grebenka, "Pisma k N. M. Novitskomu," 11–12.

Chapter Four

1. Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 4.
2. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 335, 300, 338; 378, 390; 307, etc.
3. Askochensky, *Kiev*, 2: 191–9, 269–75, 327–31; Khyzhniak, *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia*, 156–7.
4. A. A. Bezborodko, *Pisma k Ia. L. Bakurinskomu*, 11–12.
5. Quoted from a book review in *Slavonic and East European Review* 59, no. 3 (July 1981): 448. Marc Raeff has also raised the quesitons of the importance of Ukrainians in the Imperial civil service, in a book review in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 1 (March 1981): 128, and in his article "The Bureaucratic Phenomenon of Imperial Russia," 402.
6. Ransel, *The Politics of Catherinian Russia*, 194–200.
7. J. Lojek, "Catherine II's Armed Intervention in Poland: Origins of the Political Decisions at the Russian Court in 1791 and 1792"; but compare Madariaga (*Russia*, 434), who says that by late 1792 "even Bezborodko and A. R. Vorontsov, who feared the aggrandisement of Prussia, were nevertheless at bottom in favour of Russian annexation of Polish lands."
8. See N. Ia. Eidelman, "Dvortsovyi zagovor 1797–1799 godov," and his book, *Gran vekov: Politicheskaia borba v Rossii: Konets XVIII—nachalo XIX stoletiia*, esp. Ch. 8. David Christian has elucidated the political ideas in circulation at the very beginning of the nineteenth century in his articles, "The 'Senatorial Party' and the Theory of Collegial Government, 1801–1803," and "The Political Views of the Unofficial Committee in 1801: Some New Evidence."
9. See the works cited in nn. 6 and 8, above, and also (in particular) J. T. Alexander, *Autocratic Politics in a National Crisis: The Imperial Russian Government and Pugachev's Revolt*; J. P. Le Donne, "Appointments to the Russian Senate 1762–1796"; I. G. Rozner, "Pridvornye krugi nakanune i vo vremia krestianskoi voiny 1773–5gg."
10. I. de Madariaga, "Power to the Panins."
11. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 240; on Andrii Bezborodko see also Lazarevsky, "Sotniki," 378, and his "Ocherki Malorusskikh familii," 313.
12. The standard work on Bezborodko remains the partisan study by N. I. Grigorovich: *Kantsler kniaz Aleksandr Andreevich Bezborodko v sviazi s sobytiiami ego vremeni*. See also E. P. Karnovich, "Kniaz A. A. Bezborodko," and (on the family as a whole) Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 1: 41–6.
13. F. V. Rostopchin, "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 203.
14. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 155, 11.

15. See P. M. Maikov, ed., *Pisma A. A. Bezborodko k grafu P. A. Rumiantsovu, 1775–93gg.*
16. Bezborodko's letters to the Vorontsov brothers are to be found in P. Bartenev, ed., *Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova*, 13, and are cited hereafter as Bezborodko, "Pisma"; see 155–6, 415, for the letters alluded to here. Associating with the Vorontsovs did not guarantee influence at court, for as L. J. Humphreys points out, "The coup of 1762 [by which Catherine the Great came to power] . . . produced a political hiatus for the Vorontsovs that lasted until the death of Paul I in 1801": "The Vorontsov Family: Russian Nobility in a Century of Change, 1725–1825," 206.
17. (Bezborodko), "Iz bumag," 152–3; Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 492.
18. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 280.
19. Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 34.
20. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 197. The historian of the Russian nobility, A. Romanovich-Slavatinsky, asserted that "the whole pleiad of Little Russians—Bezborodko, Zavadovsky, Troshchynsky— . . . could not pretend to glittering lineage" (*Dvorianstvo v Rossii ot nachala XVIII veka do otmeny krepostnogo prava*, 13), and David Ransel says that Bezborodko "scarcely qualified as nobility at all" (*Politics*, 249); but Bezborodko thought otherwise.
21. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 362.
22. Ibid., 334.
23. Ibid., 251.
24. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 2: 640. Myklashevsky married Bezborodko's niece, A. Ia. Bakurynska; on his political difficulties in Ukraine in 1800, see the second section of Chapter Two, above.
25. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 392.
26. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 239–40.
27. Ibid., 1: 492.
28. Ibid., and also 490 (negotiating the purchase of the estate in February 1784).
29. Ibid., 1: 493.
30. Ibid., 1: 494, 501–2.
31. Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 37.
32. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 269.
33. Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 105.
34. Ibid., 109–10, 115–16.
35. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 252, 263.
36. Ibid., 2: 542–3.
37. Ibid., 2: 545.
38. Ibid., 2: 541.
39. Ibid., 1: 493.

40. Ibid., 2: 545.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., 1: 267.
43. Ibid., 1: 491.
44. Ibid., 2: 535.
45. Ibid., 1: 238.
46. Ibid., 1: 237.
47. Like Bezborodko, Troshchynsky was unassuming about the level of his education (M. A. Korf, "Aleksander I i ego priblizhennye do epokhi Speranskogo," 212); Chapter Three has tried to show, however, that Ukrainians were more cultivated than many of their contemporaries.
48. (Bezborodko), "Iz bumag," 151; perhaps Zavadovsky was speaking of Opanas Lobysevych, translator into Ukrainian of some of Virgil's pastoral poetry.
49. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 248.
50. See the second section of Chapter Five. Lazarevsky believed that Bezborodko, not Ruban, was the prime mover in the publication of the *Short Chronicle*: "Vasilii Grigorevich Ruban," 37.
51. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 262.
52. Yakovliv, " 'Istoriya Rusov' and its author." On the basis of the letter cited in n. 51 (which he assigned, improbably, to March 1776 rather than March 1778), Pavlo Klepatsky considered the case for Bezborodko's authorship of *Istoriia Rusov* proven: "Lystuvannia Oleksandra Andriievycha Bezborodka z svoim batkom, iak istorychne dzherelo," 284–5.
53. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 182–3.
54. Ibid., 296–6. Perhaps in 1790 Bezborodko had been more amenable to the notion of using Cossacks because of Vasyl Kapnist's proposals of 1788, on which see the second section of Chapter Two. L. A. Kovalenko, however (*Velyka frantsuzka burzhuazna revoliutsiia*, 99–100), argues that Bezborodko responded hesitantly to Kapnist, while Madariaga (*Russia*, 412, 421) points out that in 1790–1 Prince Potemkin was in favour of reviving the Cossacks—in which case Bezborodko may simply have seen no point in opposing the favourite. These considerations make it likely that Bezborodko expressed his true opinion in 1794 rather than 1790.
55. This paragraph should be taken in conjunction with the brief discussion of *Istoriia Rusov* in Chapter Two, section two.
56. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 295–6.
57. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 2: 538.
58. Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 106.
59. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 2: 545.

60. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 65–6; for a summary of the importance of 1783 in the life of the Ukrainian peasantry, see I. de Madariaga, "Catherine II and the Serfs: A Reconsideration of Some Problems," 37.
61. Bezborodko praised Zavadovsky's educational activity in 1784 ("Pisma," 48), recorded the temporary rupture of 1793 (ibid., 280), but was sympathetic later that year when Zavadovsky lost another baby in childbirth (ibid., 282–3).
62. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 94, 209–10, 215.
63. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 253, 263.
64. Ibid., 1: 486 (on the replacement of Bezborodko's brother-in-law, Iakiv Bakurynsky, by Bakurynsky's son-in-law, Mykhailo Myklashevsky).
65. Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 45.
66. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 241.
67. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 197–8.
68. (S. F. Golitsyn), "Bumagi," 144.
69. F. V. Rostopchin, "Pisma," 59.
70. Gelbig, "Sluchainye liudi v Rossii," 421.
71. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 471–2, 477–8, 483–4. Sulyma, who carried a letter from Bezborodko to his mother in January 1790, had come north in August of the previous year to persuade Bezborodko to help him secure ecclesiastical promotion: for a good picture of the Ukrainian patronage system at work, see Lazarevsky, *Sulimovsky arkhiv*, 133–7 (letter from Sulyma to his brother).
72. Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 119. On the Nizhyn Greeks, see N. K. Storozhevsky, *Nezhinskie greki*, and K. Kharlampovich, "Narysy z istorii hretskoi kolonii v Nizheni." In 1798 Kochubei, ambassador in Constantinople, received a letter from a relation in Ukraine via the Nizhyn Greek Klitsa, which gives an indication of the geographical range of the Greeks' activities: TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 540, l. 6, and Storozhevsky, 15 (on Klitsa).
73. (Bezborodko), "Iz bumag," 157–9.
74. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 2: 546–7.
75. Ibid., 2: 545.
76. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 199.
77. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 271.
78. Bezborodko, "Pisma," 362. Compare Maikov, *Pisma Bezborodko*, 42, where Bezborodko reports Catherine the Great's inquiry, in 1779, whether there were any Russians who would be offended by the appointment of the Ukrainian A. S. Myloradovych to a position in the south; on this occasion Bezborodko seems to have succeeded in getting the Ukrainian appointed.

79. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, passim, and Madariaga, *Russia*, pts 4 and 8.
80. For 1738 see *RBS*, 7: 137, and Modzalevskii, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 2: 100–6; for 1739 see I. Listovsky, "Graf Petr Vasilevich Zavadovsky," 81, and Maikov, *Pisma Zavadoskogo*, 2.
81. P. V. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k bratiam grafam Vorontsovym," 20. For a picture of Zavadovsky's Ukrainian estate in the year of his death see Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, 177–8; see also M. Tsapenko, *Zemlia Brianskaia*, 53–62.
82. P. V. Zavadovsky, "Tri pisma k Grigoriiu Grigorevichu Fridrikevichu"; Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 22, 63; P. V. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k A. S. Miloradovichu," CGV, 1886, no. 84, letter of 5 July (no year).
83. See, for example, Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 58, where Zavadovsky complains about *volokhi* who were distracting his peasants; and Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Miloradovichu," CGV, 1886, no. 87 (letter of 18 June 1792), where Zavadovsky complains about the billeting of troops on one of his villages.
84. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 24.
85. Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 74.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid., 75.
88. See K. G. Razumovsky, "Chastnoe pismo k ego ziatiu grafu Gudovichu," commenting wryly on Zavadovsky's procrastination.
89. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 51.
90. V. N. Zavadovskaia, "Dva pisma k grafu A. R. Vorontsovu," 314.
91. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 58.
92. See Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 52–3, and Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 31–3—letters of 1782, 1785 and 1786, in which Zavadovsky expresses either contentment in the south or regret that it was impossible to go there. In 1811 (when he was still in office) Zavadovsky exchanged estate visits with Troshchynsky in the south: Golubtsov, "K biografii Zavadovskogo," 124–5. He often went hunting with the Iskrytskys: Iskritsky, "Semeinaia khronika," 174–5.
93. F. F. Vigel, *Zapiski*, 1: 160.
94. Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, *Imperator Aleksandr I*, 1: 359.
95. Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, introduction, 10–12.
96. See the preceding section.
97. Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 50.
98. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 258.
99. Martynov was uncertain why he got the job; he had earlier failed to get a position under Zavadovsky at the State Loan Bank (Martynov, "Zapiski," 90–1, 98–101).
100. GPB, f. 603, ed. khr. 30, ll. 144–5 (from a miscellaneous collection

of printed biographical articles).

101. Zavadovsky told Martynov that he had someone in mind for one of the two places (Martynov, "Zapiski," 100), and asked V. P. Kochubei to release a certain Dunin-Borkovsky (no initials) from the ministry of internal affairs, "knowing his capacities" (TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, d. 24, l. 1). Shafonsky spoke of the Dunin-Borkovskys' glass production in Novhorod-Siversky: *Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie*, 21.
102. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, d. 60, l. 5 (asking for one Myturych).
103. See TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, dd. 164, 209, 216; successful applications from various Ukrainians of Chernihiv province.
104. V. G. Anastasevich, "Zapiska o Vasilii Nazareviche Karazine," 196. The "usurpation" took place in 1804: TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1830, d. 125, ll. 59–68 (service record of Martynov for 1830), and f. 733, op. 86, d. 58 (retirement of Karazyn).
105. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 86 (a large dossier on Catherine the Great's plans to found universities).
106. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Miloradovichu," CGV, 1886, no. 85, 23 March 1793.
107. I. P. Kornilov, "Graf P. V. Zavadovsky i F. Chatsky"; TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, d. 254, ll. 4–6 (letter from Czacki to Zavadovsky's successor at the ministry of education).
108. See the last section of Chapter Two.
109. In 1679: Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 2: 100–6, and Lazarevsky, *Opisanie*, 2, pt. 1: 87.
110. In the last section of Chapter Two.
111. Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 116.
112. Askochensky, *Kiev*, 2: 192.
113. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 96, l. 31 (thanking Zavadovsky for returning two student teachers from the St. Petersburg teachers' seminary).
114. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, d. 146, l. 1 (a letter from Kozlovsky, asking for a place in the ministry of education and speaking of his father).
115. When V. N. Hettun told his superior, M. F. Kamensky, military governor of St. Petersburg, that he came from Starodub in northern Ukraine, Kamensky instantly called him an Old Believer (*raskolnik*) and referred to the nine Old Believer settlements in that part of Ukraine: Gettun, "Zapiski," 261–2. See also M. Lileev, "Iz nachalnoi istorii raskola v Starodube."
116. See V. P. Kochubei's warning to M. P. Myklashevsky, quoted in the second section of Chapter Two.
117. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 77.
118. Ibid., 116.

119. Ibid., 128.
120. Ibid., 81.
121. Ibid., 137–8.
122. For some figures, see the second section of Chapter Three.
123. Veikart, "Iz zapisok," 256–8; see also S. L. Sobol, "Osnovopolozhnik otechestvennoi gistologii A. M. Shumliansky," 418–19.
124. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 151.
125. Ibid., 137–8.
126. Ibid., 214 ("the fall of a great oak also squashes all the mushrooms which have grown under it").
127. Ibid., 258–9.
128. P. V. Zavadovsky, "Polozhenie o pravakh i preimushchestvakh Senata," 70.
129. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 274.
130. Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 45–6, 55, 62.
131. The chief printed accounts of Troshchynsky's life are Anon., "Dmitrii Prokofevich Troshchinsky," and A. N. Popov, ed., "Zapiska D. P. Troshchinskogo ob uchrezhdenii ministerstv," 1–22 (the editorial introduction). The first of these gives Troshchynsky's date of birth as 1754, but Golubtsov, "K biografii Zavadovskogo," 124, n. 11, provides convincing justification for accepting the year 1749.
132. From 1 January to 14 September of that year Troshchynsky was conducting a senatorial inspection (*reviziia*) of provinces in the Moscow area: TsGIA, f. 1375, op. 1, d. 1 (the journal of the inspection).
133. For Troshchynsky's importance in 1801 see Eidelman, *Gran vekov*, 284–92, and Korf, "Aleksandr I i ego priblizhennye," 212–14; for his views in that year, see Christian, "The 'Senatorial Party'," 315.
134. Not 1822, as stated in the anonymous life, since he wrote a letter from Kybyntsi in December 1821: D. P. Troshchinsky, "Pisma k I. R. Martosu," 226.
135. On Troshchynsky's humble background see Askochensky, *Kiev*, 2: 327–31; but see also O. Ohloblyn, "Ancestry of Mykola Gogol (Hohol)," 38–42, which gives a different impression.
136. Quoted in Chapter One.
137. Popov, "Zapiska," 5, n. 1.
138. See, for example, D. Iofanov, *N. V. Gogol: detskie i iunosheskie gody*, 197.
139. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 49, l. 57.
140. Anon., *Katalog antikvarnoi biblioteki knigoprodavtsa E. Ia. Fedorova, priobretennoi posle byvshego ministra*

D. P. Troshchinskogo.

141. Golubtsov, "K biografii Zavadovskogo," 124–5.
142. GBL, f. 41, k. 136, ed. khr. 24, ll. 3, 7.
143. As pointed out by A. P. Evgenev and B. N. Putilov, eds., *Drevnie rossiiskie stikhotvoreniia, sobrannye Kirsheiu Danilovym*, 514, n. 1.
144. Troshchinsky, "Pisma k Martosu," 231.
145. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 38, l. 57. The doctor was the sub-Carpathian Ukrainian I. S. Orlai, information on whom is contained in the last section of Chapter Eight.
146. On Kapnist see the second section of Chapter Two.
147. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 49, l. 57.
148. Ibid., l. 68.
149. Golubtsov, "K biografii Zavadovskogo," 125.
150. Kapnist-Skalon, "Vospominaniia," 366–7.
151. (Myklashevsky), "Iz bumag," 150.
152. Popov, "Zapiska," 6, n. 2; acquired in 1795.
153. Ibid., 10.
154. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 32, l. 6.
155. Kapnist-Skalon, "Vospominaniia," 330.
156. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 413.
157. (Myklashevsky), "Iz bumag," 151–2.
158. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 50a, ll. 113–14.
159. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 28, ll. 30–1, 36 (letters from Troshchynsky to V. P. Kochubei).
160. Zavadovsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovym," 93.
161. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 30, l. 6.
162. GPB, f. 874, op. 2, ed. khr. 229, l. 1 (a letter to Illia Bezborodko).
163. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 38, ll. 13, 35–6.
164. TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 541, l. 15.
165. GBL, f. 41, k. 136, ed. khr. 24, l. 5.
166. Lazarevsky, *Liubetskii arkhiv*, 221–4.
167. D. P. Troshchinsky, "Pisma k A. R. Vorontsovu (1785–1802)," 393.
168. See, for example, IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 28, ll. 32–3 (a letter to Kochubei giving information about Osyp Sudiienko and a certain Novytsky as well as about Bezborodko and Zavadovsky).
169. Alekseeva, *Borovikovsky*, 321.
170. GPB, f. 731, ed. khr. 2182, l. 3 (a letter to Speransky).
171. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 50a, ll. 2–3 (a letter from Troshchynsky's nephew reporting that Troshchynsky now had eleven "pensioners" at school in Poltava; compare Ivan Kotliarevsky's letter to the nephew on the subject of these children, in Kotliarevsky's *Povne zibrannia tvoriv*, 325–7).

172. N. Sushkov, "Iz zapisok o vremeni Imperatora Aleksandra I," 175–6; on Sushkov see P. Shebalsky, "Literator starogo vremeni."
173. See Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 3: 513–46.
174. Sushkov, "Iz zapisok," 176–7. See also N. L. Brodsky, ed., *Literaturnye salony i kruzhki: Pervaia polovina XIX veka*, 41, n. 1, and (on the poet Rodzianko's concern for Ukraine) V. E. Vatsuro, "Pushkin i Arkadii Rodzianka [*sic*] (Iz istorii grazhdanskoi poezii 1820–kh godov)," 44–5, 52.
175. On I. R. Martos, see A. M. Lazarevsky, "Ivan Romanovich Martos"; on the sculptor, N. Kovalenskaia, *Martos*; on Oleksa Martos, Lazarevsky, "Prezhnie izyskateli," 116–40. On the Martos family and Shevchenko, see Margolis, *Istoricheskie vzgliady T. G. Shevchenko*, 79.
176. See A. M. Lazarevsky, "Aleksandr Mikhailovich Markovich (1790–1865)," and TsGIA, f. 733, op. 49, d. 706, ll. 3–5 (Markovych's service record for 1828).
177. D. P. Troshchinsky, "Mnenie o proekte ulozheniia," 15.
178. Popov, "Zapiska," 23–162.
179. Ibid., 23.
180. Ibid., 29.
181. Ibid., 30–1.
182. Ibid., 50.
183. Ibid., 51.
184. Ibid., 98.
185. Ibid., 100–1.
186. Troshchinsky, "Pisma k Vorontsovu," 402, 404.
187. TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 17, l. 5.
188. Ibid., l. 7.
189. Lazarevsky, "Sotniki," 383n. On the early history of the Kochubei family, see also Lazarevsky, "Ocherki malorusskikh familii" (1876), 438–55.
190. On Dikanka, see Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 210, n. 50; P. P. Semenov, *Geograficheskо-statisticheskii slovar Rossiiskoi Imperii*, 2: 60–1; and P. Klepatsky, "Hospodarstvo Dykanskoho maietku Kochubeiv u pershii polovyni XIX v."
191. N. V. Gogol, PSS, 1: 106.
192. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 378, 391, 393 (letters of 1804). On some other Kochubei estates, see E. I. Drakokhrust, "Promyslovye sela vladeniia Kochubeev v Novgorod-Severskom namestnichestve vo vtoroi polovine XVIIIv."
193. Grigorovich, *Kantsler*, 1: 211, n. 51. On the family, see also Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 2: 522–57.
194. Vigel, *Zapiski*, 1: 306.

195. The following narrative of Kochubei's career is based on N. D. Chechulin's article, "Kochubei, Viktor Pavlovich," and on TsGIA, f. 1162, op. 6, d. 256, ll. 12–17 (Kochubei's service record for 1828).
196. Kochubei's marriage to M. V. Vasilchikova, whose mother had been born a Rozumovsky, offended the Emperor Paul, who had intended that he marry A. P. Lopukhina (the daughter of a favourite at court). Vasilchikova's aunt and foster-mother, N. K. Zagriazhskaia, publicly insulted Lopukhina's mother at the wedding ceremony, and was banished from St. Petersburg by the Emperor. Since the ceremony took place only seven months after Bezborodko's death, when those connected with him were in disarray, these circumstances damaged Kochubei's political prospects. See Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, *Russkie portrety XVIII i XIX stoletii*, 5: 123–4 (biographies of Zagriazhskaia and Kochubei's mother-in-law).
197. His service record shows that he retired formally from the ministry in February 1825, but was given indefinite leave in June 1823.
198. V. P. Kochubei, "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 17–18.
199. V. P. Kochubei, "Pisma [to both S. R. and A. R. Vorontsov]," 8–9. The future ambassador and fellow Ukrainian was V. S. Tomara (or Tamara), whom the Ukrainian philosopher Skovoroda had once served as tutor (Makhnovets, "Epistoliarnyi dokument," 40).
200. N. D. Chechulin, "Kochubei." Kochubei's involvement in Russia's plans to attract Greek settlers in the 1790s is mentioned in Arsh, *Eteristskoe dvizhenie*, 131, 136.
201. Kochubei, "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 31–2.
202. Kochubei, "Pisma," 14, 46; "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 113.
203. Kochubei, "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 140 (incorrectly dated 1796 instead of 1798).
204. IRLI, f. 538, op. 1, ed. khr. 28 (nineteenth-century copies of twenty-six letters from Troshchynsky to Kochubei, 1789–97); see esp. ll. 53 and 58 (letters of 1795 enclosing others from Alexander).
205. Korf, "Aleksandr I i ego priblizhennye," 219.
206. Gettun, "Zapiski," 289.
207. GBL, f. 231, r. 3, k. 25, ed. khr. 41.
208. V. P. Kochubei, "Pismo k Chernigovskomu gubernatoru Frensdorfu."
209. V. P. Kochubei, "Zapiska . . . o ministerstve vnutrennikh del," 451.
210. Ibid., 452.
211. Ibid., 463.
212. TsGIA, f. 994, op. 2, ed., khr. 915, l. 1.

213. I. A. Bychkov, ed., "Speransky v Velikopole i Penze," 469–70.
214. TsGIA, f. 1162, op. 6, d. 256, l. 5.
215. Kochubei, "Pismo k Frensdorfu," 164.
216. GBL, f. 731, ed. khr. 7099, contains a large number of letters from Kochubei to Speransky, but I was denied access to them in 1975, 1977 and 1982.
217. Bychkov, "Speransky," 469–70, 55–9.
218. TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 541, l. 2.
219. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 394.
220. Ibid., 378.
221. Bychkov, "Speransky," 56.
222. TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 540, l. 6.
223. Kochubei, "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 185.
224. Ibid., 218–19. On the office of *zemskii-* or *kapitan-ispravnik* in late eighteenth-century Russia, see J. P. Le Donne, "The Provincial and Local Police under Catherine the Great, 1775–1796," 516, and Madariaga, *Russia*, 584.
225. Kochubei, "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu," 227–8.
226. IRLI, f. 265, op. 2, ed. khr. 2942, ll. 3–4. On locusts in Ukraine, see V. G. Ruban, *Kratkaia letopis Malyia Rossii s 1506 po 1776 god*, 208–9 (referring to an attack of 1748); V. Zuev, *Puteshestvennye zapiski ot S. Peterburga do Khersona v 1781 i 1782 godu*, 229; and *Osnova*, no. 6 (1861): 172 (reporting a recent incursion in the province of Chernihiv).
227. IRLI, f. 488 ed. khr. 38, l. 55 (and see the second section of Chapter two).
228. See above, n. 196.
229. The correspondence between Kochubei and Repnin, which will be used below, contains frequent references to the relationship between their wives.
230. TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 222, l. 73 (a letter to Repnin written in 1831).
231. Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 335.
232. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 26, dop., ll. 1–4.
233. P. A. Kochubei, ed., "Uchrezhdenie gimnazii vysshikh nauk v Nezhine: pisma gr. V. P. Kochubeia," 301; the originals of the letters printed here are in TsGIA, f. 971, op. 1, ed. khr. 107.
234. On the later history of the foundation of the Nizhyn gymnasium, see TsGIA, f. 732, op. 1, d. 344, and op. 49, d. 48.
235. See TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 540a. ll. 6–8, and ed. khr. 541, l. 15, in which Kochubei takes an interest in precisely these things.
236. IRLI, f. 488, ed. khr. 38, l. 17 (from the memoirs of Mykola

Markevych).

237. TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 393 (a letter from Kurakin passing on an Imperial edict containing instructions on how to deal with Apollon Kochubei).
238. See Kurakin, *Vosemnadtsatyi vek*, 1: 400, where Kurakin describes writing to Kochubei to tell him what success he has had in dealing with his brother.
239. TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 222, l. 30.
240. On S. M. Kochubei's debts, see N. S(torozhenko), "Materialy dlia istorii dvorianskogo zemlevladeniia v Poltavskoi gubernii." Some of his projects ("On Noble Duty," "On the State Revenues of Russia," etc.) are in TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 562. More than 200 sheets of his letters to Repnin (one of them in mirror-writing) are to be found in TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 224–5. The first edition of *Eneida* to be approved by Kotliarevsky (the third in all) was dedicated to S. M. Kochubei and appeared in St. Petersburg in 1809.
241. For an analysis of his 1832 memorandum, "On the Past and Present Fates of Little Russia," see N. S(torozhenko), "Poltavskii gubernskii marshal S. M. Kochubei," 138–41; the paper was firmly integrationist.
242. See the lengthy dossier in TsGIA, f. 971, op. 1, d. 10 (106 ll.).
243. TsGIA, f. 1035, op. 1, ed. khr. 222, ll. 67–8.
244. N. S(torozhenko), "K istorii malorossiiskikh kozakov," 147; Kochubei was advising Repnin to allow central government taxation of the Cossacks.

Chapter Five

1. For the upsurge in printing in eighteenth-century Russia, see G. Marker, "Russia and the 'Printing Revolution': Notes and Observations," 277; for some figures on publishing in the first half of the nineteenth century, see N. V. Riasanovsky, *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia 1801–1855*, 278–83. See also A. Meynieux, *La littérature et le métier d'ecrivain en Russie avant Pouchkine*. The crucial publishing activity of Nikolai Novikov, especially in the 1780s, has now been well treated in I. F. Martynov, *Knigoizdatel Nikolai Novikov*; but Marker ("Novikov's Readers") presents a cautious account of the range of his readership.
2. "Zadacha," *Ezhemesiachnye sochineniia* 17 (1763): 381–3, 478–80.
3. Ibid., 321–42.

4. T. Malgin, "Opisanie Malorossiiskogo tabachnogo proizrasteniia."
5. Anon., "Opisanie dorog ot Kieva do Tsargrada, sochinennoe v 1714 godu."
6. Khuliakov, "Pismo iz Ukrainy."
7. Zuev, *Puteshestvennye zapiski*, 185.
8. N. I. Petrov, "Odin iz predshestvennikov Iv. Petr. Kotliarevskogo v ukrainskoi literature XVIII veka, Afanasii Kirillovich Lobysevich," 162.
9. A. N. Neustroev, *Istoricheskoe rozyskanie o russkikh povremennykh izdaniiakh i sbornikakh za 1703–1802 gg.*, 841–2.
10. Kheraskov was of Wallachian stock, Bohdanovych of Belorussian. On the former, see M. N. Longinov, "Mikhail Matveevich Kheraskov," and on the latter G. Gennadi, "Avtobiografiia I. F. Bogdanovicha"; N. M. Karamzin, "O Bogdanoviche i ego sochineniiakh"; and G. P. Makogonenko, ed., *Pisma russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka*, 253–5. Bohdanovych worked under Khersakov on the journal *Poleznoe uveselenie* in the early 1760s: P. N. Berkov, *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII veka*, 138.
11. Desnytsky (on whom see S. A. Pokrovsky, *Politicheskie i pravovye vzgliady Desnitskogo*) "regarded himself as something of a singer" and wanted "to sit in the choir seats in the chapel" of Glasgow University (A. H. Brown, "Adam Smith's First Russian Followers," 256); in this respect he showed the Ukrainian feeling for music to which reference was made in the second part of Chapter Three. Kozelsky returned to Ukraine in 1770 after a distinguished record of publication in the north (Iu. Ia. Kogan, *Prosvetitel XVIII veka Ia. P. Kozelsky*, 64).
12. *Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik*, 5 (1780): 319.
13. Quoted in I. F. Martynov, "Zhurnalist, istorik i diplomat Grigorii Leontevich Braiko," 241. This paragraph is based almost entirely on Martynov's article. On *Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik*, see also Berkov, *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki*, 348–54.
14. I. S. Orlai, "Istoriia o karpato-rossakh."
15. Martynov, "Zapiski," 161.
16. See TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 183, on subscriptions to the serial publication of these translations.
17. On Martynov, see A. Zaldkin, *Ivan Ivanovich Martynov, deiatel prosveshcheniia v nachale XIX veka*, and TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1830, d. 125 (Martynov's service record for 1830).
18. *Korifei* 1 (1802): 149 and 232, n. 12.
19. Ibid., 148–9.
20. Ibid., 149–51; on Halynkovsky, see also Iu. M. Lotman, "Pisatel, kritik i perevodchik Ia. A. Galinkovsky."

21. B. L. Modzalevsky, "Vasilii Grigorevich Ruban," 412. Biographical details are taken largely from this article, but see also A. Elnitsky, "Vasilii Grigorevich Ruban"; I. R. Timchenko-Ruban, "Iz vospominanii o prozhitom," 333 (for the family background); and Iu. N. Aleksandrov, "Pervye putevoditeli po Moskve (XVIII v.)," 182–5 (on Ruban's guide to Moscow).
22. V. G. Ruban, "Istoricheskie izvestiia, polskikh pisatelei, o provintsiiakh i gorodakh Rossiiskikh . . . ". This article is anonymous, but is included in a list of Ruban's works on Ukraine given by N. Vasilenko in *O. M. Bodiansky i ego zaslugi dlia izucheniia Malorossii*, 220.
23. For exceptions to this generalization, see G. N. Moiseeva, "Russkaia istoricheskaia proza pervoi poloviny XVIIIv. i polskie istoriki."
24. Ruban, "Istoricheskie izvestiia," 304.
25. *Starina i novizna*, 2 (1773): 185–90.
26. V. G. Ruban, *Kratkaia letopis*, preface.
27. B. Modzalevsky, ed., "Pisma arkhiepiskopa Mogilevskogo Georgiia Konisskogo k V. G. Rubanu."
28. See the second section of Chapters Two and Four for discussion of *Istoriia Rusov*; it was attributed to Konysky in the 1846 edition (listed under "Anon." in the bibliography).
29. *Starina i novizna* 1 (1772): 75–8, and 2 (1773): 177–9.
30. Ibid., 1 (1772): 91–103, 2 (1773): 3–30.
31. Ibid., 2 (1773): 107–17.
32. Grigorovich-Barsky, *Puteshestvie*, with preface by Ruban. On the author, see Khyzhniak, *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia*, 96–8.
33. Grigorovich-Barsky, *Puteshestvie*, iii.
34. Ibid., vi.
35. On Kalinovsky's *Opisanie* see Horlenko, *Narysy*, 134–5. Kalynovsky was the main beneficiary in Ruban's will (GPB, f. 653, ed. khr. 1, ll. 22–3); in 1791 he translated a play from Polish (Berkov, *Russko-polskie literaturnye sviazi*, 39–40).
36. V. G. Ruban, *Moskovskii liubopytnyi mesiatseslov na 1776 god*, 54–108, 109–20; like the work cited in n. 22, above, this work is anonymous but attributed to Ruban by Vasilenko.
37. Kalynovsky's *Opisanie*, for example, is the first item in the chronologically arranged bibliography by B. D. Grinchenko, *Literatura ukrainskogo folklora*.
38. Ruban, *Kratkie izvestiia*, vi.
39. Ibid., vii.
40. Ibid., ix.
41. Ibid., 1.

42. Ibid., 11–12, 30.
43. Ibid., 1–13, 13–30, 40–51, 89–91.
44. Ibid., 30.
45. Ibid.
46. By N. Bakai, for example, in "Iuzhno-russkii dvorianin XVIII veka," 720 (which deals with marriages of the gentry, but points out that they differed only in degree from those of the common people).
47. Samovidets, *Letopis po novootkrytym spiskam, s prilozheniem trekh malorossiiskikh khronik*, contains a number of eighteenth-century Ukrainian chronicles, and a preface which explains the relationship between Ruban, Scherer, and their common primary source, the chronicler Hrabianka. On Tumansky, see the next section, and on Bodiansky Vasilenko's *O. M. Bodiansky*. See also Chapter Two, section two, and Chapter Seven.
48. Ruban, *Kratkaia letopis*, preface (no pagination).
49. Ibid., xx–xxvii.
50. Ibid., 241–2.
51. Berkov, *Russko-polskie literaturnye sviazi*, 33, 37–9.
52. S. L. Peshtich, *Russkaia istoriografiia XVIII veka*, 3: 167 (and see n. 21, above).
53. See, for example, the eulogy of Samiilo Myslavsky: *Pismo . . . Samuilu.*
54. The auctioneer's list is in GPB, f. 653, ed. khr. 1, ll. 38–46.
55. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 245–6.
56. Ohloblyn gives Tumansky's birth-date as 1757 (*Liudy*, 248), but Tumansky recorded his age as forty-two in both March and September 1798: TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1798, d. 31, ll. 2, 13 (Tumansky's service record). For a genealogy of the Tumansky family see Anon., "Rodoslovnaia dvorian Tumanskikh."
57. He owned fewer than a hundred serfs himself, and inherited only another forty households on his father's death in 1798: TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1798, d. 31, ll. 2, 15–16.
58. Kogan, *Prosvetitel*, 59; TsGADA, f. 1445, op. 1, ed. khr. 540a and 541 (correspondence between V. P. and E. V. Kochubei, née Tumanska, 1799–1814); V. I. Tumansky, *Stikhotvoreniia . . . 1817–39*, ed. G. A. Miloradovich, introduction. V. I. Tumansky knew Kotliarevsky: see the latter's *Povne zibrannia*, 328.
59. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 248; Losky, "Ukraintsi na studiiakh v Nimechchyni," 107.
60. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 248–58.
61. All these services are recorded on Tumansky's service record, TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1798, d. 31, ll. 2–5. V. F. Horlenko

brought the "topographical description" to light and subjected it to detailed scrutiny: *Narysy*, 100–9.

62. Andrievsky, *Istoricheskie materialy*, 2: 27.
63. See I. I. Liubimenko, "Proekt 1779g. ob ustroistve filiala Akademii nauk v Glukhove i o napisanii istorii Ukrainy," and O. Ohloblyn, "Fedir Tumansky i ioho proiekt akademichnoi knyharni v Hlukhovi kintsia 1770-kh rr." Tumansky's bookshop project did not get very far, for, as Madariaga says, "provincial demand was very slight" throughout the empire (*Russia*, 330). In 1790 Tumansky opened a public reading room in St. Petersburg (A. A. Zaitseva, " 'Kabinety dlia chteniia' v Sankt-Peterburge kontsa XVIII—nachala XIX veka," 35, 44).
64. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 93, l. 5 (a letter from Tumansky to Zavadovsky, describing the destruction of his library by fire on 26 May 1796).
65. Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 254.
66. I. I. Liubimenko, ed., *Uchenaia korrespondentsiia Akademii nauk 1766–1782*, 332, 350, and esp. 484–90; Liubimenko, "Proekt," 51–3.
67. *Korifei* 1 (1802): 118–19. For Tumansky's publications on Peter the Great, see *Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoi pechati XVIII veka*, 3: 250–1 (nos. 7402–3).
68. Liubimenko, *Uchenaia korrespondentsiia*, 484–90.
69. For Tumansky's closeness to Zavadovsky, see his laudatory poem of 1791, *Ego prevoskhoditelstvu milostivomu gosudariu Petru Vasilevichu Zavadovskomu*. He may have been recommended to Zavadovsky by P. A. Rumiantsev, for in his New Year greetings to the latter in 1788 he thanked him for his many kindnesses: TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 75, dop., l. 5.
70. TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1798, d. 31, ll. 2–5; Golubtsov, "K biografii Zavadovskogo," 119–20.
71. TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1798, d. 31, ll. 2–5.
72. See above, first section of Chapter Three.
73. TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1798, d. 31, ll. 2–3.
74. Ibid., ll. 3–5.
75. Ibid., and TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 93, l. 5.
76. The censorship at Riga was a new creation: Madariaga, *Russia*, 547.
77. Golubtsov, "K biografii Zavadovskogo," 119–20; Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 254.
78. The subscription list occupies thirteen unnumbered pages following *Zerkalo sveta* 1 (1786): 392, and contains 246 names.
79. *Korifei* 1 (1802): 118–19.
80. See Kapnist, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2: 286, a letter from Kapnist responding to Tumansky's request for a contribution. The poem

Kapnist suggested did not appear, but another did, on E. I. Kostrov's version of the Iliad: *Zerkalo sveta* 2, no. 82 (23 July 1787): 496. That both Kapnist and Tumansky were in Kiev in 1785 is shown in Andrievsky, *Istoricheskie materialy*, 2: 25, 27.

81. *Zerkalo sveta* 2, no. 59 (12 February 1787). (104 nos. of *Zerkalo sveta* appeared between 9 February 1786 and 24 December 1787, numbered in two series and forming two bound volumes.)
82. Ibid. 2, nos 61, 68, 70, 74; 72, 76, 80; 81 (all 1787).
83. Ibid. 2, no. 74 (28 May 1787): 358–62.
84. Ibid. 1, no. 3 (23 February 1786): 59.
85. Ibid. 1, no. 46 (13 November 1786): 274.
86. Ibid. 1, no. 45 (6 November 1786): 248–57.
87. Ibid. 2, no. 90 (17 September 1787).
88. Ibid. 2, no. 58 (5 February 1787): 88n.
89. See, for example, V. N. Karazin, "Rech, govorennaia v sobranii Kharkovskogo dvorianstva," 235 (a speech of 1803), and E. Kovalevsky, "Pismo iz Ukrainy," 47 (a letter of 1819).
90. *Rossiiskii magazin* 1 (1792–3): 427–8, quoted in N. Belozerskaia, "Istoricheskii zhurnal XVIII veka," 64.
91. Belozerskaia, "Istoricheskii zhurnal XVIII veka," 61, quoting the introduction to the journal.
92. Ibid., 61–4, outlining the contents of the first of the three parts of the journal.
93. Ibid., 71, referring to Tumansky's articles on the Vorontsovs, the Dolgorukys, the Stroganovs, Saltykovs and Lopukhins; in *Zerkalo sveta* he had published a life of N. I. Panin and a study of the Chernyshevs (1 (1786): 73–92, 2 (1787): 34–48).
94. Belozerskaia, "Istoricheskii zhurnal," 61.
95. *Rossiiskii magazin* 2 (1793): i.
96. Ibid., i–ii.
97. Ibid., 15–109, 209–90, 366–88, and 3 (1793–4): 54–73, 75–6, 125–56, 205–36, 280–311; for the manifesto, see 2 (1793): 1–14; for the letter, see 2 (1793): 473–97; and for the 1749 extract, see 1 (1792–3): 187–98.
98. Ibid. 2 (1793): ii.
99. Ibid. 2 (1793): iii, and 3 (1793–4): i.
100. Ibid. 2 (1793): iii.
101. Belozerskaia, "Istoricheskii zhurnal," 76–82.
102. *Rossiiskii magazin* 2 (1793): 20–1.
103. Ibid. 2 (1793): 35–6.
104. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 361.
105. *Rossiiskii magazin* 2 (1793): iii–iv.
106. See M. T. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*,

1: 259.

107. See TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 48 dop., l. 112 (a letter from one of his agents to the antiquarian N. P. Rumiantsev).
108. On Tumansky in Riga, see V. V. Sipovsky, "Iz proshlogo russkoi tsenzury."
109. N. M. Karamzin, *Pisma k Dmitrievu*, 19. Tumansky got his own back in 1800, when as censor in Riga he stopped the German version of Karamzin's *Letters of a Russian Traveller* (Karamzin, *Pisma*, 115).
110. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 15, d. 21, l. 1 (an 1812 letter from Antonovsky to the minister of education, providing a curriculum vitae in support of requests for promotion, a pension and a job); for the narrative of Antonovsky's career, see also L. B. Svetlov, "M. I. Antonovsky," 102.
111. Svetlov, "M. I. Antonovsky," 97–8.
112. Ibid., 98.
113. Antonovsky, "Zapiski," 161–2.
114. Ibid., 145.
115. Ibid.
116. Ibid., 148.
117. Ibid., 150; Sushkov, *Moskovskii universitetskii blagorodnyi pansion*, esp. 30.
118. Antonovsky, "Zapiski," 151.
119. Ibid., 156–7.
120. See Svetlov, "Antonovsky," 103.
121. O. Khaliavsky, "Skovoroda, ukrainskii pisatel XVIII veka (Materialy dlia istorii iuzhnorusskoi literatury)," 78 (giving a list of the works of Skovoroda printed between 1798 and 1860).
122. GPB, f. 683, ed. khr. 18, l. 2 (from Antonovsky's preface to the Kiev survey, which remained unpublished); for Shafonsky's work on Chernihiv, see the opening of Chapter Three.
123. M. I. Antonovsky, "Malorossiiskie kozaki (byvshie)"; for Antonovsky's authorship of this essay, see Horlenko, *Narysy*, 124–5.
124. Antonovsky, "Malorossiiskie kozaki," 234.
125. F. I. Glinka, *Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnytsky ili osvobozhdennaia Malorossiia*, 8n.
126. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 15, d. 12, l. 2.
127. Antonovsky, "Zapiski," 166–7 (and Madariaga, *Russia*, 448).
128. This theme is developed in the last section of Chapter Two.
129. Briskman, *Anastasevich*, 63.
130. See the last section of Chapter Eight.
131. *Ulei* 1 (1811): 35–50. The pagination of *Ulei* was in four series, each containing six of the twenty-four monthly numbers; references are to

these four series rather than to individual issues.

132. *Ulei* 2 (1811): 26–34, 117–26; 1 (1811): 354–64; 2 (1811): 293–7; 3 (1812): 145–8, 394–409, 477–91.
133. *Ulei* 1 (1811): 118–27, 132–4, 197–203; 2 (1811): 186–94; 1 (1811): 467–72.
134. *Ulei* 1 (1811): 468.
135. *Ulei* 2 (1811): 367–8.
136. Priima, " 'Slovo o polku Igoreve' v otsenke 1814g. V. G. Anastasevicha," 298.
137. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 361.
138. On Czacki, see D. Beauvois, "École et société en Ukraine occidentale (1800–1825)," and R. W. Wołoszynski, *Polsko-rosyjskie związki w naukach społecznych 1801–1830*, 318–21.
139. Zamkov, " 'Ulei'," 46, n. 5.
140. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 289.
141. *Ulei* 2 (1811): 367–74. Anastasevych was officially rewarded for his work on the translation of the Lithuanian Statute, which appeared in the same year as this extract from Czacki's *O litewskich i polskich prawach* (Warsaw, 1800–1801): see TsGIA, f. 777, op. 1, d. 571, ll. 10–11 (Anastasevych's service record for 1826).
142. *Ulei* 1 (1811): 286, 94, 347–54, 421–9; 2 (1811): 284–91, 434–41; 3 (1812): 280ff., 365ff., 446ff.; 4 (1812): 115ff., 249ff., 329ff., 388ff.
143. See the five extracts in *Ulei* 4, nos. 19–23 (1812).

Chapter Six

1. E. C. Thaden, "The Beginnings of Romantic Nationalism in Russia," 502–3. See also H. Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia*; L. G. Leighton, *Russian Romanticism: Two Essays*, 1–39 ("On a Discrimination of Russian Romanticism"); and V. V. Poznansky, *Ocherk formirovaniia russkoi natsionalnoi kultury: Pervaia polovina XIX veka.*
2. Quoted in Thaden, "Beginnings," 519.
3. See D. Wilson, *The Life and times of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić 1787–1864*, 190–207 (" 'National Poetry' and Romantic Europe"); P. Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3–22 ("The Discovery of the People").
4. P. K. Christoff, *The Third Heart: Some Intellectual-Ideological Currents and Cross Currents in Russia 1800–1830*, 106.
5. I. I. Zamotin, *Romanticheskii idealizm v russkom obshchestve i literature 20–30kh godov XIX stoletiia.*

6. N. Trubitsyn, *O narodnoi poezii v obshchestvennom i literaturnom obikhode pervoi treti XIX veka.*
7. Ibid., 137–8.
8. Ibid., 35.
9. R. F. Iusufov, *Russkii romantizm nachala XIX veka i natsionalnye kultury*, 16, 32.
10. M. K. Azadovsky, *Istoriia russkoi folkloristiki*; A. A. Gorelov, F. Ia. Priima, A. D. Soimonov, eds., *Russkaia literatura i folklor (pervaia polovina XIXv.)*; B. P. Kirdan, *Sobirateli narodnoi poezii: Iz istorii ukrainskoi folkloristiki XIXv.*
11. M. S. Anderson, *Historians and Eighteenth-Century Europe*, 176.
12. For the best guides to the "Ukrainian theme" in early nineteenth-century Russian literature, see Grinchenko, *Literatura ukrainskogo folklora*; O. Andriievsky, *Bibliohrafiia literatury z ukrainskoho folkloru*, 1; Komarov, "Ukrainskii iazyk"; and especially Sypovsky, "Ukraina v rosiiskomu pysmenstvi."
13. *Vestnik Evropy* 10, no. 16 (1803): 235–43; 10, no. 13 (1803): 39–45; 12, no. 21 (1803): 88–91; 50, no. 8 (1810): 311–14.
14. Ibid., 33, no. 9 (1807): 39n.
15. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 30, d. 192, l. 3 (Kachenovsky's service record for 1835).
16. A. A. Shakhovskoi, *Komedii, stikhotvoreniia*, 818.
17. The song so appealed to the contemporary writer V. K. Kiukhelbeker that he translated it into German, an interesting example of the way in which Ukrainian culture could be brought into play by a self-conscious "translator and propagandist of Russian national culture in the West"; see A. V. Arkhipova, "Problema natsionalnoi samobytnosti v russkoi literature pervoi chetverti XIXv. (epokha stanovleniia romantizma)," 68 and n. 91.
18. Shakhovskoi, *Komedii*, 27; for the words under discussion, see A. A. Shakhovskoi, *Kozak stikhotvorets, Anekdoticheskaia opera vodevil v odnom deistvii*, 63.
19. *Syn otechestva* 17–18 (1814): 118–20; reproduced in Medvedeva, *Gnedich* 2: 473–5.
20. *Ukrainskii vestnik* 8, no. 12 (1817): 366–70.
21. P. K. Volynsky, *Ivan Kotliarevsky: zhyttia i tvorchist*, 176, 193–4.
22. *Blagonamerennyi* 13 (1823): 62–5.
23. B. Hollingsworth, "Arzamas: Portrait of a Literary Society," 312–13.
24. V. Bazanov, *Uchenaia respublika*, 103–4.
25. Ibid., 105. On Somov, see N. K. Ostrovskaia, "Istoricheskaia povest O. Somova 'Gaidamak'."
26. Glinka, *Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnitsky*, 9–10.
27. Ibid., 8–9.

28. Ibid., 17.
29. Ibid., 10–11.
30. Ibid., 12n.
31. On the wider ramifications of Glinka's interest in Ukraine, see N. M. Zharkevich, *Tvorchestvo F. N. Glinki v istorii russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei*; and on Glinka's left-wing politics, F. A. Walker, "Reaction and Radicalism in the Russia of Tsar Alexander I: The Case of the Brothers Glinka."
32. *Sorevnovatel prosveshcheniia i blagotvoreniia*, no. 7 (1819): 43–54. Kovalevsky became a member of the society in 1816: Bazanov, *Uchenaia respublika*, 442.
33. The dates when Hnidych and Ryleev became members of the society are given in Bazanov, *Uchenaia respublika*, 444; Ryleev was in the southern part of Voronezh province between 1817 and 1820, and visited Ukraine proper in 1822 (A. E. Khodorov, "Ukrainskie siuzhety poezii K. F. Ryleeva," 121); the possibility of Hnidych's influence on Ryleev is suggested by I. N. Medvedeva (*Gnedich* 1: 192); see also Ryleev's 1825 letter to Mykola Markevich in A. M. Egolin et al., eds., *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 59 (Moscow, 1954): 153–4.
34. *Nevskii zritel* 1, no. 2 (February 1820): 46–56.
35. Priima, " 'Slovo o polku Igoreve' v otsenke Anastasevicha."
36. He was corrected by Bolkhovitinov: see the latter's "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 363.
37. M. Maksimovich, *Ukrainskie narodnye pesni, chast pervaia*, 68.
38. Ibid., 20, 67–8. On the eighteenth-century discovery and subsequent widespread discussion of the *Slovo*, see G. N. Moiseeva, *Spaso-Iaroslavskii khronograf i "Slovo o polku Igoreve"*; F. Ia. Priima, *"Slovo o polku Igoreve" v russkom istorikoliteraturnom protsesse pervoi treti XIX veka*; and A. S. Mylnikov, " 'Slovo o polku Igoreve' i slavianskie izucheniia kontsa XVIII—nachala XIX v."
39. Of the many works on Maksymovych, the most helpful are probably A. Grushevsky, "M. A. Maksimovich (1804–1873): Iz ukrainskoi istoriografii XIX v."; Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia*, 194–246; D. Ostrianyn, *Svitohliad M. O. Maksymovycha*; and (for further bibliography) Korduba, *La littérature historique soviétique-ukrainienne*, 112–13.
40. M. Maksimovich, "O poeme Pushkina 'Poltava' v istoricheskom otnoshenii," 507. For a different opinion of Pushkin's view of Mazepa, see J. P. Pauls, *History of Pushkin's "Poltava,"* 12–18. See also O. Riabinin-Skliarevsky, "Ukrainski motyvy v poemi O. S. Pushkina 'Poltava' (kilka dyskusiinykh uvah do stolitnykh

rokovyn poemy)," and (on Pushkin and Ukraine in general) I. Ia. Zaslavsky, *Pushkin i Ukraina.*

41. *Vestnik Evropy* 167, no. 20 (1829): 304–5.
42. V. Karazin, "Odna glava iz rukopisi."
43. TsGALI, f. 1251, op. 1, ed. khr. 3, l. 8 (a letter from Kachenovsky to his wife).
44. P. K. Christoff, *A. S. Xomjakov*, 54.
45. *Vestnik Evropy* 154, no. 15 (1827): 184–200, and n. 41, above.
46. *Vestnik Evropy*, no. 21 (1822): 61n.
47. Ibid., 84 (1815): 123n.
48. M. T. Kachenovsky, "Istoricheskii vzgliad na Grammatiku slavianskikh narechii," and "O Slavianskom iazyke voobshche i v osobennosti o tserkovnom."
49. *Vestnik Evropy*, no. 6 (1827): 116–21.
50. A. Pavlovsky, *Stikhi na konchinu ego svetlosti Kantslera Kniazia Aleksandra Andreevicha Bezborodko.* On Pavlovsky see M. Nakonechny, "Persha hramatyka 'novoi' literaturnoi movy," and G. Y. Shevelov, "Die 'Grammatik der kleinrussischen Mundart' von Pavlovskij und ihr Autor."
51. A. Pavlovsky, *Grammatika malorossiiskogo narechiia*, ii.
52. A. Pavlovsky, *Pribavlenie k grammatike malorossiiskogo narechiia*, 16; this reply is reprinted in P. D. Tymoshenko, ed., "Vidpovid O. Pavlovskoho na retsenziiu M. Tserteleva."
53. Pavlovsky, *Pribavlenie*, 1. Pavlovsky had tried to gain official support for his *Grammar*, in 1805: F. Savchenko, "Ukrainska mova pered Ros. akademiieiu nauk u 1805 r."
54. Hromova, "V. V. Kapnist," 29.
55. See Ivan Kotliarevsky's letter of December 1821 to Hnidych, in his *Povne zibrannia*, 330.
56. Pavlovsky, *Grammatika*, vi.
57. Loboiko reported this discussion in a letter of 1824 to N. P. Rumiantsev: TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 61 dop., ll. 22–3.
58. *Syn otechestva*, no. 23 (1818): 147, n. 2.
59. The subtitle was "A Grammatical Demonstration of the most essential distinctions which distance the Little Russian dialect from the pure Russian language."
60. Pavlovsky, *Grammatika*, 112.
61. Pavlovsky, *Pribavlenie*, 17–18. On these doctors, see Pliushch, *Narysy*, 174–81, 192–202.
62. Pavlovsky, *Pribavlenie*, 35–6.
63. For purposes of comparison see R. Auty, "Language and Nationality in East-Central Europe 1750–1950." The formal study of Ukrainian developed more rapidly in Galicia than in the

Ukrainian part of the Russian Empire, but still lagged behind that of other Slavic languages; see P. R. Magocsi, "The Language Question as a Factor in the National Movement in Eastern Galicia."

64. *Syn otechestva*, no. 23 (1818): 150.
65. I. Mastak (O. Bodiansky), "Malorossiiskie poslovitsy i pogovorki, sobrannye V. N. S. Kharkov 1834," 337.
66. For discussion of later developments in the rise of the Ukrainian language, see the third section of Chapter Nine.
67. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 179 (10 August 1834): 714.
68. *Moskovskii vestnik* 6 (1827): 313–14.
69. On Sreznevsky, see the last section of Chapter Eight.
70. M. Maksimovich, "Predislovie k sobraniiu Malorossiiskikh pesen," 184.
71. On Vasyl Trutovsky, publisher of this collection, see Simoni, *Kamer-guslist V. F. Trutovsky*.
72. Ibid., 7–8.
73. TsGALI, f. 1064, op. 1, ed. khr. 7, l. 9. The song was possibly that published by K. Kharlampovych, " 'Malorosiiska pisnia' 1791 roku." See also A. M. Lazarevsky, "Kniaz Potemkin i malorusskie pesni," and (for the festivities as a whole) Madariaga, *Russia*, 564.
74. See the end of Chapter Two, section two.
75. P. A. Lukashevich, *Malorossiiskie i Chervonorusskie pesni*, 5.
76. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 123 (13 October 1827).
77. Maksimovich, *Ukrainskie narodnye pesni*, iv, vi. On P. V. Kireevsky, see A. D. Soimonov, *P. V. Kireevsky i ego sobranie narodnykh pesen*.
78. On Maksymovych's collection of 1827, see V. Danylov, "Do istorii 'Malorossiiskikh pesen' M. O. Maksymovycha," and especially F. Savchenko, "Pershyi zbirnyk ukrainskykh pisen Maksymovycha (1827–1927)"; on the collection of 1834, see V. Danylov, "Druhyi zbirnyk ukrainskykh pisen M. O. Maksymovycha z 1834 roku," and B. S. Shteinpress, ed., *Golosa ukrainskikh pesen, izdannye Mikhailom Maksimovichem*, esp. 85–145. On the collectors of Ukrainian songs in general, see Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, 3: 11–150; Kirdan, *Sobirateli*; and O. I. Dei, *Storinky z istorii ukrainskoi folklorystyky*. On the greatest of these collectors, the Pole Zorian Chodakowski, see the last section of Chapter Seven.
79. N. A. Tsertelev, *Opyt sobraniia starinnykh malorossiiskikh pesen*, 10, 16. On Tsertelev, see M. Mochulsky, "Kn. Mykola Andreievych Tsertelev: Biohrafichno-literaturnyi narys" (as well as Kirdan, *Sobirateli*, 28–51, and Dei, *Storinky*, 12–22).
80. N. V. Gogol, "O Malorossiiskikh pesniakh."
81. Ibid., 25.

82. Ibid., 26.
83. Ibid., 21.
84. The introduction is reprinted in Medvedeva, *Gnedich*, 2: 425–52.
85. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 1, d. 578, l. 6. Hnidych was close to his sister, who lived in Ukraine until her death (at the end of the second decade of the century): Gnedich, *Stikhotvoreniia*, 21.
86. I. F. Hnidych's study trip to England and other countries of Western Europe (1817–21) is chronicled in TsGIA, f. 733, op. 49, d. 296.
87. Medvedeva, *Gnedich*, 2: 310–32.
88. Ibid., 2: 453–6.
89. Quotations from I. N. Medvedeva, "N. I. Gnedich i dekabristy," 119–20.
90. Medvedeva, *Gnedich* 2: 442. On Fauriel, see Wilson, *Karadžić*, 201, 204.
91. Medvedeva, *Gnedich* 2: 443–4, 446.
92. Ibid., 448–52.
93. On politics, see Arsh, *Eteristskoe dvizhenie*; in the cultural sphere, Martynov was publishing his translation of the Greek classics throughout the 1820s (see above, first section of Chapter Five), and Hnidych's version of the *Iliad* appeared in 1829.
94. F. P. Lvov, *O penii v Rossii*, 65.
95. Poznansky, *Ocherk formirovaniia*, 151.
96. I have published a longer version of this section under the title "Contemporary Critics of Gogol's *Vechera* and the Debate about Russian *narodnost'* (1831–1832)."
97. P. K. Bogolepov, N. P. Verkhovskaia, eds., *Tropa k Gogoliu*, 15.
98. N. V. Gogol, PSS, 10: 142.
99. P. A. Viazemsky, "Pismo v Parizh," 182–3. This article was signed "A. M.," but see I. F. Masanov, *Slovar psevdonimov russkikh pisatelei, uchenykh i obshchestvennykh deiatelei*, 1: 47, for the confirmation that Viazemsky was the author.
100. N. V. Gogol, PSS, 11: 419.
101. E. Malaniuk, "Hohol-Gogol."
102. Although not set in Ukraine, *The Government Inspector* is about a visitor from the centre to the provinces and very like another play by a Ukrainian writing in Russian, Kvitka's *Priezzhii iz stolitsy*. Since there was apparently no direct link between the two plays, the theme may have been one which was likely to be conceived by Ukrainians. See N. V. Volkov, *K istorii russkoi komedii: I. Zavisimost 'Revizora' Gogolia ot komedii Kvitki 'Priezzhii iz stolitsy'*, and I. Aizenshtok, "K voprosu o literaturnykh vliianiiakh (G. V. Kvitka i N. V. Gogol)." For the connection between the subject-matter of

Dead Souls and the south, see Druzhinina, *Iuzhnaia Ukraina v 1800–1825 gg.*, 181.

103. Not all the critical discussion of Gogol's early work has turned upon its Ukrainian subject matter (see, for example, V. P. Kazarin, "Tipologiia istoricheskoi prozy Gogolia 1829–1832 godov," which turns on whether Gogol was by nature a fantasist or a realist), but even critics whose main concerns lie elsewhere find it difficult to escape the issue: see Piksanov, "Ukrainskie povesti Gogolia," where the author is primarily interested in Gogol's class orientation, but has to go into the Ukrainian context in order to assess it. For the *Vechera* as consummation of the "Ukrainian theme" in early nineteenth-century Russian literature, see V. V. Gippius, " 'Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki' Gogolia," and for the two next most important Ukrainian writers in Russian (in the 1830s), see S. D. Zubkov, *Russkaia proza G. F. Kvitki i E. P. Grebenki v kontekste russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei.*
104. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 219 (29 September 1831): 1.
105. V. G. Belinsky was of the same opinion: see the second and third sections of Chapter Nine.
106. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 219 (29 September 1831): 1–2.
107. Ibid., 2. The reviewer probably had in mind Pogodin's *Marfa, posadnitsa novgorodskaia* (Moscow, 1830), a five-act verse drama. In the preface to the play Pogodin claimed the authority of medieval chronicles for the outmoded expressions his characters were made to speak. Pushkin, unlike the *Severnaia pchela* reviewer, approved of Pogodin's attempt to grasp the atmosphere of the sixteenth century: A. S. Pushkin, PSS, 11: 181.
108. The *Severnaia pchela* reviewer, who signed himself "V," was V. A. Ushakov (Masanov, *Slovar psevdonimov*, 1: 181). Paul Debreczeny mistakenly ascribed the review to F. V. Bulgarin, one of the editors of *Severnaia pchela* ("Nikolay Gogol and his Contemporary Critics," 5). Ushakov was more liberal than Bulgarin: on Ushakov, see Poznansky, *Ocherk formirovaniia*, 159; on Bulgarin, see N. Malcolm, "Ideology and Intrigue in Russian Journalism under Nicholas I: 'Moskovskii telegraf' and 'Severnaya pchela'," 257, where Bulgarin and N. I. Grech are described as "two men who closed their minds to broader political questions in 1825."
109. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 219 (29 September 1831): 3. Pushkin, however, thought Zagoskin's novel was good: PSS, 11: 92–3.
110. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 219 (29 September 1831): 3.
111. Ibid. Polevoi's *Istoriia* appeared in six volumes between 1829 and 1833.
112. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 220 (30 September 1831): 1.

113. Ibid., 2–3 (emphasis conveyed by word order in the original).
114. Sympathy with Ukrainian nationalism was one of the charges levelled against Polevoi by the minister of education, S. S. Uvarov, when the latter sought to close Polevoi's journal in 1834: V. N. Orlov, "Nikolai Polevoi i ego 'Moskovskii telegraf'," 440.
115. *Moskovskii telegraf* 41, no. 17 (September 1831): 94. N. I. Nadezhdin mocked Polevoi for falling victim to journalistic intrigues: *Teleskop* 5 (1831): 558–9.
116. A. Tsarynny, *Mysli malorossiianina po prochtenii povestei Pasichnika Rudogo-Panka.* This work appeared serially in *Syn otechestva* for 1832, but references are to the separate edition.
117. Ibid., 6.
118. Ibid., 9.
119. Ibid., 4–5, 9–10, 69, 71, 11, 10–11.
120. Ibid., 21, 49, 55–9.
121. Storozhenko, "Ubezhdenie," 86. For the identification of Tsarynny with Storozhenko, see Masanov, *Slovar psevdonimov*, 3: 223.
122. IRLI, f. 488, ed. khr. 64, ll. 1–2.
123. Tsarynny, *Mysli malorossiianina*, 61.
124. Ibid., 49.
125. *Moskovskii telegraf* 44, no. 6 (1832): 262, 265–6.
126. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 59 (12 March 1832). The reviewer may not have been Ushakov, as in September 1831, since the review was unsigned.
127. But see F. Ia. Priima, "N. I. Nadezhdin i slaviane."
128. *Teleskop* 5 (1831): 559–60.

Chapter Seven

1. This paragraph should be taken in conjunction with the discussion of eighteenth-century Ukrainian history-writing in the second section of Chapter Two. See especially Grushevsky, "Ob ukrainskoi istoriografii XVIII veka"; Ia. D. Isaievych, "Ukrainska arkheohrafiia v XVII–XVIII st."; and Polukhin, *Formuvannia istorychnykh pohliadiv M. I. Kostomarova*, pt. 1. On the relative weakness of history-writing in the north, see J. L. Black, "The Search for a 'Correct' Textbook of National History in 18th Century Russia."
2. Beauplan, *Description d'Ukraine*; P. Chevalier, *Histoire de la Guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne*; P. Linage de Vauciennes, *L'Origine véritable du soulèvement des Cosaques contre la Pologne*; J. B. Scherer, *Annales de la Petite-Russie*; J. C. von Engel,

Geschichte der Ukraine und der Cosaken: Geschichte von Galizien und Lodomerien; C. von Plotho, *Die Kosaken*; C.-L. Lesur, *Histoire des Kosaques*. On this extensive foreign-language literature, see especially É. Borschak, *L'Ukraine dans la littérature de L'Europe occidentale*, and Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments* (esp. 67–88, on Beauplan). See also Holobutsky, "Problema kozatstva"; F. Savchenko, "Kozachchyna u frantsuzkomu pysmenstvi ta kozakofilstvo Merime," 38–41; and I. Borshchak, "Volter i Ukraina (Za nevydanymy dokumentamy)."

3. *Korifei* 1 (1802): 86.
4. Beauplan's *Description* (1660) was translated by F. U(strialov) and published in St. Petersburg in 1832 as *Opisanie Ukrainy*; the translator lamented its pro-Polish stance (*Opisanie*, x–xi).
5. See O. Ohloblyn, " 'Annales de la Petite-Russie' Sherera i 'Istoriia Rusov'." Scherer's son also served in Russia, where he was a professor at the St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute in 1807: LGIA, f. 13, op. 1, ed. khr. 281, ll. 12–13.
6. Scherer, *Annales*, 1: vii–viii.
7. Ibid., ix–x.
8. Ibid., 1: 257–8.
9. *Korifei* 1 (1802): 148.
10. Lesur, *Histoire*, vi–vii.
11. N. A. Markevich, *Ukrainskie melodii*, 95.
12. Ibid., 3.
13. Ibid., 98–9.
14. IRLI, f. 488, ed. khr. 63, l. 2. On Markevych's history of Ukraine, see the third section of Chapter Nine.
15. G. F. Müller published two articles, "O nachale i proiskhozhdenii kazakov" and "Izvestiia o zaporozhskikh kazakakh," in *Ezhemesiachnye sochineniia* for April and May 1760 (Vasilenko, *O. M. Bodiansky*, 219), and I. N. Boltin copied parts of them for his commentary on the French historian N. G. Leclerc (Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 355).
16. Lazarevsky, "Prezhnie izyskateli," 86–7.
17. Chepa, "Dva pisma," 367.
18. Markovich, vii–viii. On Markovych see Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia*, 127–38, and Horlenko, *Narysy*, 120–4.
19. Markovich, *Zapiski*, vii.
20. Ibid., "Pogreshnosti i zamechaniia" (separately paginated at the end), iv.
21. D. N. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1830 edition), 3: 264.
22. TsGIA, f. 1349, op. 4, 1817, d. 188, ll. 2–5 (Bantysh-Kamensky's

service record for 1817, from which the information on his career is taken).

23. See S. G. Potepalov, "Puteshestvie P. I. Keppena po slavianskim zemliam," 5–7.
24. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, ll. 226–7 (a letter written by Vasyl Karazyn to D. I. Iazykov in 1820, alluding to the quality of the 1810 engraving).
25. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoriia* (1822 edition), 1: v.
26. Ibid.
27. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, l. 37 (a letter from I. M. Muraviev-Apostol to Bantysh-Kamensky, 1822, regretting the latter's intention). On the cultural orientation of Repnin's Chancery, see D. Doroshenko, "Kn. M. Repnin i D. Bantysh- Kamensky"; and on Bantysh-Kamensky in general, see Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia*, 138–49.
28. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, ll. 193–4 (a letter from Kochubei to Repnin, 8 May 1822).
29. Ibid., l. 116 (Kochubei to Bantysh-Kamensky).
30. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 182, ll. 1, 6.
31. Ibid., l. 8.
32. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoriia* (1830 edition), 1: 6.
33. In the second part of Chapter Three.
34. N. N. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoricheskoe izvestie o voznikshei v Polshe Unii*, 406–7, 411–12.
35. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoriia* (1830 edition), 1: ixn.
36. Ibid., 3: 245–51.
37. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, l. 20 (a letter from Evgenii Bolkhovitinov to Bantysh-Kamensky, written from Kiev and offering his services to Bantysh-Kamensky's local relatives).
38. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoriia* (1830 edition), 1: viii.
39. Ibid. (1830 edition), 3: 264.
40. Ibid., 1: vii–viii.
41. IRLI, 339, d. 1, l. 19. On Rigelman, see Ia. I. Dzyra, "Dzherelna osnova pratsi O. Rigelmana z istorii Ukrainy."
42. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, l. 19 (a letter to Bantysh-Kamensky from Osyp Bodiansky, secretary of the Moscow society).
43. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoriia* (1822 edition), 1: v.
44. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, l. 19.
45. See the last section of Chapter Two.
46. *Syn otechestva* 83 (1823): 137–8 (italics in original). That this anonymous review was written by Oleksa Martos is confirmed in Savchenko, "Novi vidomosti," 8.
47. *Syn otechestva* 83 (1823): 132, 137–8.

48. Bantysh-Kamensky listed his sources for the 1822 edition of his *Istoriia* in 1: vi–viii, and for the 1830 edition in 1: vii–xx. The second list was more heavily annotated—confirmation, perhaps, that the author was responding to his critics. See Kotliarevsky, *Povne zibrannia*, 335, for an 1829 letter from Kotliarevsky to Bantysh-Kamensky answering questions about Ukrainian customs (particularly relevant to the more "sociological" outlook of the second edition of the *Istoriia*).
49. N. Polevoi, "Istoriia Maloi Rossii (Sochinenie D. N. Bantysh-Kamenskogo)," 247–9.
50. Ibid., 77, 85, 246.
51. See the end of the section on Kochubei in Chapter Four.
52. Orlov, "Nikolai Polevoi," 440.
53. Polevoi, "Istoriia," 88.
54. Ibid., 256.
55. This section is based on my articles, "Historians and Concepts of Nationality" and "Z. D. Chodakowski (1784–1825) and the Unity of Slavonic Culture."
56. N. M. Karamzin, *Letters of a Russian Traveler 1789–90*, 218.
57. A. S. Pushkin, PSS, 11: 57; M. N. Tikhomirov, M. V. Nechkina, eds., *Ocherki istorii istoricheskoi nauki v SSSR*, 1: 277; J. L. Black, *Nicholas Karamzin and Russian Society in the Nineteenth Century*, 129.
58. Pushkin, PSS, 11: 57.
59. V. I. Saitov and P. N. Sheffer, eds., *Ostafievskii arkhiv kniazei Viazemskikh*, 1: 107.
60. Pushkin, PSS, 13: 127 (saying that Karamzin had changed this phrase in Pushkin's presence); compare Black, *Karamzin*, 101.
61. For the latest work on Karamzin as historian, see N. Ia. Eidelman, *Poslednii letopisets*.
62. N. M. Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, 1: viii.
63. I. Ia. Shchipanov and S. Ia. Shtraikh, eds., *Izbrannye sotsialno-politicheskie i filosofskie proizvedeniia dekabristov*, 1: 333–6, 687.
64. L. N. Luzianina, "Epigramma na Karamzina."
65. See Pushkin, PSS, 13: 28, 182.
66. B. V. Tomashevsky, "Epigrammy Pushkina na Karamzina," 208.
67. P. A. Viazemsky, *Zapisnye knizhki 1813–1848*, 21.
68. IRLI, f. 339, d. 1, l. 218 (from a letter to D. N. Bantysh-Kamensky).
69. See Black, *Karamzin*, 143, and S. Russov, *O kritike G. Artsybasheva na Istoriiu gosudarstva Rossiiskogo, sochinennuiu N. M. Karamzinym.*

70. J. L. Black, "The Primečanija: Karamzin as a 'Scientific' Historian of Russia."
71. Z. D. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie przed Chrześcijaństwem oraz inne pisma i listy*, ed. J. Maślanka, 301.
72. See, for example, the obituary in *Bibliograficheskie listy*, no. 38 (13 March 1826): 562–4.
73. A. N. Pypin, "Zoriian Dolenga-Khodakovsky: Biograficheskii ocherk." The remainder of this paragraph is based on Chodakowski's false autobiography and Pypin's article, updated where necessary by the introduction to Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie* (5–14). Literature on Chodakowski to 1965 is listed in J. Maślanka, *Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski: jego miejsce w kulturze polskiej i wpływ na polskie piśmiennictwo romantyzcne*, 148–9.
74. Chodakowski's movements in 1813–14 remain obscure: see Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 7, and Maślanka, *Chodakowski*, 32–3.
75. All reprinted in Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*: the essay which gives the volume its title (19–31); "Razyskaniia kasatelno russkoi istorii" (49–59); and "Proekt uchenogo puteshestviia po Rossii, dlia obiasneniia drevnei slavianskoi istorii" (75–100).
76. See L. A. Malash-Aksamitova, "Dolenga-Khodakovsky (Adam Charnotsky) i ego nasledie."
77. V. N. Orlov, ed., *Nikolai Polevoi: Materialy po istorii russkoi literatury i zhurnalistiki tridtsatykh godov*, 137–40.
78. IRLI, f. 154, ed. khr. 55, ll. 10–11.
79. Priima, *"Slovo o polku Igoreve" v russkom istoriko-literaturnom protsesse*, 109.
80. References in the second half of this paragraph are to Maślanka, *Chodakowski*; Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyznie*; O. I. Dei and L. A. Malash, eds., *Ukrainski narodni pisni v zapysakh Zoriana Dolenhy-Khodakovskoho*, 51; P. S. Wandycz, *The Lands of Partitioned Poland, 1795–1918*, 95; Burke, *Popular Culture*, 9; P. Brock, "Z. D. Chodakowski and the Discovery of Folklife: A Chapter in the History of Polish Nationalism"; and V. Diakov et al., eds., *Slavianovedenie v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii: biobibliograficheskii slovar*, 357–8. See also Wołoszyński, *Polsko-rosyjskie związki*, 302–18.
81. On Chodakowski's motivation, see Pypin, "Zoriian Dolenga-Khodakovsky," 306, 313–14, 338; V. Domanytsky, "Pioner ukrainskoi etnohrafii (Zorian Dolenha-Khodakovsky)," 27–30; and Maślanka, *Chodakowski*, 32–51.
82. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 301.
83. Ibid., 7; Malash-Aksamitova, "Dolenga-Khodakovsky," 130.

84. Beauvois, "École et société."
85. In 1814 the Kiev director wrote to the minister of education to say that, unless special measures were set in train, it would take twenty years to extirpate the "harmful thoughts" implanted by Czacki: TsGIA, f. 733, op. 69, d. 1, l. 191.
86. Beauvois, "École et société," 178.
87. In 1825 it was selling there for twenty silver rubles: TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 61 dop., ll. 76–7 (from a letter by I. N. Loboiko to N. P. Rumiantsev).
88. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, ll. 16–17 (a Russian translation made in 1810).
89. See the summary at the end of Chodakowski's 1820 proposal: Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 99–100.
90. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 185, l. 22 (a letter from the minister to Czacki); women had been drowned in Western Ukraine in the attempt to discover whether they were witches.
91. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 165 (a letter of 1805).
92. Vasyl Anastasevych, Rumiantsev's secretary, knew Czacki, visited Krzemieniec in 1810, and in 1816 brought "certain appeals" of Chodakowski to Rumiantsev's attention: Wołoszynski, *Polsko-rosyjskie związki*, 304, 318, 321. Anastasevych received these appeals not from Chodakowski himself but from a mutual acquaintance in Krzemieniec; perhaps he passed them on because he recognized the inspiration of Czacki.
93. The estate from which he promulgated his 1805 paper had been confiscated by the Russians in 1794 because he was suspected of complicity in the Polish uprising of that year. Czacki got the estate back in 1796, but in 1807 was still seeking compensation for his losses: TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 18, ll. 60–88.
94. Brock, "Z. D. Chodakowski," 21.
95. Wandycz, *Lands of Partitioned Poland*, 102.
96. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 49; Alexander I had made a liberal speech at the opening of the Polish sejm in March 1818.
97. GPB, f. 440 op. 1, ed. khr. 4, l. 15 (letter to Loboiko).
98. Ibid., l. 11; the Targowica confederates were Polish conservatives whom Catherine the Great made use of to justify Russian intervention in Poland in the early 1790s.
99. See Gippius, " 'Vechera'," 31–4, for the number of works with Ukrainian subject-matter which appeared in Russia in 1819. Chodakowski knew Ukrainian (see Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 283–6, where he attempts to write in it), and engaged in a lengthy correspondence with the Ukrainian I. N. Loboiko in 1822–3 (GPB, f. 440, op. 1, ed. khr. 4, and f. 588, op. 4,

ed. khr. 78).

100. "Razyskaniia kasatelno russkoi istorii," reprinted in Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 49–59.
101. Ibid., 49.
102. But see Black, "Primečanija," 140–2, for confirmation that Karamzin included amongst his sources "legends, old stories and ballads."
103. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 50.
104. Ibid., 51.
105. For a brief account of the origins of the Normanist controversy, see I. Boba, *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs: Eastern Europe in the Ninth Century*, 11, n. 1.
106. Black, *Karamzin*, 142.
107. For these dates from 1818–19, see Rovniakova, "Russko-polskii etnograf," 73–4; GBL, f. 255, k. 5, ed. khr. 27, l. 3 (letter from Rumiantsev to Anastasevych); A. A. Formozov, "Pushkin i Khodakovsky," 104; and GBL, f. 255, k. 18, ed. khr. 30 (a letter from Chodakowski, at Homel, to Rumiantsev).
108. It was dated "Homel, 29 August 1819."
109. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 230.
110. Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, second edition of first eight volumes (St. Petersburg, 1818–19), 8: 143, 145–7 (for evidence of Chodakowski's assistance); Rovniakova, "Russko-polskii etnograf," 73–4 (for the apology).
111. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 306–7.
112. V. A. Frantsev, *Polskoe slavianovedenie kontsa XVIII i pervoi chetverti XIX st.*, cxvii–cxx.
113. "Proekt uchenogo puteshestviia po Rossii, dlia obiasneniia drevnei Slavianskoi istorii," reprinted in Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 75–100.
114. Ibid., 75.
115. Z. D. Khodakovsky, "Otryvok iz puteshestviia po Rossii. Ladoga, Novgorod." (not reprinted in *O Sławiańszczyźnie*).
116. Z. D. Chodakowski, "Opyt iziasneniia slova: kniaz, ksiądz," reprinted in *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 129–39.
117. S. V. Russov, *Obozrenie kritiki Khodakovskogo na istoriiu rossiiskogo gosudarstva, sochinennuiu Nikolaem Mikhailovichem Karamzinym.*
118. K. F. Kalaidovich, *Pisma k Alekseiu Fedorovichu Malinovskomu ob arkheologicheskikh issledovaniiakh v Riazanskoi gubernii*, 48–70.
119. GPB, f. 440, op. 1, ed. khr. 4, l. 14 (letter to Loboiko).
120. L. S. Kishkin, "Iz perepiski cheshskikh 'buditelei' s russkimi

uchenymi-slavistami," 81.
121. *Vestnik Evropy*, no. 22 (1827): 155, and no. 7 (1829): 244.
122. *Molva* 22 (1834): 89 (Bodiansky's praise); Maksimovich, *Ukrainskie narodnye pesni*, iv; N. V. Gogol, PSS, 10: 311.
123. A. S. Pushkin, PSS, 5: 100 (compare 3: 427), and 12: 147; see A. A. Formozov, *Pushkin i drevnosti: nabliudeniia arkheologa*, 69–70.
124. GPB, f. 588, op. 4, ed. khr. 82, ll. 2–3.
125. Orlov, *Nikolai Polevoi*, 137, 236–40; Malash-Aksamitova, "Dolenga-Khodakovsky," 144ff. (presenting Nikolai Polevoi in a less than favourable light).
126. GPB, f. 588, op. 4, ed. khr. 82, l. 3.
127. Pypin, "Zoriian Dolenga-Khodakovsky."

Chapter Eight

1. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 251 (5 November 1834): 1001–2.
2. For the original review, see Mastak, "Malorossiiskie poslovitsy i pogovorki, sobrannye V. N. S., Kharkov, 1834." Masanov, *Slovar psevdonimov*, 2: 181, states that Mastak was Bodiansky's pseudonym. For the subsequent exchange, see V. N. S(mirnytsky), "Pismo ot izdatelia malorossiiskikh poslovits i pogovorok," and Bodiansky's untitled reply in *Molva* 22 (1834): 86–99. See also Vasilenko, *O. M. Bodiansky*, 60–73, for a full description of the controversy, and A. Liashchenko, "Lyst H. F. Kvitky do I. M. Snehiriova," for additional details.
3. Mastak, "Malorossiiskie poslovitsy," 337–8.
4. *Molva* 22 (1834): 89.
5. All the Slavic peoples produced individuals of this kind in the first half of the nineteenth century: see E. Niederhauser, "Literature and the Arts in the Movement of National Revolution amongst the Peoples of Eastern Europe in the first half of the Nineteenth Century," and his book, *The Rise of Nationality in Eastern Europe*.
6. See the section on F. O. Tumansky in Chapter Five, and G. N. Moiseeva, "Slavistika v Rossii XVIII v."
7. For the history of Slavic studies in Russia, see especially the following: V. Picheta, "K istorii slavianovedeniia v SSSR"; I. A. Kaloeva, "Izuchenie iuzhnykh slavian v Rossii v kontse XVIII—nachale XIX veka"; and L. P. Lapteva, "Osnovnye linii razvitiia nauchnogo slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX—nachale XX v." On the Rumiantsev circle, see V. P. Kozlov, *Kolumby rossiiskikh drevnostei*, which updates the substantial

nineteenth-century literature.

8. GPB, f. 588, op. 4, ed. khr. 78, ll. 11–12.
9. Smirnytsky, "Pismo ot izdatelia," 30–5.
10. Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 308, on Maksym Berlynsky.
11. TsGIA, f. 735, op. 1, d. 80 (concerning M. L. Magnitsky's criticism of P. I. Köppen's journal *Bibliograficheskie listy*).
12. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 2, d. 222, l. 15.
13. For information on Rumiantsev's career, see P. Maikov, "Rumiantsov, graf Nikolai Petrovich." In connection with the way in which he applied his Western training to Slavic studies, see A. N. Pypin, "Metsenaty i uchenye aleksandrovskogo vremeni," 424: "Rumiantsev—and he is far from alone—must be hard to explain for those who used to howl against the 'foreign infection' [of Russia in the nineteenth century]."
14. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 44 dop., l. 3 (letter of 1825).
15. Ibid.
16. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 38 dop., l. 1 (an 1816 letter to Rumiantsev from A. Voeikov).
17. V. S. Ikonnikov, "Graf N. P. Rumiantsov—deiatelnost ego na polzu razrabotki russkoi istorii i arkheologii," 70.
18. TsGADA, f. 18, ed. khr. 12 dop., l. 7.
19. Pypin, "Metsenaty," 445.
20. The three volumes of the *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov* sponsored by Rumiantsev appeared in Moscow between 1813 and 1822; for a chronological list of the books published under Rumiantsev's aegis, see TsGADA, f. 179, ed. khr. 204.
21. See, for example, Maikov, *Pisma Zavadovskogo*, 109–10 (letters of 1790–1 bearing on S. P. and M. P. Rumiantsev).
22. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 75, ll. 4, 6 (letters of 1824–5).
23. A. Starchevsky, "O zaslugakh Rumiantseva," 36–9; Semen Vorontsov remained in London after serving for twenty years as Russian Ambassador to Britain.
24. For the letters of Grimm to N. P. and S. P. Rumiantsev, see RS 61 (March 1889): 435–58.
25. See L. V. Krestova, "S. P. Rumiantsev—pisatel i publitsist (1755–1838)."
26. See Kochubei's reply to S. P. Rumiantsev in TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 26 dop., ll. 1–2.
27. The conjecture is mine; on the Free Farmers' Law, see Florinsky, *Russia*, 2: 717.
28. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 52 dop., ll. 1 and 13.
29. TsGADA, f. 18, ed. khr. 2 dop., l. 32 (a letter of 1814 from the

Bishop of Kharkiv to Rumiantsev).
30. Ibid., ll. 35–8 (letters of 1814–15).
31. Ibid., l. 144 (quoted near the beginning of Chapter Three, above).
32. Ibid., l. 34.
33. Briskman, *Anastasevich*, 234.
34. Starchevsky, "O zaslugakh," 49.
35. The reply is in GPB, f. 588, op. 4, ed. khr. 57, l. 1 (incorrectly assigned to Berlynsky's brother Vasyl by Rovniakova, "Russko-polskii etnograf," 59).
36. M. Berlinsky, "Opisanie naidennykh nedavno v Kieve raznykh starinnykh, zolotykh i serebrianykh, veshchei."
37. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 4, l. 165.
38. Vasyl came to St. Petersburg in 1790, three years after his brothers, and was in Vitebsk from 1795 to 1801: TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 50, l. 134; d. 96, ll. 54–60; d. 48, ll. 426, 703.
39. In 1802 Matvii was teaching drawing at St. Petersburg teachers' seminary: TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 128, l. 36.
40. On Berlynsky's retirement, see TsGIA, f. 733, op. 69, d. 194.
41. TsGIA, f. 732, op. 2, d. 86, ll. 2–3.
42. On Symonovsky, see Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 219–26.
43. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 97, ll. 19–21.
44. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 118, d. 31, l. 1.
45. Ibid., l. 5.
46. On the fate of Berlynsky's *Istoriia* during his lifetime, see Chepa, "Dva pisma," 368; *Ulei* 1 (1811): 35–40, 127–9, etc.; GPB, f. 588, op. 4, ed. khr. 57, l. 1 (Berlynsky's letter to Chodakowski); I. Betsky, ed., *Molodyk na 1844 god* (St. Petersburg, 1844), 163–96; and Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 335 (for the "bawling ministry" quotation), 340, 344, 364. Berlynsky's work was rediscovered in 1970, but its fate remained ill-starred, for the journal in which much of it was published in 1972, *Kyivska starovyna*, was closed down after one number; see M. Berlynsky, "Istoriia mista Kiieva," and (on the politics of Ukrainian historiography in the early 1970s) Pelenski, "Shelest and His Period in Soviet Ukraine," 87–8.
47. M. Berlinsky, "O Kievskoi akademii."
48. Evgenii Bolkhovitinov called him a "despicable pedant" in 1822: "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 308.
49. TsGADA, f. 18, ed. khr. 12 dop., l. 8 (a letter from the Metropolitan of Kiev to Rumiantsev, approving his employment of Berlynsky as an agent).
50. IRLI, f. 265, op. 2, ed. khr. 2443, l. 3. There are copies of twenty-six letters from Rumiantsev to Berlynsky in ibid., ed. khr. 2444; and thirty folios of letters from Berlynsky to Rumiantsev (1815–16) in

GBL, f. 255, k. 6, ed. khr. 53. References are to these sources.

51. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 33 dop., ll. 1–31.
52. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 61 dop., l. 4.
53. N. A. Lavrovsky, *Gimnaziia vysshikh nauk kn. Bezborodko v Nezhine (1820–32gg.)*, 32.
54. The correspondence is printed in Sventsitsky, *Materialy*, 1: 25–30.
55. See the section on Zavadovsky in Chapter Four.
56. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 49, d. 385 (a miscellany of folders without consecutive folio numbers, one of which opens with this description).
57. On Khalansky, see Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 262–9.
58. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 125, ll. 16, 20a–20b, 24–5, 31–2.
59. M. Khanenko, "O poseshchenii Novgorodseverskoi gimnazii N. P. Rumiantsovym."
60. Tymkovsky's appointment as Khalansky's successor is dealt with in TsGIA, f. 733, op. 49, d. 591, which includes his service record for 1820 (ll. 30–3); see also the third section of Chapter Nine, below.
61. Roman's unfinished edition of the *Letopis Nestorova, po drevneishemu spisku Mnikha Lavrentiia* was published, with a glowing preface, by K. F. Kalaidovych in Moscow in 1824; the influence on Stroev is attested in the article on the latter in RBS, 19: 532–6.
62. GBL, f. 255, k. 10, ed., khr. 26, ll. 1–2.
63. The speech is to be found in GBL, f. 255, k. 5, ed. khr. 23, ll. 1–18, where it is tentatively assigned to 1811; that it was made in 1816 is clear from the article by M. Khanenko cited in n. 59.
64. S. B. Bronevsky: TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 34 dop., ll. 1 and 4–5.
65. The discovery was reported excitedly by Rumiantsev to Bolkhovitinov on 30 July 1817: E. Bolkhovitinov, *Perepiska s gosudarstvennym kantslerom grafom Nikolaem Petrovichem Rumiantsevym i s nekotorymi drugimi sovremennikami*, 1: 6–7.
66. D. V. Polenov, "Opisanie Borozdinskogo sobraniia risunkov," 66, 69.
67. N. N. Ulashchik, *Ocherki po arkheografii i istochnikovedeniiu istorii Belorussii feodalnogo perioda*, 16–28.
68. I. I. Grigorovich, *Belorusskii arkhiv drevnikh gramot, chast* 1, v–vii.
69. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 542, l. 1.
70. TsGADA, f. 18, ed. khr. 2 dop., l. 160.
71. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 61 dop., l. 103.
72. I. I. Grigorovich, "Perepiska s grafom Rumiantsevym," 39n.
73. GPB, f. 588, op. 4, ed. khr. 78, l. 7.
74. F. P. Keppen, "Biografiia P. I. Keppena," 39–43; L. V. Alekseev, "Ocherk istorii belorusskoi dorevoliutsionnoi arkheologii," 147.

75. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 21 dop., l. 8.
76. Ibid., ll. 5–6, 24, 32–3 (from a dossier entitled "On the publication of *Belorusskii arkhiv*").
77. Ibid., l. 47.
78. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 44 dop., ll. 1–2.
79. See TsGIA, f. 733, op. 62, d. 518.
80. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 66, dd. 2–3, are dossiers dealing with the secularization of Belorussian schools in the 1820s, which at one point (d. 2, ll. 58–9) show Doroshkevych trying to make a speech in Russian at a church school in Polotsk and being warned off by the Rector. Rumiantsev's assistant was clearly committed to Imperial integration.
81. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 48 dop., l. 14 (18 December 1823).
82. Ibid., l. 71 (26 October 1824).
83. Ibid., l. 27.
84. Ibid., ll. 112–13 and l. 19 (letters of March 1824 and September 1825 respectively; the documents in this folder are not arranged chronologically); on the Kuntsevich murder, see the section on Tumansky in Chapter Five (nn. 106–7).
85. For letters from Rumiantsev to the Bishop of Volhynia, see TsGADA, f. 18, ed. khr. 17 dop. (1824).
86. See Ulashchik, *Ocherki*, 25–8.
87. TsGIA, f. 1101, op. 2, d. 300, l. 75.
88. G. Konisky, *Sobranie sochinenii, chast* 1, ed. I. Grigorovich (published in St. Petersburg in 1835).
89. TsGIA, f. 1661, op. 1, ed. khr. 286, l. 4 (a signed copy of Stroev's speech).
90. There is information on Stroev's career in TsGIA, f. 733, op. 2, d. 182 (which includes his service record for 1835, ll. 74–83) and in ibid., op. 232, d. 13; both these dossiers arose out of Stroev's transference from the ministry of foreign affairs to the ministry of education in 1834, and contained useful incidental information about the archaeographic expedition and the funds for publishing its findings.
91. In the second section of Chapter Six.
92. Grigorovich, "Perepiska," 39–43.
93. Vasyl Anastasevych: see Bolkhovitinov, "Pisma k Anastasevichu," 314n.
94. TsGIA, f. 730, op. 1, d. 122, l. 36, and d. 48, ll. 382–3; Keppen, "Biografiia," 27.
95. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 31, d. 126, ll. 3–12 (a service record with entries to 1834).
96. GBL, f. 255, k. 12, ed. khr. 34, ll. 2–3 (memorandum of

1 November 1817).

97. GBL, f. 255, k. 12, ed. khr. 35, ll. 2–3, 6.
98. TsGADA, f. 17, ed. khr. 61 dop., l. 102 (a letter from Loboiko to Rumiantsev of November 1824).
99. I. N. Loboiko, *O vazhneishikh izdaniiakh Gerbershteina zapisok o Rossii s kriticheskim obozreniem ikh soderzhaniia*, and *Vzgliad na drevniuiu slovesnost skandinavskogo severa* (published in St. Petersburg in 1818 and 1821).
100. Zagorovsky, *Topograficheskoe opisanie Kharkovskogo namestnichestva*, 16, n. 1.
101. On sub-Carpathian Ukrainians in early nineteenth-century Russia, see especially T. Baitsura, *Zakarpatoukrainskaia intelligentsiia v Rossii v pervoi polovine XIX veka*; her earlier work, *Iurii Ivanovych Venelyn*; and Magocsi, *The Shaping of a National Identity*, 31–5. On Orlai, see Sventsitsky, *Materialy*, 1: 22–83, and Kovalenko, "Rol revoliutsioneriv-dvorian," 180–1. On Baludiansky, see E. M. Kosachevskaia, *M. A. Baludiansky i Peterburgskii universitet pervoi chetverti XIX veka*. See also V. L. Mykytas, *Cherez hory i kordony (Kulturni i literaturni zviazky Zakarpattia z Ukrainoiu ta Rosiieiu u XIX–XX st.)*, and F. I. Steblii and S. M. Trusevich, "Sviazi zapadnoukrainskikh zemel s Rossiei v kontse XVIII—nachale XX veka."
102. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, d. 30.
103. I. S. Orlai, "Istoriia o Karpato-Rossakh."
104. Chodakowski, *O Sławiańszczyźnie*, 283–6.
105. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 69, d. 33, l. 6 (extract from the minutes of the Academic Committee of the Imperial schools administration, 29 July 1826).
106. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 77 (10 April 1839): 305–6.
107. Iu. N. Venelin, *Drevnie i nyneshnie Bolgare v politicheskom, narodopisnom, istoricheskom i religioznom otnoshenii k Rossiianam*, 1: vi.
108. *Moskovskii nabliudatel* 2 (1835): 152.
109. Venelin, *Drevnie i nyneshnie Bolgare*, 1: x.
110. Ibid., xiv.
111. Ibid., 174–219 and 220–47.
112. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 14, d. 23, ll. 4–5.
113. Ibid., ll. 1–3.
114. Iu. N. Venelin, "Ob istochnikakh narodnoi poezii voobshche i iuzhno-russkoi v osobennosti." This essay appeared without a title, as a book review, but it is so described in Grinchenko, *Literatura ukrainskogo folklora*, no. 51.
115. Venelin, "Ob istochnikakh," 566.

116. Potepalov, "Puteshestvie P. I. Keppena."
117. F. P. Keppen, "Biografiia," 55.
118. Ibid., 57.
119. Sventsitsky, *Obzor*, 47–8.
120. P. I. Keppen, "Zapiska o puteshestvii po Slovenskim zemliam i Arkhivam," 478.
121. *Bibliograficheskie listy*, no. 13 (3 May 1825): 185.
122. Ibid., no. 20 (30 July 1825): 280.
123. Ibid., no. 23 (3 September 1825): 319–20.
124. Sventsitsky, *Obzor*, 49, n. 2; on the unsuccessful project of Hnidych, Kapnist and Tsertelev, see the second section of Chapter Six, above.
125. See F. P. Keppen, "Biografiia," 111–15.
126. See Kollár's letter of 1824 to Köppen,. inquiring about Chodakowski's progress, in Kishkin, "Iz perepiski," 81.
127. The bibliography appeared in *Bibliograficheskie listy*, nos. 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26; the Dobrovský extracts in no. 8 (all 1825).
128. On the organization and administration of their travels, see TsGIA, f. 733, op. 30, d. 293 (Bodiansky, 1837–42), and op. 49, d. 1130 (Sreznevsky, 1839–42).
129. For reminiscences of Bodiansky and Sreznevsky, see P. A. Dmitriev, ed., *Russkoe i slavianskoe iazykoznanie v Rossii serediny XVIII–XIX vv.*, 49–59 and 73–106; for a centenary article on Sreznevsky see M. Iu. Dostal, "I. I. Sreznevsky kak slavist."
130. See Vasilenko, *O. M. Bodiansky*, 211–19, and Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia*, 162–8. For a general study of Bodiansky, see N. A. Kondrashov, *Osip Maksimovich Bodiansky*.
131. See V. I. Sreznevsky, "Iz pervykh let nauchno-literaturnoi deiatelnosti I. I. Sreznevskogo, 1831–1839," esp. 3, 15–16.
132. Shishkov made a second attempt to bring Hanka and Šafařik to Russia in 1829–30, this time in company with F. L. Čelakovsky, but although he received government blessing (TsGIA, f. 733, op. 14, d. 24), the attempt was no more successful than that of 1826–7.

Chapter Nine

1. See the extracts from Drahomanov's work under this title in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, ed., "Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings," 153–60.
2. Saitov and Sheffer, *Ostafievskii arkhiv*, 1: 357–8; compare Leighton, *Russian Romanticism*, 49.
3. N. Barsukov, *Zhizn i trudy M. P. Pogodina*, 4: 83.

4. Poznansky, *Ocherk formirovaniia*, 144. Uvarov's imagination and originality are key themes of C. J. H. Whittaker, "Count S. S. Uvarov: Conservatism and National Enlightenment in pre-Reform Russia," and Pelech, "Toward a Historical Sociology" (esp. 74: "the formulation and propagation of a national ideology by a Czarist minister in his official capacity was without precedent in the empire"); see also J. T. Flynn, "S. S. Uvarov's 'Liberal' Years" and "Tuition and Social Class in the Russian Universities: S. S. Uvarov and 'Reaction' in the Russia of Nicholas I."
5. S. S. Uvarov, "Tsirkuliarnoe predlozhenie G. Upravliaiushchego Ministerstvom Narodnogo Proveshcheniia Nachalstvam Uchebnykh Okrugov, o vstuplenii v upravlenie Ministerstvom," xlix–l; translation in Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I*, 73.
6. P. N. Stolpiansky, "Na zare ukrainofilskogo dvizheniia (Istoricheskaia spravka)."
7. See P. K. Volynsky, *Teoretychna borotba v ukrainskii literaturi (persha polovyna XIX st.)*, 177–87.
8. For evidence that the term was coined by Pypin, see Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I*, 73, n. 2.
9. In the competition for a textbook of Russian history, eventually won by N. G. Ustrialov.
10. P. B(artenev), ed., "Ob Ukraino-slavianskom obshchestve (iz bumag D. P. Golokhvastova)," 347–8.
11. See the quotation at the end of Chapter Six, above.
12. On the new intellectual currents that dominated Russian thought in the eighteen-thirties, see A. I. Gertsen, *Sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh*, 9: 16ff, and especially 9: 111–71 (the celebrated Chapters Twenty-Nine and Thirty of *Byloe i dumy*, in which Herzen speaks of Westerners and Slavophiles respectively). On the difference between the eighteen-twenties and eighteen-thirties, see N. P. Pavlov-Silvansky, "Materialisty dvadtsatykh godov"; and for the Germanic origins of the new philosophical trends, see D. I. Chizhevsky, *Gegel v Rossii*.
13. E. I. Chapkevich, "Granovsky i Orlovskii krai," 39, 44–5.
14. Gertsen, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 8: 132, 137, 225; 17: 102; 15: 54.
15. (V. V. Passek), *Putevye zapiski Vadima* —, 113. For the friendship between Herzen and Passek, see Gertsen, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 8: 135–44. Despite his closeness to Herzen, Passek was extremely sympathetic toward Slavophilism: see V. I. Sreznevsky, "Vadim Vasilevich Passek i ego pisma k I. I. Sreznevskomu," 377–402.
16. Gertsen, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9: 134.
17. Ibid., 137.
18. Ibid., 149.

19. Ibid., 16, 29.
20. V. Swoboda, "Shevchenko and Belinsky" and "Shevchenko and Belinsky Revisited." To give a typical example of Belinsky's attitude toward Ukrainian, he wrote in 1841: "The literary language of Little Russians ought to be the language of their educated society—Russian" (V. G. Belinsky, PSS, 5: 330).
21. On Markevych's *Istoriia*, see Marchenko, *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia*, 149–54, and Basarab, *Pereiaslav*, 85–91.
22. They were third cousins once removed (extrapolated from Modzalevsky, *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik*, 3: 388–413). On Iakiv Markovych, and on Mykola Markevych's *Ukrainskie melodii* of 1831, see the first section of Chapter Seven, above.
23. IRLI, f. 488, ed. khr. 38, ll. 5–7 (from Markevych's memoirs). For the service record of Field-Marshal Count Ivan Vasylovych Hudovych (1741–1820), Markevych's great-uncle, see TsGVIA, f. 489, op. 1, d. 7062, ll. 14–48. On Andrii Hudovych, brother of Ivan Vasylovych and a good Ukrainian autonomist, see Ohloblyn, *Liudy*, 7–13.
24. N. A. Markevich, "Arkhiv N. A. Markevicha." See also Ia. N. Shchapov, *Sobranie I. Ia. Lukashevicha i N. A. Markevicha*, introduction.
25. See Ryleev's reply, in A. M. Egolin et al., eds., *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 59: 153–4.
26. Markevich, *Ukrainskie melodii*, 135.
27. Markevich, "Arkhiv," 328.
28. Belinsky, PSS, 7: 44–52.
29. Ibid., 60 (italics in the original); the remaining quotations in this paragraph are from the rest of Belinsky's essay, 60–5.
30. On S. T. Aksakov and Gogol, see the former's *Istoriia moego znakomstva s Gogolem*; on Aksakov's admiration for Shchepkin, see *Mikhail Semenovich Shchepkin 1788–1863g.*, 286–7 (and compare Chapter One, n. 8, above); on P. V. Kireevsky and Gogol, see Soimonov, *P. V. Kireevsky*, 196–202; and on Khomiakov's opinion of preaching in Ukrainian, see A. S. Khomiakov, PSS, 3: 285–7.
31. For the texts of these exchanges, see Khomiakov, PSS, 3: 11–29 ("O starom i novom"); I. V. Kireevsky, *Kritika i estetika*, 143–53 ("V otvet A. S. Khomiakovu"); ibid., 248–93 ("O kharaktere prosveshcheniia Evropy i o ego otnoshenii k prosveshcheniiu Rossii"); and Khomiakov, PSS, 1: 195–258 ("Po povodu stati I. V. Kireevskogo").
32. Kireevsky, *Kritika*, 371.
33. I. S. Aksakov, *Sochineniia*, 6, second pagination: 6, 8; L. Zhemchuzhnikov, "Neskolko zamechanii po povodu narodnykh

pesen," 89–90. On the importance of Aksakov's book on Ukrainian fairs (in the political context of the late 1850s), see N. I. Tsimbaev, *I. S. Aksakov v obshchestvennoi zhizni poreformennoi Rossii*, 48–9, and W. B. Lincoln, *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia's Enlightened Bureaucrats 1825–1861*, 99. Ivan Aksakov was less stridently Slavophile than others in his camp, and in youth, indeed, had been a Westernizer; see A. I. Koshelev, *Zapiski*, 75.

34. K. S. and I. S. Aksakov, *Literaturnaia kritika*, 149–50. For the term Rus', see the first section of Chapter One, above, especially nn. 31–2.
35. See the opening of the last section of Chapter Six.
36. See the second section of Chapter Two.
37. The best account of the early years of Kharkiv University remains D. I. Bagalei, *Opyt istorii Kharkovskogo universiteta*; see also Pelech, "Towards a Historical Sociology," Ch. 2, and J. T. Flynn, "V. N. Karazin, the Gentry, and Kharkov University." On Karazyn, see N. Tikhii, "V. N. Karazin"; A. G. Sliusarsky, *V. N. Karazin: Ego nauchnaia i obshchestvennaia deiatelnost*; and Iu. Lavrinenko, *Vasyl Karazyn: arkhitekt vidrodzhennia*. For the specific references in this paragraph, see N. K. Shilder, *Imperator Aleksandr I*, 2: 324–30 (Karazyn's letter of March 1801); TsGIA, f. 733, op. 86, d. 58 (Karazyn's 1804 retirement); ibid., f. 733, op. 49, d. 13 (on the professors appointed to Kharkiv University); ibid., ll. 5–6 (the instructions to Professor Tymkovsky on fostering the Kharkiv region's educational infrastructure); V. N. Karazin, "Rech, govorennaia v sobranii Kharkovskogo dvorianstva" (whipping up local enthusiasm in the south); TsGIA, f. 733, op. 49, d. 591, ll. 30–3 (Tymkovsky's service record for 1820, detailing his activities between 1803 and 1811); I. Vernet, "Mysli o Kharkove," esp. 186 (where the author quotes Augustus); D. I. Bagalei, "I. F. Vernet" (on the author of the preceding article); and V. N. Karazin, "Eshche nekotorye zamechaniia o Slobodsko-Ukrainskoi gubernii," 140n. (on the extent of education in the Kharkiv area).
38. V. I. Sreznevsky, "I. E. Betsky, izdatel Molodyka," 31; V. N. Karazin, "Vzgliad na ukrainskuiu starinu (1842g.)," 604. Despite his feelings about *Molodyk*, Karazyn helped the editor of the almanac: *Molodyk na 1844 god* (St. Petersburg, 1844), 241.
39. V. N. Karazin, "Odna glava iz rukopisi," esp. 113–15.
40. I. Timkovsky, *Opyt k filosoficheskomu poznaniiu Rossiiskogo iazyka*.
41. Tymkovsky's brother Roman, a professor of classics at Moscow University, was mentioned in section two of Chapter Eight; the

Tymkovskys were uncles of the integrationist Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Maksymovych.

42. "Ot izdatelia," *Kharkovskii demokrit* 1 (1816): 3–4.
43. S. R(usanova), "Kharkovskaia zhurnalistika nachala nastoiashchego stoletiia," 184.
44. TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 68.
45. A. G. Dementev et al., eds., *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat (1702–1894): spravochnik*, 181.
46. *Ukrainskii vestnik* 1: 7–21, 2: 3–19 ("Getman Khmelnitsky"); 1: 145–56, 304–14 (Kvitka, "O Maloi Rossii"); 2: 19–33, 151–68, 265–97 (M. Gribovsky, "Istoricheskie zamechaniia o Malorossii ot smerti Bogdana Khmelnitskogo do Poltavskogo srazheniia"); 6: 106–31 (G. Gess de Kalve and I. Vernet, "Skovoroda, Ukrainskii filosof").
47. I. Kulzhinsky, "Nekotorye zamechaniia kasatelno istorii i kharaktera Malorossiiskoi poezii." For the journal editor's commitment to local interests, see *Ukrainskii zhurnal* 1: 1. The remainder of this paragraph summarizes Kulzhynsky's article. For his literary and pedagogical activity in general, see his memoirs, "Vospominaniia uchitelia"; his ethnographic study of 1827, *Malorossiiskaia derevnia*; I. S. Abramov, "Pro dzherela etnohrafichnoho materiialu v knyzi I. H. Kulzhynskogo 'Malorossiiskaia derevnia' 1827 r."; and M. Speransky, *Odin iz uchitelei N. V. Gogolia (I. G. Kulzhinskii)*.
48. For the contents of these works, see I. Boiko, *Ukrainski literaturni almanakhy i zbirnyky XIX—pochatku XX st: bibliohrafichnyi pokazhchyk*, 27–9.
49. The voluminous literature on literary Romanticism in Ukraine is best exemplified by A. Shamrai, *Kharkivski poety 30–40 rokiv XIX stolittia (Kharkivska shkola romantykiv)*; the same author's collection of documents, *Kharkivska shkola romantykiv*; Volynsky, *Teoretychna borotba*; Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko*; and S. Kozak, *U źródeł romantyzmu i nowoytnej myśli społecznej na Ukrainie*. See also three articles by V. I. Sreznevsky: "Iz pervykh let nauchno-literaturnoi deiatelnosti I. I. Sreznevskogo 1831–1839"; "G. F. Kvitka i I. I. Sreznevsky"; and "Pro zbyrachiv ukrainskykh pisen: Z hurtka I. I. Sreznevskoho na pochatku 1830-kh rokiv." For the possibility that some Ukrainian writers had stronger political motives than appears at first sight, see J. Ajzensztok, "Romantycy ukraińscy a zagadnienia jedności słowiańskiej." For a recent work on the Russian-language activity of two members of the "Kharkiv school," see Zubkov, *Russkaia proza G. F. Kvitki i E. P. Grebenki*. For some illuminating letters from

Levko Borovykovsky to I. I. Sreznevsky, see the former's *Povne zibrannia tvoriv*, 207–16. For Ievhen Hrebinka in Russian service, see TsGIA, f. 802, op. 1, d. 7814 (Hrebinka's dealings with the Commission for Religious Schools, 1834–43).

50. Review in *Teleskop* 5 (1831): 104–6.
51. I. Mogilevsky, "O drevnosti i samobytnosti Iuzhno-Russkogo iazyka," reprinted in Kulish, *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi*, 2: 257–79. For the publishing history of this essay, see ibid., 279. The author may have been the Kharkiv cleric of the same name who appears in TsGIA, f. 733, op. 87, d. 68, ll.7–8, as a possible censor for *Ukrainskii vestnik* (when it was under pressure from the central authorities in 1819–20).
52. Bodiansky, "Rassmotrenie razlichnykh mnenii o drevnem iazyke Severnykh i Iuzhnykh Russov"; compare Kondrashov, *Osip Maksimovich Bodiansky*, 16.
53. M. Maksimovich, "Kritiko-istoricheskoe issledovanie o russkom iazyke," 538–9.
54. A. Mogila (Metlynsky), *Dumky i pisni ta shche de-shcho*, 3–35 ("Zametki otnositelno iuzhnorusskogo iazyka").
55. Maslov, "Ukrainska etnohrafiia pershoi polovyny XIX stolittia," 128.
56. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 110 (20 May 1839): 438.
57. N. Polevoi, *Ocherki russkoi literatury*, 2: 483–510 (a review of Kyrylo Topolia's *Chari, ili neskolko stsen iz narodnykh bylei i rasskazov Ukrainskikh*; first published in 1837).
58. Ibid., 489.
59. *Severnaia pchela*, no. 27 (3 February 1832), reviewing Hryhorii Kvitka's *Shelmenko, volostnoi pisar*.
60. B(artenev), "Ob Ukraino-Slavianskom obshchestve," 335–47. The police report provides the basis for the remainder of this paragraph.
61. For much fuller accounts of the Cyrillo-Methodian Society, and reference to the extensive literature on the subject, see Pelech, "Towards a Historical Sociology," 197–245; P. A. Zaionchkovsky, *Kirillo-Mefodievskoe obshchestvo (1846–47)*; and G. Luciani, *Le Livre de la genèse du peuple ukrainien*. See also F. Fadner, *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karazin to Danilevskii 1800–1870*, 124–46; V. Mijakovskyj, "Ševčenko in the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius"; and M. Mohyliansky, "Kulish and Shevchenko."
62. Uvarov's circular follows the Third Section's report in B(artenev), "Ob Ukraino-Slavianskom obshchestve" (335–47 and 347–51); the circular was dispatched to all educational districts save those of Dorpat and Warsaw (Pelech, "Towards a Historical Sociology," 238).

63. Ie. Galka (Kostomarov), "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh na malorossiiskom iazyke," 160.
64. B(artenev), "Ob Ukraino-Slavianskom obshchestve," 342.
65. L. Kołakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism*, 2: 307.
66. Belinsky, PSS, 12: 440–1.
67. B(artenev), "Ob Ukraino-Slavianskom obshchestve," 336; F. V. Chizhov, "Vospominaniia"; I. V. Kozmenko, "Dnevnik F. V. Chizhova 'Puteshestvie po slavianskim zemliam' kak istochnik," esp. 134 (for the banishment to Kiev).
68. B(artenev), "Ob Ukraino-Slavianskom obshchestve," 343.
69. A. S. Khomiakov, "Pisma," 327–8.
70. Christoff, *Xomjakov*, 92.
71. B(artenev), "Ob Ukraino-Slavianskom obshchestve," 346.
72. See Vasilenko, *O. M. Bodiansky*, 211–19.
73. Iu. Venelin, "O spore mezhdu iuzhanami i severianami na schet ikh rossizma." The rest of this paragraph is based on Venelyn's article, which was supposed to be a review of the Russian translation of Beauplan's seventeenth-century *Description d'Ukraine*.
74. For publishing a Russian translation of Giles Fletcher's sixteenth-century work, *Of the Russe Commonwealth*: Vasilenko, *O. M. Bodiansky*, 158–70.
75. See M. D. Bernshtein, *Zhurnal "Osnova" i ukrainskyi literaturnyi protses kintsia 50–60–kh rokiv XIX st.*
76. N. Kostomarov, "Dve russkie narodnosti," 63, 77.
77. Russo-Ukrainian relations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries lie beyond the scope of this study, but the following works provide an introduction to them: on the proscription of the Ukrainian language, F. Savchenko, *Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 r.*, and R. Solchanyk, "Lex Jusephovicia 1876 roku: Z pryvodu 100-littia zaborony ukrainstva"; on Ukraine and the Russian revolutionary movement, M. Dragomanov, *Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikorusskaia demokratiia*, and L. Deich, "Obshcherusskaia i ukrainskaia emigratsiia"; on the continuity of the Ukrainian federalist tradition, I. L. Rudnytsky, "The Fourth Universal and its Ideological Antecedents"; and on the Ukrainian movement in Galicia, A. S. Markovits and F. E. Sysyn, eds., *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*, esp. Chs. 2, 7, 9, 11. For the British official's comment of May 1918, see Public Record Office, London, Cabinet papers, class 45, piece 52/4638, folio 117 verso.
78. Hrushevsky, *Traditional Scheme*, 16.

Bibliography

This two-section bibliography is confined largely to works cited in the notes. The manuscript section contains only *fond* (general classification) numbers; for reference to specific documents within each *fond*, see individual notes. In the section dealing with printed sources, the names of East European authors appear in transliteration from the Slavic language of the text concerned (Russian or Ukrainian), or in the Roman form which the author used himself (in Polish and Western languages). Cross-references make clear when an author's name has more than one form (because he wrote in more than one language or spelt his name in various ways).

Manuscript Sources

Leningrad

Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka imeni Saltykova-Shchedrina, otdel rukopisei [Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, manuscript department] (GPB):

f. 440 I. N. Loboiko

f. 588 M. P. Pogodin

f. 603 S. D. Poltoratsky

f. 653 V. G. Ruban

f. 683 M. I. Antonovsky

f. 874 S. N. Shubinsky

Institut russkoi literatury Akademii nauk SSSR (Pushkinskii Dom), otdel rukopisei [Institute of Russian Literature of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (Pushkin House), manuscript department] (IRLI):

f. 154 I. N. Loboiko

f. 265 The journal *Russkaia starina* (*Russian Antiquity*)

f. 339 D. M. Bantysh-Kamensky

f. 488 M. Markevych

f. 538 D. P. Troshchynsky

Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv [Leningrad State Historical Archive] (LGIA):

f. 13 St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute

Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv SSSR [Central State Historical Archive of the Soviet Union] (TsGIA):

f. 499 Court Choir

f. 730 Schools Commission

f. 732 Main Schools Administration

f. 733 Department of Education

f. 735 Chancery of the Minister of Education
f. 777 St. Petersburg Censorship Committee
f. 802 Educational Committee of the Holy Synod
f. 971 Kochubei family
f. 994 Mordvinov family
f. 1035 Repnin family
f. 1088 Sheremetev family
f. 1101 Miscellaneous personal documents
f. 1162 Chancery of the State Council
f. 1349 Service records of civil servants
f. 1375 Senatorial Inspection of central Russian provinces (1799–1800)
f. 1661 K. S. Serbinovich

Moscow

Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka imeni Lenina, otdel rukopisei [Lenin Library, manuscript department] (GBL):

f. 41 Bulgakov family
f. 231 M. P. Pogodin
f. 255 N. P. Rumiantsev
f. 731 M. M. Speransky

Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov [Central State Archive of Ancient Acts] (TsGADA):

f. 17 Scholarship, literature and art
f. 18 Ecclesiastical administration
f. 179 Commission on printing of state charters and treaties
f. 1445 Kochubei family

Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva [Central State Archive of Literature and Art] (TsGALI):

f. 1064 I. M. Dolgorukov
f. 1251 M. T. Kachenovsky

Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi voenno-istoricheskii arkhiv [Central State Military-Historical Archive] (TsGVIA):

f. 489 Service records of generals

Printed Sources

Abalikhin, B. S. "Istoriohrafiia ukrainskoho opolchennia vitchyznianoi viiny 1812 r." [The historiography of the Ukrainian militia in the patriotic war of 1812]. UIZh, no. 5 (1962): 99–103.

———."Ukrainskoe opolchenie 1812 g." [The Ukrainian militia in 1812]. IZ 72 (1962): 87–118.

Abramov, I. S. "Pro dzherela etnohrafichnoho materiialu v knyzi I. H. Kulzhynskoho 'Malorossiiskaia derevnia' 1827 r." [On the sources of the ethnographic material in I. H. Kulzhynsky's book *The Little Russian Countryside* (1827)]. *Naukovyi zbirnyk Leninhradskoho tovarystva doslidnykiv ukrainskoi istorii, pysmenstva ta movy* 2 [ZIFV VUAN 74b] (1929): 109–13.

Adams, Arthur E. "The Awakening of the Ukraine." SR 22 (1963): 217–23.

Aizenshtok, Ieremiia (Ajzensztok, J.). "K voprosu o literaturnykh vliianiiakh (G. V. Kvitka i N. V. Gogol)" [On the question of literary influences (H. V. Kvitka and N. V. Gogol)]. *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk* 24, no. 1 (1923): 23–42.

Ajzensztok, Jeremiasz (Aizenshtok, Ie.). "Romantycy ukraińscy a zagadnienia jedności słowiańskiej" [The Ukrainian Romantics and questions of Slavic unity]. *Slavia Orientalis*, no. 3 (1973): 321–34.

Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. *Sochineniia* [Works]. 7 vols. Moscow, 1886–91.

Aksakov, Konstantin Sergeevich and Ivan Sergeevich. *Literaturnaia kritika* [Literary criticism]. Moscow, 1981.

Aksakov, Sergei T. *Istoriia moego znakomstva s Gogolem* [The history of my acquaintanceship with Gogol]. Moscow, 1960.

Aleksandrov, Iu. N. "Pervye putevoditeli po Moskve (XVIII v.)" [The first guides to Moscow (the eighteenth century)]. VI, no. 10 (1982): 182–6.

Alekseev, L. V. "Ocherk istorii belorusskoi dorevoliutsionnoi arkheologii i istoricheskogo kraevedeniia do 60-kh godov XIXv." [An essay on the history of prerevolutionary Belorussian archaeology and local historical studies (to the 1860s)]. *Sovetskaia arkheologiia*, no. 4 (1967): 146–63.

Alekseev, M. P. "Maksim Berezovsky." In *Posev*, 67–77. Odessa, 1921.

Alekseeva, T. V. *Vladimir Lukich Borovikovsky i russkaia kultura na rubezhe 18-go–19-go vekov* [Vladimir Lukich Borovikovsky and Russian culture at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries]. Moscow, 1975.

Alexander, J. T. *Autocratic Politics in a National Crisis: The Imperial Russian Government and Pugachev's Revolt / 1773–1775*. Bloomington and London, 1969.

_____. *Bubonic Plague in Early Modern Russia: Public Health and Urban Disaster*. Baltimore and London, 1980.

Anastasevich, V. G. "Zapiska o Vasilii Nazareviche Karazine" [A Note on Vasyl Nazarovych Karazyn]. ChOIDR, no. 3 (1861), *Smes*: 192–9.

_____., ed. *Ulei* [The Beehive]. 4 vols. St. Petersburg, 1811–12.

Anderson, M. S. *The Eastern Question 1774–1923: A Study in International Relations*. London and Basingstoke, 1966.

_____. *Historians and Eighteenth-Century Europe 1715–1789*. Oxford, 1979.

Andrievsky, A. (Andriievsky, O.). "Arkhivnaia spravka o sostave Kievskogo 'obshchestva' v 1782–1797 godakh" [Archival information about the composition of the Kievan 'society' between 1782 and 1797). KS 44 (February 1894): 192–203.

_____. *Istoricheskie materialy iz arkhiva Kievskogo gubernskogo pravleniia* [Historical materials from the archive of the Kiev provincial administration]. 8 vols., Kiev, 1882–5.

Andriievsky, O. (Andrievsky, A.). *Bibliohrafiia literatury z ukrainskoho folkloru*, vol. 1 [A bibliography of Ukrainian folklore literature]. Kiev, 1930.

Anna Ioannovna. "Imennoi ukaz A. I. Shakhovskomu o priniatii sekretno iskusnykh mer k pobuzhdeniiu malorossiiskogo naroda vstupat v svoistvo s velikorossiiskim narodom, a ne s smolianami, poliakami i drugimi zarubezhnymi zhiteliami" [Personal instruction to A. I. Shakhovskoi on the secret taking of skilful measures to encourage the Little Russian people to marry Great Russians, and not men of Smolensk, Poles, and other foreigners]. SIRIO 108 (1900): 26.

———."Imennoi ukaz kn. A. I. Shakhovskomu ob uchrezhdenii v Malorossii getmanskogo pravleniia iz 6-ti lits" [Personal instruction to Prince A. I. Shakhovskoi on the establishment in Little Russia of a six-man administration of the Hetmanate]. SIRIO 108 (1900): 24–6.

Anon. "Dmitrii Prokofevich Troshchinsky 1754–1829." RS 34 (June 1882): 641–82.

Anon. "Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii" [History of the Rus' people, or of Little Russia]. ChOIDR, nos. 1–4 (1846), second pagination: 1–260.

Anon. *Katalog antikvarnoi biblioteki knigoprodavtsa E. Ia. Fedorova, priobretennoi posle byvshego ministra D. P. Troshchinskogo* [Catalogue of the antiquarian library of bookseller E. Ia. Fedorov, acquired after the (death of the) former minister D. P. Troshchynsky]. Kiev, 1874.

Anon. "Opisanie dorog ot Kieva do Tsargrada, sochinennoe v 1714 godu" [A description of the roads from Kiev to Tsargrad (Constantinople), composed in 1714]. *Akademicheskie izvestiia* 7 (1781): 326–49.

Anon. "Proshenie malorossiiskogo shliakhetstva . . . o vosstanovlenii raznykh starinnykh prav . . . v 1764 godu" [A petition of the Little Russian gentry on the restoration of various ancient rights (1764)]. KS (May 1883): 317–45.

Anon. "Rech 'O popravlenii sostoianiia' Malorossii" [A speech 'On correcting the circumstances' of Little Russia]. KS 4 (1882): 119–25.

Anon. "Rodoslovnaia dvorian Tumanskikh" [A genealogy of the Tumansky gentry]. CGV, *neoffitsialnaia chast*, nos. 21–2, 24–5, 35 (1890).

Anon. "Une histoire ou plutôt un conte à propos de l'Histoire des Kosaques, par C. L. Lesur." *L'Athenaeum francais* (9 June 1855): 489.

Anon. "Zamechaniia, do Maloi Rossii prinadlezhashchie" [Observations pertaining to Little Russia]. ChOIDR, no. 1 (1848), second pagination: 1–55.

Antonovsky, M. I. "Malorossiiskie kozaki (byvshie)" [The former Little Russian Cossacks]. In *Opisanie vsekh, obitaiushchikh v Rossiiskom gosudarstve, narodov*, ed. I.-G. Georgi, 4: 233–346. St. Petersburg, 1799.

_____."Zapiski" [Memoirs]. RA, no. 1 (1885): 145–78.

Apanovych, O. M. "Znachennia pratsi O. F. Shafonskoho 'Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie' dlia vyvchennia istorii livoberezhnoi Ukrainy druhoi polovyny XVIII st." [The significance of O. F. Shafonsky's work, "A topographical description of Chernihiv province," for the study of the history of Left-Bank Ukraine in the second half of the eighteenth century]. UIZh, no. 5 (1960): 126–32.

Arkhipova, A. V. "Problema natsionalnoi samobytnosti v russkoi literature pervoi chetverti XIXv. (epokha stanovleniia romantizma)" [The problem of national identity in Russian literature of the first quarter of the nineteenth century (the age of the emergence of romanticism)]. In *Russkaia literatura i folklor (pervaia polovina XIX veka)*, ed. A. A. Gorelov, F. Ia. Priima, and A. D. Soimonov, 30–84. Leningrad, 1976.

Arsh, G. L. *Eteristskoe dvizhenie v Rossii: osvoboditelnaia borba grecheskogo naroda v nachale XIXv. i russko-grecheskie sviazi* [Thé *Philikė Etairia* movement in Russia: the Greek people's war of liberation at the beginning of the nineteenth century and Russo-Greek ties]. Moscow, 1970.

Askochensky, V. *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem Akademieiu* [Kiev and its oldest school, the academy]. 2 vols. Kiev, 1856.

Auerbach, Hans. *Die Besiedelung der Südukraine in den Jahren 1774–1787*. Wiesbaden, 1965.

Auty, Robert. "Language and Nationality in East-Central Europe 1750–1950." OSP, new series, 12 (1979): 52–83.

Avseenko, V. G. *Malorossiia v 1767 godu: epizod iz istorii XVIII stoletiia. Po neizdannym istochnikam* [Little Russia in 1767: an episode in eighteenth-century history. Based on unpublished sources]. Kiev, 1864.

Azadovsky, M. K. *Istoriia russkoi folkloristiki* [A history of Russian folklore studies]. 2 vols. Moscow, 1958–63.

Babinski, Hubert F. *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism.* New York and London, 1974.

Babkin, D. S. "V. V. Kapnist i A. N. Radishchev" [V. V. Kapnist and A. N. Radishchev]. *Vosemnadtsatyi vek* 4 (1959): 269–88.

Bagalei, D. I. (Bahalii, D. I.). "Generalnaia opis Malorossii: epizod iz deiatelnosti pervogo pravitelia Malorossii, gr. P. A. Rumiantseva-Zadunaiskogo" [The "General Description" of Little Russia: an episode in the activity of the first ruler of Little Russia, Count P. A. Rumiantsev]. KS (November 1883): 1–31.

_____."I. F. Vernet." *Sbornik kharkovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva* 18 (1909): 186–92.

_____.*Opyt istorii Kharkovskogo universiteta* [An attempt at the history of Kharkov university]. 2 vols. Kharkiv, 1893–1904.

Bahalii, D. I. (Bagalei, D. I.), ed. *Bibliohrafiia istorii Ukrainy, Rosii ta ukrainskoho prava, kraieznavstva i etnolohii za 1917–1927* [Bibliography of the history of Ukraine and Russia, and of Ukrainian law, regional studies, and ethnology, 1917–27]. Kharkiv, 1930.

Baitsura, Tamara. *Iurii Ivanovych Venelyn.* Bratislava, 1968.

_____.*Zakarpatoukrainskaia intelligentsiia v Rossii v pervoi polovine XIX veka* [The trans-Carpathian intelligentsia in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century]. Bratislava, 1971.

Bakai, N. "Iuzhno-russkii dvorianin XVIII veka" [The south Russian gentleman in the eighteenth century]. KS 11 (1885): 717–42.

Bantysh-Kamensky, D. N. *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* [The history of Little Russia]. 3 vols. 1st ed. Moscow, 1822. 2d ed. Moscow, 1830.

Bantysh-Kamensky, N. N. *Istoricheskoe izvestie o voznikshei v Polshe Unii* [Historical Information about the Union which arose in Poland]. Moscow, 1805.

Baranovich, A. I., et al., eds. *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei 1654–1954: sbornik statei* [The Reunion of Ukraine with Russia 1654–1954: a collection of essays]. Moscow, 1954.

Barber, John. *Soviet Historians in Crisis 1928–1932.* London and Basingstoke, 1981.

Barsukov, N. *Zhizn i trudy M. P. Pogodina* [The life and works of M. P. Pogodin]. 22 vols. St. Petersburg, 1888–1910.

Bartenev, P., ed. *Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova* [The archive of Prince Vorontsov]. 40 vols. Moscow, 1870–1895.

B(artenev), P., ed. "Ob Ukraino-slavianskom obshchestve (iz bumag D. P. Golokhvastova)" [On the Ukraino-Slavic society (from the papers of D. P. Golokhvastov)]. RA, no. 7 (1892): 334–59.

Bartenev, P., ed. *Osmnadtsatyi vek* [The eighteenth century]. 4 vols. Moscow, 1868–9.

Bartlett, Roger P. *Human Capital: The Settlement of Foreigners in Russia 1762–1804.* Cambridge, England, 1979.

Barvinsky, B. *Zvidky pishlo imia "Ukraina"?* [Where did the name Ukraine come from?]. Vienna, 1916.

Basarab, John. *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study.* Edmonton, 1982.

Bazanov, V. *Uchenaia respublika* [A learned republic]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1964.

Bazhova, A. P. *Russko-iugoslavianskie otnosheniia vo vtoroi polovine XVIII v.* [Russia's relations with the south Slavs in the second half of the eighteenth century]. Moscow, 1982.

Beauplan, Sieur de. *Description d'Ukraine.* Rouen, 1660.

Beauvois, D. "École et société en Ukraine occidentale (1800–1825)." *Revue du nord*, vol. 57, no. 225 (April-June 1975): 173–84.

Belinsky, V. G. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete Works]. 13 vols. Moscow, 1953–9.

Belozerskaia, N. "Istoricheskii zhurnal XVIII veka" [A Historical journal of the eighteenth century]. ZhMNP 315 (January 1898): 61–84.

Berezhkov, M. *A. F. Shafonsky i ego trud: Chernigovskogo Namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie (Zametki k istorii Chernigovskoi gubernii i Malorossii voobshche)* [O. F. Shafonsky and his work, "A Topographical description of Chernihiv province" (Notes on the history of Chernihiv province and Little Russia in general)]. Nizhyn, 1910.

Berkov, P. N. *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII veka* [A History of eighteenth-century Russian journalism]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1952.

_____. *Russko-polskie literaturnye sviazi v XVIII veke* [Russo-Polish literary ties in the eighteenth century]. Moscow, 1958.

Berlinsky, M. (Berlynsky, M.). "O Kievskoi akademii" [On the Kiev Academy]. *Sorevnovatel prosveshcheniia*, no. 7 (1819): 94–112.

_____. "Opisanie naidennykh nedavno v Kieve raznykh starinnykh, zolotykh i serebrennykh, veshchei" [A description of various ancient gold and silver objects, recently found in Kiev]. *Ukrainskii zhurnal* 2 (1824): 332–8.

Berlynsky, M. (Berlinsky, M.). "Istoriia mista Kiieva" [A history of the city of Kiev]. *Kyivska starovyna: shchorichnyk* 1 (1972): 74–202.

Bernshtein, M. D. *Zhurnal "Osnova" i ukrainskyi literaturnyi protses kintsia 50-60-kh rokiv XIX st.* [The journal *Osnova* (*Foundation*) and the Ukrainian literary process of the end of the 1850s and the 1860s]. Kiev, 1959.

Betsky, I., ed. *Molodyk: Ukrainskii literaturnyi sbornik* [The new moon: A Ukrainian literary miscellany]. 4 vols. Kharkiv and St. Petersburg, 1843–4.

Bezborodko, A. A. "Iz bumag" [From Bezborodko's papers]. RA 3 (1890): 145–60.

_____. "Pisma" [Letters]. AKV 13 (1879): 1–417.

_____. *Pisma k grafu P. A. Rumiantsovu, 1775–93gg.* [Letters to Count P. A. Rumiantsev, 1775–93]. Ed. P. M. Maikov. St. Petersburg, 1900.

_____. *Pisma k Ia. L. Bakurinskomu* [Letters to Ia. L. Bakurynsky]. Ed. Iu. V. Tatishchev. Moscow, 1907.

Bibliograficheskie listy [Bibliographical pages]. Ed. P. I. Keppen (Köppen). 43 nos. St. Petersburg, 1825–6.

Biletsky, O. I., and M. K. Hudzii, eds. *Rosiisko-ukrainske literaturne iednannia: zbirnyk statei* [Russo-Ukrainian literary unity: a collection of articles]. Kiev, 1953.

Black, J. L. *Nicholas Karamzin and Russian Society in the Nineteenth Century*. Toronto and Buffalo, 1975.

_____. "The Primečanija: Karamzin as a "Scientific" Historian of Russia." In *Essays on Karamzin: Russian Man of Letters, Political Thinker, Historian*, ed. J. L. Black, 127–47. The Hague and Paris, 1975.

_____. "The Search for a 'Correct' Textbook of National History in 18th Century Russia." *The New Review of East-European History* 16, no. 1 (March 1976): 3–19.

Blum, Jerome. *The End of the Old Order in Rural Europe*. Princeton, 1978.

Boba, Imre. *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs*. The Hague, 1967.

Bodiansky, Iosif (Osyp). "Rassmotrenie razlichnykh mnenii o drevnem iazyke Severnykh i Iuzhnykh Russov" [An examination of different opinions concerning the ancient language of the north and south Russians]. *Uchenye zapiski imperatorskogo universiteta* 9 (1835): 472–91.

Bogolepov, P. K., and N. P. Verkhovskaia. *Tropa k Gogoliu* [The path to Gogol]. Moscow, 1976.

Bogoliubov, A. N. "Rossiiskaia nauka XVIII veka" [Russian learning in the eighteenth century]. VI, no. 4 (1980): 82–94.

Boiko, I. *Ukrainski literaturni almanakhy i zbirnyky XIX—pochatku XX st: bibliohrafichnyi pokazhchyk* [Ukrainian literary almanacs and miscellanies of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries: a bibliographical handbook]. Kiev, 1967.

Bolkhovitinov, E. *Perepiska s gosudarstvennym kantslerom grafom Nikolaem Petrovichem Rumiantsevym i s nekotorymi drugimi sovremennikami (s 1813 po 1825 god vkliuchitelno)* [Correspondence with State Chancellor Count Nikolai Petrovich Rumiantsev and with certain other contemporaries (from 1813 to 1825 inclusive)]. 3 vols. Voronezh, 1868–85.

———."Pisma k Anastasevichu" [Letters to Anastasevich]. *Drevniaia i novaia Rossiia* 18 (1880): 336–64, 611–40, 19 (1881): 288–317.

Borodii, M. K. "Uchast vykhovantsiv Kyivskoi akademii v rozvytku vitchyznianoi medytsyny XVIII st." [The participation of pupils of the Kiev Academy in the development of the fatherland's eighteenth-century medicine]. UIZh, no. 3 (1980): 96–102.

Borovykovsky, Levko. *Povne zibrannia tvoriv* [Complete works]. Kiev, 1967.

Borschak, É. (Borshchak, Bortchak). *Le mouvement national ukrainien au XIXe siècle*. Paris, 1931.

———.*L'Ukraine dans la littérature de l'Europe occidentale*. Paris, 1935.

Borshchak, I. (Borschak, Bortchak). "Franco-Ucrainica XVII–XIX st." [Franco-Ukrainian matter of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries]. *Stara Ukraina: chasopys istorii i kultury* 1 (1924): 114.

———."Volter i Ukraina (Za nevydanymy dokumentamy)" [Voltaire and Ukraine (on the basis of unpublished documents)]. *Ukraina*, no. 1 (1926): 34–42.

Bortchak, É. (Borschak, Borshchak). "Napoléon et l'Ukraine." *Revue des etudes Napoléoniennes* 19 (1922): 24–40.

Braudel, F. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. Pbk. ed. 2 vols. London, 1975.

Briskman, M. A. *V. G. Anastasevich*. Moscow, 1958.

Brock, Peter. "Z. D. Chodakowski and the Discovery of Folklife: A Chapter in the History of Polish Nationalism." *The Polish Review*, 21, nos. 1–2 (1976): 3–21.

Brodsky, N. L., ed. *Literaturnye salony i kruzhki: Pervaia polovina XIX veka* [Literary salons and circles: The first

half of the nineteenth century]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1930.

Bromlei, Iu. V., et al., eds. *Aktualnye problemy natsionalnykh otnoshenii v svete konstitutsii SSSR* [Current problems concerning national relations in the light of the Soviet constitution]. Moscow, 1981.

Brown, A. H. "Adam Smith's First Russian Followers." In *Essays on Adam Smith*, ed. Andrew S. Skinner and Thomas Wilson, 247–73. Oxford, 1975.

Bryl, M. N. "Heohrafiia rozmishchennia knyhovydavnychoi spravy i knyhotorhovelnoi merezhi v Ukrainskii RSR" [The geography of the location of the book-publishing business and the book-trade network in the Ukrainian republic]. *Ukrainskyi istoryko-heohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 2 (1972): 264–78.

Bulgakov. "Zapiska . . . posle obrevizovaniia dela o sformirovanii Malorossiiskim gubernatorom kniazem Repninym v 1831-m godu, vosmi Malorossiiskikh kazachikh polkov" [A note following inspection of the dossier on the formation (in 1831, by Little Russian governor Prince Repnin) of eight Little Russian Cossack regiments]. RA (1872): 953–65.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. London, 1978.

Buzhynsky, Mykhailo. "Do biohrafii V. L. Lukashevycha" [A contribution to the biography of V. L. Lukashevych]. *Za sto lit* 3 (*Zapysky b. Istorychnoi sektsii Ukrainskoho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyivi* 29) (1928): 3–4.

Bychkov, I. A., ed. "Speransky v Velikopole i Penze" [Speransky in Velikopole and Penza]. RS (June 1902): 467–86, (July 1902): 45–59.

Catherine II. "Manifest k pravoslavnomu naseleniiu Polshi, vydannyi 9 iulia 1768g." [Manifesto to the Orthodox population of Poland, promulgated on 9 July 1768]. KS 2 (1882): 308–11.

———. "Nastavlenie, dannoe grafu Petru Rumiantsovu, pri naznachenii ego malorossiiskim general-gubernatorom, s sobstvennoruchnymi pribavkami Ekateriny II (noiabria 1764 goda)" [Directions given to Count Petr Rumiantsev on his

appointment as Little Russian Governor-General, with additions by Catherine II in her own hand (November 1764)]. SIRIO 7 (1871): 376–91.

———."Sobstvennoruchnoe nastavlenie kniaziu Viazemskomu pri vstuplenie (*sic*) im v dolzhnost general-prokurora (1764 goda)" [Directions in her own hand to Prince Viazemsky, on his assumption of the office of Procurator-General]. SIRIO 7 (1871): 345–8.

Chapkevich, E. I. "Granovsky i Orlovskii krai" [Granovsky and the Orel region]. In *Timofei Nikolaevich Granovsky*, ed. V. G. Verzhbitsky, 38–45. Moscow, 1970.

Chaslavsky, V. "Pervaia zemledelcheskaia shkola v Rossii (1797–1803)" [The first agricultural school in Russia (1797–1803)]. *Selskoe khoziaistvo i lesovodstvo* 105 (1870), second pagination: 1–18.

Chechulin, N. D. "Kochubei, Viktor Pavlovich." RBS 9: 366–82.

Chepa, A. I. "Dva pisma" [Two letters]. KS 29 (1890): 364–9.

Chertina, Z. S. "Burzhuaznye istoriki o novoi istoricheskoi obshchnosti—sovetskii narod" [Bourgeois historians on a new historical community—the Soviet people]. *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 6 (1982): 191–201.

Chevalier, P. *Histoire de la Guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne.* Paris, 1663.

Chizhevsky, D. I. *Gegel v Rossii* [Hegel in Russia]. Paris, 1939.

Chizhov, F. V. "Vospominaniia" [Recollections]. *Istoricheskii vestnik* (February 1883): 241–62.

Chodakowski, Z. D. (Khodakovsky, Z. D.). *O Slawiańszczyźnie przed Chrześcijaństwem: oraz inne pisma i listy* [On Slavdom before Christianity: together with other writings and letters]. Ed. Julian Maślanka. Warsaw, 1967.

Choldin, Marianna Tax. "Three Early Russian Bibliographers." *The Library Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (January 1974): 1–28.

Christian, David. "The Political Views of the Unofficial Committee in 1801: Some New Evidence." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 12, no. 2 (Summer 1978): 247–65.

———."The 'Senatorial Party' and the Theory of Collegial Government, 1801–1803." *The Russian Review* 38, no. 3

(1979): 298–322.

Christoff, Peter K. *A. S. Xomjakov.* The Hague, 1961.

_____. *The Third Heart: Some Intellectual-Ideological Currents and Cross Currents in Russia 1800–1830.* The Hague and Paris, 1970.

Cracraft, James. *The Church Reform of Peter the Great.* London and Basingstoke, 1971.

_____. "Did Feofan Prokopovich Really Write *Pravda Voli Monarshei*?" SR 40 no. 2 (Summer 1981): 173–93.

Danylov, Volodymyr. "Do istorii 'Malorossiiskikh pesen' M. O. Maksymovycha" [A contribution to the history of M. O. Maksymovych's *Little Russian Songs*]. *Ukraina*, no. 4 (1927): 23–33.

_____. "Druhyi zbirnyk ukrainskykh pisen M. O. Maksymovycha z 1834 roku" [M. O. Maksymovych's second collection of Ukrainian songs (1834)]. *Ukraina*, no. 6 (1929): 14–30.

(Dashkova, E. R.). *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkov.* Ed. and trans. Kyril Fitzlyon. London, 1958.

Debreczeny, Paul. "Nikolai Gogol and his Contemporary Critics." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new series, 56, no. 3 (1966): 1–68.

Dei, O. I. *Storinky z istorii ukrainskoi folklorystyky* [Pages from the history of Ukrainian folklore studies]. Kiev, 1975.

_____., and L. A. Malash, eds. *Ukrainski narodni pisni v zapysakh Zoriana Dolenhy-Khodakovskoho (z Halychyny, Volyni, Podillia, Prydniprianshchyny i Polissia)* [Ukrainian popular songs as recorded by Zorian Dołega Chodakowski (from Galicia, Volhynia, Podillia, the Dnieper region, and Polissia)]. Kiev, 1974.

Deich, L. "Ukrainskaia i obshcherusskaia emigratsiia." [The Ukrainian and the all-Russian emigration]. VE, no. 8 (1914): 209–33.

Dementev, A. G., et al., eds. *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat (1702–1894): spravochnik* [The Russian periodical press (1702–1894): a reference book]. Moscow, 1959.

Diadychenko, V. A. *Narysy suspilno-politychnoho ustroiu Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy kintsia XVII—pochatku XVIII*

stolittia [Essays on the socio-political structure of Left-Bank Ukraine at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries]. Kiev, 1959.

Diakov, V. A., et al., eds. *Slavianovedenie v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii: biobibliograficheskii slovar* [Slavic studies in prerevolutionary Russia: a bio-bibliographical dictionary]. Moscow, 1979.

Dmitriev, P. A., ed. *Russkoe i slavianskoe iazykoznanie serediny XVIII–XIX vv. (v biograficheskikh ocherkakh i vospominaniiakh sovremennikov)* [Russian and Slavic linguistics of the mid-eighteenth through the nineteenth centuries (in the biographical essays and recollections of contemporaries)]. Leningrad, 1980.

Dmitriukov. "Nravy, obychai i obraz zhizni v Sudzhenskom uezde, Kurskoi gubernii" [Behaviour, customs and the way of life in Sudzhenskii district of Kursk province]. *Moskovskii telegraf*, no. 10 (1831): 255–71, and no. 11 (1831): 359–77.

Dobrovolsky, P. "Puteshestvie imp. Ekateriny II chrez Chernigovskii krai" [Empress Catherine II's journey through the Chernihiv region]. *Trudy Chernigovskoi gubernskoi arkhivnoi komissii* 5 (1903): 31–127.

Dolgorukov, I. M. "Dnevnik puteshestviia v Kiev 1817 goda" [Diary of a journey to Kiev in 1817]. ChOIDR, no. 2 (1870): 1–208.

Domanytsky, V. "Pioner ukrainskoi etnohrafii (Zorian Dolenha-Khodakovsky)" [A pioneer of Ukrainian ethnography (Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski)]. ZNTSh 65 (1905), 1st pagination: 1–43.

Doroshenko, D. "Kn. M. Repnin i D. Bantysh-Kamensky (Storinka z ukrainskoho hromadskoho zhyttia pershoi chetvertyny XIX stolittia)" [Prince N. Repnin and D. Bantysh-Kamensky (A page from the life of Ukrainian society in the first quarter of the nineteenth century)]. In *Pratsi ukrainskoho pedahohichnoho instytutu im. M. Drahomanova u Prazi: naukovyi zbirnyk* 1, ed. V. Simovych, 90–108. Prague, 1929.

_____."Pokazhchyk literatury ukrainskoiu movoiu v Rosii za

1798–1897 roky" [An index of Ukrainian-language literature in Russia, 1798–1897]. In *Naukovyi iuvileinyi zbirnyk Ukrainskoho universitetu v Prazi prysviachenyi prof. Dr. T. H. Masarykovi*, 142–238. Prague, 1925.

_____."A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography." AUAAS 5, no. 4 (18)–6, nos. 1–2 (19–20) (1957): 11–304.

Dostal, M. Iu. "I. I. Sreznevsky kak slavist (1812–1880)" [I. I. Sreznevsky as a slavist (1812–1880)]. *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie*, no. 3 (1980): 90–105.

Dragomanov, M. P. (Drahomanov, M. P.). *Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikorusskaia demokratiia* [Historical Poland and Great Russian democracy]. Geneva, 1881.

Drahomanov, M. P. (Dragomanov, M. P.). *Literaturno-publistystychni pratsi* [Literary-publicistic works]. 2 vols. Kiev, 1970.

Drakokhrust, E. I. "Promyslovye sela vladeniia Kochubeev v Novgorod-Severskom namestnichestve vo vtoroi polovine XVIIIv." [Villages of producers owned by the Kochubei family in Novhorod-Siversk province in the second half of the eighteenth century]. In *K voprosu o pervonachalnom nakoplenii v Rossii (XVII–XVIIIvv.)*, ed. L. G. Beskrovnyi et al., 342–75. Moscow, 1958.

Druzhinina, E. I. *Iuzhnaia Ukraina v period krizisa feodalizma 1825–1860gg.* [Southern Ukraine in the period of the crisis of feudalism, 1825–1860]. Moscow, 1981.

_____.*Iuzhnaia Ukraina v 1800–1825gg.* [Southern Ukraine 1800–25]. Moscow, 1970.

_____.*Severnoe prichernomore v 1775–1800gg.* [The northern littoral of the Black Sea, 1775–1800]. Moscow, 1959.

Durylin, S. "M. S. Shchepkin i I. P. Kotliarevsky" [M. S. Shchepkin and I. P. Kotliarevsky]. In *Russko-ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi*, ed. N. K. Gudzii, 79–107. Moscow, 1951.

Dyck, Harvey L. "Pondering the Russian Fact: Kaunitz and the Catherinian Empire in the 1770s." CSP 22, no. 4 (1980): 451–69.

Dzeverin, I. A., ed. *Edinenie literatur* [The solidarity of literatures]. Kiev, 1982.

Dzhydzhora, Ivan. *Ukraina v pershii polovyni XVIII viku* [Ukraine in the first half of the eighteenth century]. Kiev, 1930.

Dzyra, Ia. I. "Dzherelna osnova pratsi O. Rihelmana z istorii Ukrainy" [The sources underlying O. Rihelman's work on the history of Ukraine]. *Istoriohrafichni doslidzhennia v Ukrainskii RSR* 2 (1969): 158–79.

_____."Taras Shevchenko i ukrainski litopysy XVII–XVIII st." [Taras Shevchenko and Ukrainian chronicles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. In *Istorychni pohliady T. H. Shevchenka*, ed. I. O. Hurzhii et al., 61–89. Kiev, 1964.

Edgerton, W. B. "Laying a legend to rest: the poet Kapnist and Ukraino-German intrigue." SR 30, no. 3 (1971): 551–60.

Efimenko, A. "Malorusskoe dvorianstvo i ego sudba: istoricheskii ocherk" [The Little Russian gentry and its fate: a historical essay]. VE (August 1891): 515–69.

Egolin, A. M., et al., eds. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* [Literary heritage] 59. Moscow, 1954.

Eidelman, N. Ia. "Dvortsovyi zagovor 1797–1799 godov" [The palace conspiracy of 1797–9]. VI, no. 1 (1981): 103–12.

_____.*Gran vekov: Politicheskaia borba v Rossii: Konets XVIII—nachalo XIX stoletiia* [The turn of the century: Political struggle in Russia at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries]. Moscow, 1982.

_____.*Poslednii letopisets* [The last chronicler]. Moscow, 1983.

Eleonsky, F., ed. *Arkheograficheskii sbornik dokumentov, otnosiashchikhsia k istorii severo-zapadnoi Rusi* [An archaeographic collection of documents relating to the history of north-west Rus'] 2. Vilnius, 1867.

Elnitsky, A. "Vasilii Grigorevich Ruban." RBS, vol. "Romanova-Riasovsky": 368–83.

Engel, Johann Christian von. *Geschichte der Ukraine und der Cosaken; Geschichte von Galizien und Lodomerien.* Halle, 1796.

Eremin, I. P. "K istorii russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei v XVII veke" [Toward a history of Russo-Ukrainian literary relations in the seventeenth century]. TODRL 9 (1953): 291–6.

Erofiiv, I. I. "Kharkivski spohady V. H. Maslovycha" [The Kharkiv memories of V. H. Maslovych]. ZIFV VUAN 13–14 (1927): 70–5.

Esipov, G. V. "Puteshestvie Ekateriny II v iuzhnuiu Rossiiu" [Catherine II's journey to southern Russia]. KS 31 (1890): 175–94, 391–411; 32 (1891): 98–118, 215–31, 402–21; 33 (1891): 68–81, 244–55; 34 (1891): 22–52, 237–53, 407–26; 35 (1891): 232–45, 361–83.

Evgenev, A. P., and B. N. Putilov, eds. *Drevnie rossiiskie stikhotvoreniia, sobrannye Kirsheiu Danilovym* [Old Russian verse collected by Kirsha Danilov]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1958.

Fadner, Frank. *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karazin to Danilevskii 1800–1870.* Georgetown, 1962.

Florinsky, M. T. *Russia: A History and an Interpretation.* 2 vols. 16th printing. New York, 1971.

Flynn, J. T. "S. S. Uvarov's 'Liberal' Years." JFGO (1972): 481–91.

_____."Tuition and Social Class in Russian Universities: S. S. Uvarov and 'Reaction' in the Russia of Nicholas I." SR 35 (1976): 232–48.

_____."V. N. Karazin, the Gentry, and Kharkov University." SR (June 1969): 209–20.

Formozov, A. A. *Pushkin i drevnosti: nabliudeniia arkheologa* [Pushkin and antiquities: the observations of an archaeologist]. Moscow, 1979.

_____."Pushkin i Khodakovsky" [Pushkin and Chodakowski]. *Prometei* 10 (1974): 100–105.

Frantsev, V. A. *Polskoe slavianovedenie kontsa XVIII i pervoi chetverti XIX st.* [Polish Slavic studies at the end of the eighteenth and in the first quarter of the nineteenth centuries]. Prague, 1906.

Freeze, Gregory L. *The Russian Levites: Parish Clergy in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1977.

Gajecky, George. *The Cossack Administration of the Hetmanate*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass, 1978.

Galinkovsky, Ia. "Rassmotrenie Rossiiskoi istorii" [An examination of Russian history]. *Korifei ili kliuch literatury* 1 (1802): 86–158.

Galka, Ieremiia (Mykola Kostomarov). "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh na malorossiiskom iazyke" [A survey of works written in Little Russian]. In *Molodyk na 1844 god*, ed. I. Betsky, 157–85. Kharkiv, 1843.

Gelbig. "Sluchainye liudi v Rossii" [Parvenus in Russia]. RA (1865): 383–442.

Gennadi, G. "Avtobiografiia I. F. Bogdanovicha" [The Autobiography of I. F. Bohdanovych]. *Otechestvennye zapiski* 87, no. 4 (1853): 181–6.

Gertsen, A. I. *Sobranie sochinenii* [Works]. 30 vols. Moscow, 1954–65.

Gettun, V. N. "Zapiski 1771–1815gg." [Memoirs, 1771–1815]. *Istoricheskii vestnik* 1 (1880): 26–67, 253–96, 473–504.

Gippius, V. V. " 'Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki' Gogolia" [Gogol's *Evenings on a farmstead near Dikanka*]. *Trudy otdela novoi russkoi literatury Instituta literatury Akademii nauk* 1 (1948): 9–38.

Glinka, F. N. *Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnitskii ili osvobozhdennaia Malorossiia* [Zinovii Bohdan Khmelnytsky, or Little Russia liberated]. St. Petersburg, 1819.

Gl. L. "Spisok doktorov meditsiny iz malorossov, praktikovavshikh v Rossii v XVIII stoletii" [A list of Little Russian doctors of medicine who practiced in Russia in the eighteenth century]. KS 52 (1896): 98–103.

Gnedich, N. I. *Stikhotvoreniia* [Verse]. Ed. I. N. Medvedeva. Leningrad, 1956.

Gogol, N. V. "O malorossiiskikh pesniakh" [On Little Russian songs]. ZhMNP (April 1834), second pagination: 16–26.

_____. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete Works]. 14 vols. Moscow, 1937–52.

Golitsyn, S. F. "Bumagi" [Papers]. RA 2 (1876): 129–60.

Golobutsky, V. A. (Holobutsky, V. O.). "Sotsialnye otnosheniia v Zaporozhe XVIII veka" [Social relations in eighteenth-century Zaporizhzhia]. VI, no. 9 (1948): 71–84.

_____. *Zaporozhskoe kazachestvo* [The Zaporozhian Cossacks]. Kiev, 1958.

Golubtsov, V. V. "K biografii grafa P. V. Zavadovskogo" [Toward the biography of Count P. V. Zavadovsky]. RA 1 (1887): 118–28.

Gorbachevsky, I. I. *Zapiski, pisma* [Notes, letters]. Ed. B. E. Syroechkovsky, L. A. Sokolsky and V. Porokh. Moscow, 1963.

Gorelov, A. A., F. Ia. Priima, and A. D. Soimonov, eds. *Russkaia literatura i folklor: pervaia polovina XIX veka* [Russian literature and folklore: the first half of the nineteenth century]. Leningrad, 1976.

Gorlenko, V. "Iz istorii iuzhno-russkogo obshchestva nachala XIX veka (pisma V. I. Charnysha, A. I. Chepy, V. G. Poletiki i zametki k nim)" [From the history of south Russian society at the beginning of the nineteenth century (letters of V. I. Charnysh, A. I. Chepa, V. H. Poletyka, and notes to them)]. KS 40 (1893): 41–76.

Grabowicz, George G. "The History of Polish-Ukrainian Literary Relations: A Literary and Cultural Perspective." In *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj, 107–31. Edmonton and Toronto, 1980.

_____. "Three Perspectives on the Cossack Past: Gogol', Ševčenko, Kuliš." HUS 5, no. 2 (June 1981): 171–94.

Grebenka, E. P. (Hrebinka, Ie.). "Pisma k N. M. Novitskomu" [Letters to M. M. Novytsky]. *Trudy poltavskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii* 11 (1914): 1–25.

Griffiths, D. M. "The Rise and Fall of the Northern System: Court Politics and Foreign Policy in the First Half of Catherine II's Reign." *Canadian Slavic Studies* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1970): 547–69.

Grigorovich, I. I., ed. *Belorusskii arkhiv drevnikh gramot* [A Belorussian archive of ancient charters]. Vol. 1. Moscow,

1824.

———."Perepiska s Rumiantsevym" [Correspondence with Rumiantsev]. ChOIDR, no. 2 (1864), *Issledovaniia*: 1–92.

Grigorovich, N. I. *Kantsler kniaz Aleksandr Andreevich Bezborodko v sviazi s sobytiiami ego vremeni* [The Chancellor Prince Oleksander Andriiovych Bezborodko in relation to the events of his time]. 2 vols (SIRIO 26, 29). St. Petersburg, 1879–81.

Grigorovich-Barsky, V. *Puteshestvie k sviatym mestam, v Evrope, Azii i Afrike nakhodiashchimsia, predpriiatoe v 1723, i okonchennoe v 1747 godu* [A journey to the holy places of Europe, Asia, and Africa, undertaken in 1723 and concluded in 1747]. Ed. V. Ruban. St. Petersburg, 1778.

Grinchenko, B. D. *Literatura ukrainskogo folklora: Opyt bibliograficheskogo ukazatelia* [The literature of Ukrainian folklore: an attempt at a bibliographical handbook]. Chernihiv, 1901.

Grushevsky, A. (Hrushevsky, O.). "M. A. Maksimovich (1804–1873): iz ukrainskoi istoriografii XIXv." [M. O. Maksymovych (1804–1873): From the history of nineteenth-century Ukrainian historiography]. *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk* 11 (1906): 375–416.

Grushevsky, M. S. (Hrushevsky, M. S.). "Ob ukrainskoi istoriografii XVIII veka: neskolko soobrazhenii" [On eighteenth-century Ukrainian historiography: Some considerations]. *Izvestiia Akademiia nauk SSSR, VII seriia: otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk*, no. 3 (1934): 215–23.

———."Razvitie ukrainskikh izuchenii v XIXv. i raskrytie v nikh osnovnykh voprosov ukrainovedeniia" [The development of Ukrainian studies in the nineteenth century and their definition of the basic questions involved in the investigation of Ukraine]. In *Ukrainskii narod v ego proshlom i nastoiashchem* 1: 1–37. St. Petersburg, 1914.

Gudzenko, P. P., et al., eds. *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: dokumenty i materialy* [The Reunion of Ukraine and Russia: documents and materials]. 3 vols. Moscow, 1954.

Gudzii, N. K. "Kulturnye sviazi ukrainskogo i russkogo narodov do kontsa XVIII v." [Cultural ties of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples to the end of the eighteenth century]. *Uchenye zapiski Saratovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 56 (1957): 3–18.

_____. *Russko-ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi* [Russo-Ukrainian literary ties]. Moscow, 1951.

Gurzhii, A. I. (Hurzhii, O. I.). "Formirovanie krupnogo feodalnogo zemlevladeniia kazatskoi starshiny na Levoberezhnoi Ukraine (Vtoraia polovina XVII–60-e gody XVIII v.)" [The formation of large-scale feudal landholdings on the part of the Cossack *starshyna* in Left-Bank Ukraine (from the second half of the seventeenth century to the 1760s)]. *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 3 (1983): 153–62.

Herbilsky, H. Iu. *Rozvytok prohresyvnykh idei v Halychyni u pershii polovyni XIX st. (do 1848 r.)* [The development of progressive ideas in Galicia in the first half of the nineteenth century (to 1848)]. Lviv, 1964.

Herlihy, P. "Odessa: Staple Trade and Urbanization in New Russia." JFGO, no. 2 (1973): 184–95.

Hermaize, O. "Rukh dekabrystiv i ukrainstvo" [The Decembrist movement and Ukrainianism]. *Ukraina*, no. 6 (1925): 25–38.

Hollingsworth, B. "Arzamas: Portrait of a Literary Society." SEER 44 (1965–6): 306–26.

Holobutsky, V. O. (Golobutsky, V. A.). "Problema kozatstva v ukrainskii ta inozemnii istoriohrafii XVI–pershoi polovyny XVIII st." [The problem of the Cossacks in Ukrainian and foreign historiography from the sixteenth to the first half of the eighteenth century]. UIZh, no. 1 (1960): 109–17.

Horak, Stephen M. "The Kiev Academy: A Bridge to Europe in the 17th Century." *East European Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (June 1968): 117–37.

_____."Periodization and Terminology of the History of Eastern Slavs: Observations and Analyses." SR 31 (1972): 853–62.

_____."Problems of Periodization and Terminology in Ukrainian Historiography." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, no. 3 (1976): 20–9.

Horban, M. "Lyst Petra Myrovycha do batka-mazepyntsia" [A letter from Petro Myrovych to his father, the Mazepist]. *Ukraina*, no. 5 (1927): 6–22.

———." 'Zapiski o Maloi Rossii' O. Shafonskoho" [O. Shafonsky's "Notes on Little Russia"]. *Zapysky Ukrainskoho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyivi* 21 (1926): 132–45.

Horlenko, V. F. *Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi etnohrafii ta rosiisko-ukrainskykh etnohrafichnykh zviazkiv* [Essays on the history of Ukrainian ethnography and Russo-Ukrainian ethnographic ties]. Kiev, 1964.

Hrakhovetsky, D. "Odruzhinnia Semena Horkushi" [The wedding of Semen Horkusha]. *Ukraina*, no. 2 (1929): 47–53.

Hrebinka, Ievhen (Grebenka, E. P.). "Putevye zapiski zaitsa" [Travel notes of a stowaway]. In *Tvory* 2: 165–208. 5 vols. Kiev, 1957.

Hromova, T. "V. V. Kapnist u suspilno-literaturnomu zhytti Ukrainy kintsia XVIII—pochatku XIX st." [V. V. Kapnist in the socio-literary life of Ukraine at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries]. *Radianske literaturoznavstvo*, no. 11 (1973): 28–36.

Hrushevsky, M. (Grushevsky, M.). *The Traditional Scheme of "Russian" History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the East Slavs*, ed. Andrew Gregorovich. Winnipeg, 1965.

———."Zvychaina skhema 'russkoi' istorii i sprava ratsionalnoho ukladu istorii Skhidnoho Slovianstva" [The traditional scheme of "Russian" history and the problem of a rational organization of the history of the east Slavs]. In *Stati po slavianovedeniiu* 1, ed. V. I. Lamansky, 298–304. St. Petersburg, 1904.

Hrushevsky, O. (Grushevsky, A.). "Zminy shkilnoi systemu na Liboverezhzhi v XVIII v." [Changes in the school system on the left bank in the eighteenth century]. *Ukraina*, nos. 1–2 (1924): 82–7.

Humphreys, L. J. "The Vorontsov Family: Russian Nobility in a Century of Change, 1725–1825." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1969.

Hurzhii, O. I. (Gurzhii, A. I.). "Riadove kozatstvo i ioho mistse v klasovo-stanovii strukturi suspilstva livoberezhnoi Ukrainy pershoi polovyny XVIII st." [Cossacks of the line and their place in the class-estate structure of Left-Bank Ukrainian society in the first half of the eighteenth century]. UIZh, no. 8 (1982): 89–96.

Iavorsky, M. *Narysy z istorii revoliutsiinoi borotby na Ukraini* [Essays on the history of the revolutionary struggle in Ukraine]. Vol. 1. Kiev, 1927.

Ievdokymenko, V. Iu., and V. O. Ihnatov. *Natsionalizm i natsii* [Nationalism and nations]. Kiev, 1981.

Ikonnikov, V. S. "Graf N. P. Rumiantsov: deiatelnost ego na polzu razrabotki russkoi istorii i arkheologii" [Count N. P. Rumiantsev: his activity in the interest of cultivating Russian history and archaeology]. RS (1881): 47–74, 225–50.

Inozemtsev, I. V. "Baturinskie pamiatniki" [The monuments of Baturyn]. *Istoricheskii vestnik* 71 (1898): 1054–61.

Iofanov, D. *N. V. Gogol: detskie i iunosheskie gody* [N. V. Gogol: childhood and youth]. Kiev, 1951.

Isaevich, Ia. D. (Isaievych, Ia. D.). "Ukrainskaia kultura XVIII stoletiia" [Eighteenth-century Ukrainian culture]. VI, no. 8 (1980): 85–97.

———. *Bratstva ta ikh rol v rozvytku ukrainskoi kultury XVI–XVIII st.* [The brotherhoods and their role in the development of Ukrainian culture from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries]. Kiev, 1966.

———. *Dzherela z istorii ukrainskoi kultury doby feodalizmu XVI–XVIII st.* [Sources on the history of Ukrainian culture in the age of feudalism (from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries)]. Kiev, 1972.

———. "Ukrainska arkheohrafiia v XVII–XVIII st." [Ukrainian archaeography in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. *Istorychni dzherela ta ikh vykorystannia* 1 (1964): 174–88.

Iskritsky, F. M. "Semeinaia khronika roda Iskritskikh" [A family chronicle of the Iskrytsky clan]. *Trudy Chernigovskoi gubernskoi arkhivnoi kommissii* 8 (1911): 152–94.

Iurovska, O. "Kulish i Grabovsky" [Kulish and Grabowski]. *Ukraina*, no. 5 (1929): 72–85.

Iusufov, R. F. *Russkii romantizm nachala XIX veka i natsionalnye kultury* [Russian romanticism at the beginning of the nineteenth century and national cultures]. Moscow, 1970.

Iuzvenko, V. A. *Ukrainska narodna poetychna tvorchist u polskii folklorystytsi XIX st.* [Ukrainian folk poetry in nineteenth-century Polish folklore studies]. Kiev, 1961.

Jabłonowski, A. *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilańska: zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywilizacyi zachodniej na Rusi* [The Kiev-Mohyla Academy: a historical outline against the background of the general development of western civilization in Rus']. Cracow, 1899–1900.

Kabuzan, V. M. *Zaselenie Novorossii (ekaterinoslavskoi i khersonskoi gubernii) v XVIII—pervoi polovine XIX veka (1719–1858 gg.)* [The Settlement of New Russia (Ekaterynoslav and Kherson provinces) in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries (1719–1858)]. Moscow, 1976.

Kachenovsky, M. T. "Istoricheskii vzgliad na Grammatiku Slavianskikh narechii" [A historical approach to the Grammar of the Slavic dialects]. VE 93, no. 11 (1817): 186–208.

_____."O Slavianskom iazyke voobshche i v osobennosti o tserkovnom" [On the Slavic language in general and the ecclesiastical language in particular]. VE 89, no. 19 (1816): 241–63.

Kaganov, I. Ia. (Kahanov, I. Ia.). "G. A. Poletika i ego knizhnye interesy" [H. O. Poletyka and his interests in books]. *Vosemnadtsatyi vek* 7 (1966): 138–44.

_____."Katalog biblioteki kharkovskogo kollegiuma 1769 goda (Iz istorii ukrainskoi knizhnoi kultury XVIII stoletiia)" [A 1769 catalogue of the Kharkiv Collegium library (From the history of eighteenth-century Ukrainian book culture)]. *Kniga* 6 (1962): 105–22.

Kahanov, I. Ia. (Kaganov, I. Ia.) "Problemy vyvchennia ukrainskoi knyzhkovoi kultury XVIII storichchia" [Problems in studying eighteenth-century Ukrainian book culture]. In

Ukrainska knyha, ed. I. M. Pedaniuk et al., 220–36. Kiev and Kharkiv, 1965.

_____."Shcho chytaly suchasnyky H. Skovorody" [What H. Skovoroda's contemporaries read]. *Radianske literaturoznavstvo*, no. 6 (1967): 77–80.

Kalaidovich, K. F. *Pisma k Alekseiu Fedorovichu Malinovskomu ob arkheologicheskikh issledovaniiakh v Riazanskoi gubernii* [Letters to Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovsky on the archaelogical investigations in Riazan province]. Moscow, 1823.

Kalinovsky, G. I. *Opisanie svadebnykh ukrainskikh prosto-narodnykh obriadov* [A description of the Ukrainian common people's marriage rites]. St. Petersburg, 1777.

Kaloeva, I. A. "Izuchenie iuzhnykh slavian v Rossii v kontse XVII—nachale XIX veka (bibliograficheskii obzor)" [The study of the south Slavs in Russia at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries (A bibliographic survey)]. *Trudy biblioteki Akademii nauk i Fundamentalnoi biblioteki obshchestvennykh nauk Akademii nauk SSSR* 7 (1963): 170–210.

Kamanin, I. "Iz istorii mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii Polshi i Rossii" [From the history of the international relations of Poland and Russia]. KS 3 (1882): 42–60.

Kapnist, V. V. *Sobranie sochinenii* [Works]. 2 vols. Moscow and Leningrad, 1960.

Kapnist-Skalon, S. V. "Vospominaniia" [Recollections]. In *Vospominaniia i rasskazy deiatelei tainykh obshchestv 1820-kh godov*, ed. Iu. G. Oksman and S. N. Chernov, 1: 289–428. Moscow, 1931–3.

Karamzin, N. M. *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo* [History of the Russian state]. 12 vols. St. Petersburg, 1818–29.

_____.*Letters of a Russian Traveler 1789–1790*. Trans. F. Jonas. New York, 1957.

_____."O Bogdanoviche i ego sochineniiakh" [On Bohdanovych and his works]. In *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* 2: 198–226. Moscow and Leningrad, 1964.

_____.*Pisma k Dmitrievu* [Letters to Dmitriev]. St. Petersburg, 1866.

Karazin, V. N. "Eshche nekotorye zamechaniia o Slobodsko-Ukrainskoi gubernii" [A few more remarks about Slobodska-Ukraine province]. *Sorevnovatel prosveshcheniia* 9, no. 2 (1820): 129–41.

———."Odna glava iz rukopisi" [A chapter from a manuscript]. VE 91, no. 2 (1817): 104–34.

———."Rech, govorennaia v sobranii Kharkovskogo dvorianstva" [A speech given at the assembly of the Kharkiv gentry]. VE 10, no. 16 (1803): 234–43.

———."Vzgliad na Ukrainskuiu starinu" [A look at Ukrainian antiquity]. In *Sochineniia, pisma, i bumagi V. N. Karazina*, ed. D. I. Bagalei, 599–606. Kharkiv, 1910.

Karnovich, E. P. "Kniaz A. A. Bezborodko" [Prince A. A. Bezborodko]. In *Zamechatelnye i zagadochnye lichnosti XVIII i XIX stoletiia*, 191–304. St. Petersburg, 1884.

Kashpirev, V., ed. *Pamiatniki novoi russkoi istorii: Sbornik istoricheskikh statei i materialov* [Memorials of recent Russian history: a collection of historical articles and materials]. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1871–2.

Kashuba, M. V. *Georgii Konissky*. Moscow, 1979.

Kazarin, V. P. "Tipologiia istoricheskoi prozy Gogolia 1829–1832 godov" [A typology of Gogol's historical prose of 1829–32]. *Problemy realizma* 7 (1980): 31–42.

Keppen, F. P. "Biografiia P. I. Keppena" [A biography of P. I. Köppen]. *Sbornik otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk* 89, no. 5 (1911): 1–170.

Keppen, P. I., ed. *Bibliograficheskie listy* [Bibliographical pages]. 43 nos. St. Petersburg: 1825–6.

———."Zapiska o puteshestvii po Slovenskim zemliam i arkhivam" [A memorandum on travelling round Slavic lands and archives]. *Bibliograficheskie listy*, no. 33–4 (30 December 1825–21 January 1826): 474–95.

Khaliavsky, O. "Skovoroda, ukrainskii pisatel XVIII veka (Materialy dlia istorii iuzhnorusskoi literatury)" [Skovoroda, a Ukrainian writer of the eighteenth century (Materials for the history of south Russian literature)]. *Osnova*, no. 8–9

(1862).

Khanenko, A. *Istoricheskii ocherk mezhevykh uchrezhdenii v Malorossii* [A historical essay on land-surveying institutions in Little Russia]. Chernihiv, 1870.

_____."Rasskazy o starine" [Stories of olden days]. RA (1868): 1069–80.

Khanenko, M. "O poseshchenii Novgorodseverskoi gimnazii gr. N. P. Rumiantsovym, s pismami ego k direktoru I. I. Khalanskomu" [On N. P. Rumiantsev's visit to Novhorod-Siversky gymnasium, with his letters to Director I. I. Khalansky]. CGV, no. 12 (1852).

Kharkovskii demokrit [The Kharkiv Democritus]. 3 nos: Kharkiv, 1816.

Kharlampovich, K. V. (Kharlampovych, K. V.). *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn* [Little Russian influence on Great Russian church life]. Vol. 1. Kazan, 1914.

Kharlampovych, K. V. (Kharlampovich, K. V.) "'Malorosiiska pisnia' 1791 roku" [A "Little Russian song" of 1791]. *Ukraina*, no. 3 (1925): 111.

_____."Narysy z istorii hretskoi kolonii v Nizheni (XVII–XVIII st.)" [Essays on the history of the Greek colony in Nizhyn (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries)]. ZIFV VUAN 24 (1929): 109–205.

Khmel, I. S., et al., eds. *Pravda istorii protiv falsifikatorov (Kritika burzhuaznykh i burzhuazno-natsionalisticheskikh falsifikatsii istorii Ukrainy)* [Historical truth versus the falsifiers (A critique of bourgeois and bourgeois-nationalist falsifications of the history of Ukraine)]. Kiev, 1982.

Khodakovsky, Z. D. (Chodakowski, Z. D.). "Otryvok iz puteshestviia" [An extract from a travelogue]. *Russkii istoricheskii sbornik* 3, no. 2 (1839): 131–200.

Khodorov, A. E. "Ukrainskie siuzhety poezii K. F. Ryleeva" [The Ukrainian subjects of K. F. Ryleev's poetry]. In *Literaturnoe nasledie dekabristov*, ed. V. G. Bazanov and V. E. Vatsuro, 121–41. Leningrad, 1975.

Khomiakov, A. S. "Pisma" [Letters]. RA, no. 11 (1879).

_____. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete works]. 8 vols. 4th ed. Moscow, 1914.

Khuliakov. "Pismo iz Ukrainy" [A letter from Ukraine]. *Zhivopisets* 2 (1773): 297–300.

Khyzhniak, Z. I. *Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia* [The Kiev-Mohyla Academy]. Kiev, 1970.

Kievskaia starina [Kievan antiquity]. 94 vols. Kiev, 1882–1906.

Kirchner, W. "Ukrainian Tobacco for France." In his *Commercial Relations Between Russia and Europe 1400–1800*, 176–91. Bloomington, 1966.

Kirdan, B. P. *Sobirateli narodnoi poezii: iz istorii ukrainskoi folkloristiki XIXv.* [Collectors of folk poetry: From the history of nineteenth-century Ukrainian folklore studies]. Moscow, 1974.

Kireevsky, I. V. *Kritika i estetika* [Criticism and aesthetic appreciation]. Moscow, 1979.

Kiriakov, M. M. "O rode Kiriakovykh: zapiski" [On the Kiriakov clan: notes]. *Trudy Chernigovskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi kommissii* 11 (1915): 103–14.

Kishkin, L. S. "Iz perepiski cheshskikh 'buditelei' s russkimi uchenymi-slavistami" [From the Czech "awakeners'" correspondence with Russian Slavic scholars]. In *Slavianskii arkhiv*, ed. S. A. Nikitin et al., 77–87. Moscow, 1961.

Kititsyn, P. "Malorossiiskaia guberniia" [The Little Russian province]. KS 26 (1889): 534–43.

Kizevetter, A. A. "Imperator Nikolai I, kak konstitutsionnyi monarkh" [The Emperor Nicholas I as constitutional monarch]. In his *Istoricheskie ocherki*, 402–18. Moscow, 1912.

Klepatsky, P. "Holos kapitala z Ukrainy pershoi polovyny XIX st." [The voice of capital from Ukraine in the first half of the nineteenth century]. *Ukraina* (December 1929): 73–82.

_____. "Hospodarstvo Dykanskoho maietku Kochubeiv u pershii polovyni XIX v." [The management of the Dikanka estate of the Kochubei family in the first half of the nineteenth century]. In *Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika*

Dmytra Ivanovycha Bahaliia, vol. 1 (ZIFV UAN 51), ed. V. I. Lypsky et al., 967–89. Kiev, 1927.

_____."Lystuvannia Oleksandra Andriievycha Bezborodka z svoim batkom, iak istorychne dzherelo" [The correspondence of Oleksander Andriievych Bezborodko with his father as a historical source]. In *Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevskoho*, vol. 1, ed. P. A. Tutkivsky et al., 280–5. Kiev, 1928.

Klier, J. D. "The Ambiguous Legal Status of Russian Jewry in the Reign of Catherine II." SR 35 (1976): 504–17.

Kochubei, A. V. *Semeinaia khronika* [A family chronicle]. St. Petersburg, 1890.

Kochubei, P. A., ed. "Uchrezhdenie gimnazii vysshikh nauk v Nezhine: pisma gr. V. P. Kochubeia" [The establishment of the gymnasium for higher learning in Nizhyn: letters of Count V. P. Kochubei]. RS 2 (1870): 298–304.

Kochubei, V. P. "Pisma" [Letters]. AKV 14 (1879): 1–202.

_____."Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu" [Letters to Count S. R. Vorontsov]. AKV 18 (1880): 1–295.

_____."Pismo k chernigovskomu gubernatoru Frensdorfu" [A letter to Chernihiv governor Frensdorf]. RA 2 (1886): 163–4.

_____."Zapiska, predstavlena E. I. V. marta 27-go 1803 o ministerstve vnutrennikh del" [A memorandum presented to His Imperial Highness on 27 March 1803, concerning the ministry of internal affairs]. AKV 11 (1877): 450–64.

Kogan, Iu. Ia. *Prosvetitel XVIII veka Ia. P. Kozelsky* [The eighteenth-century enlightener Ia. P. Kozelsky]. Moscow, 1958.

Kohl, J. G. *Russia: St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkoff, Riga, Odessa, The German Provinces on the Baltic, The Steppes, The Crimea, and the Interior of the Empire*. London, 1842.

Kohut, Z. E. "The Abolition of Ukrainian Autonomy (1763–1786): A Case Study in the Integration of a Non-Russian Area into the Empire." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1975.

_____."A Gentry Democracy within an Autocracy: The Politics of Hryhorii Poletyka (1723/5–1784)." HUS 3–4 (1979–1980): 507–19.

———."Myths Old and New: The Haidamak Movement and the *Koliivshchyna* in Recent Historiography." HUS 1, no. 3 (1977): 359–78.

———."Problems in Studying the Post-Khmelnytsky Ukrainian Elite (1650s to 1830s)." In *Rethinking Ukrainian History*, ed. Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 103–19. Edmonton, 1981.

Kołakowski, L. *Main Currents of Marxism*. 3 vols. Oxford, 1978.

Komarov, A. I. "Ukrainskii iazyk, folklor i literatura v russkom obshchestve nachala XIX veka" [Ukrainian language, folklore and literature in Russian society at the beginning of the nineteenth century]. *Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo universiteta, seriia filologicheskikh nauk* 4 (1939): 124–58.

Kondrashov, N. A. *Osip Maksimovich Bodiansky*. Moscow, 1956.

Kondufor, Iu. Iu., et al., eds. *Druzhba i bratstvo russkogo i ukrainskogo narodov* [The friendship and brotherhood of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples]. 2 vols. Kiev, 1982.

———., R. G. Simonenko, and I. S. Khmel. "Kritika sovremennykh burzhuazno-natsionalisticheskikh falsifikatsii istorii druzhby i bratstva russkogo i ukrainskogo narodov" [A critique of contemporary bourgeois-nationalist falsifications of the history of the friendship and brotherhood of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples]. *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 4 (1980): 201–11.

Konisky, G. (Konissky, G.). *Sobranie sochinenii* [Works]. Ed. I. I. Grigorovich. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1835.

Konissky, G. (Konisky, G.). "Pisma k V. G. Rubanu" [Letters to V. H. Ruban]. Ed. B. Modzalevsky. RS 88 (1896): 467–71.

Korchmaryk, F. B. (Kortschmaryk, F. B.). *Dukhovi vplyvy Kyieva na Moskovshchynu v dobu hetmanskoi Ukrainy* [Kiev's cultural influences on Muscovy in the age of hetman Ukraine]. New York, 1964.

Korduba, M. *La littérature historique soviétique-ukrainienne: Compte-rendu 1917–1931*. Ed. Omeljan Pritsak. Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies 10. Munich, 1972 (first pub. Warsaw, 1938).

Korf, M. A. "Aleksandr I i ego priblizhennye" [Alexander I and his associates]. RS, no. 1 (1903): 5–36, no. 2 (1903): 211–34.

Korifei, ili kliuch literatury [Coryphaeus, or the key to literature]. Ed. Ia. Halynkovsky. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1802.

Kornilov, I. P., ed. "Graf P. V. Zavadovsky i F. Chatsky" [Count P. V. Zavadovsky and T. Czacki]. RS (February 1898): 428–30.

Kortschmaryk, F. B. (Korchmaryk, F. B.). *The Kievan Academy and its Role in the Organization of Education in Russia at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century*. New York, 1976 (1975 on dust-jacket).

Kosachevskaia, E. M. *M. A. Balugiansky i Petersburgskii universitet pervoi chetverti XIX veka* [M. A. Baludiansky and St. Petersburg University in the first quarter of the nineteenth century]. Leningrad, 1971.

Koshelev, A. I. *Zapiski* [Notes]. Newtonville, 1976 (first pub. Berlin, 1884).

Kostomarov, M. I. (Kostomarov, N. I., Galka, Ie.). *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia* [Academic-publicistic and polemical writings]. Ed. M. Hrushevsky. Kiev, 1928. (Zapysky b. Ukrainskoho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyivi: 28).

———. *Tvory* [Works]. 2 vols. Kiev, 1967.

Kostomarov, N. I. (Kostomarov, M. I., Galka, Ie.). "Dve russkie narodnosti" [Two Russian nationalities]. *Osnova*, no. 3 (1861): 33–80.

———. "Pavel Polubotok." In his *Sobranie sochinenii: istoricheskie monografii i issledovaniia*. Bk. 5, vol. 14: 689–709. St. Petersburg, 1904.

Kotliar, M. F. "Ideia davnoruskoi iednosti v istorychnomu rozvytku rosiiskoho, ukrainskoho i biloruskoho narodiv" [The idea of old Russian unity in the historical development of the Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian peoples]. UIZh, no. 9 (1980): 18–29.

Kotliarevsky, I. P. *Eneida* [Aeneid]. 3rd ed. St. Petersburg, 1809.

———. *Povne zibrannia tvoriv* [Complete works]. Kiev, 1969.

Kovalenko, L. A. "O vliianii frantsuzskoi burzhuaznoi revoliutsii na Ukrainu" [On the influence of the bourgeois French Revolution on Ukraine]. VI, no. 2 (1947): 80–7.

———."Rol revoliutsioneriv-dvorian i prohresyvnykh dvorianskykh istorykiv u rozrobtsi istorii ukrainskoho narodu" [The role of gentry revolutionaries and progressive gentry historians in the cultivation of the history of the Ukrainian people]. *Istoriohrafichni doslidzhennia v Ukrainskii RSR* 4 (1971): 173–93.

———.*Velyka frantsuzka burzhuazna revoliutsiia i hromadsko-politychni rukhy na Ukraini v kintsi XVIII st.* [The great bourgeois French revolution and socio-political movements in Ukraine at the end of the eighteenth century]. Kiev, 1973.

Kovalevskaia, N. *Martos*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1938.

Kovalevsky, A. L. "Nekotorye podrobnosti, kasaiushchiesia uchrezhdeniia Malorossiiskoi (Chernigovskoi) gubernii v 1796–1797 godakh (po neizdannym arkhivnym dokumentam)" [Certain details touching upon the establishment of the Little Russian (Chernihiv) province in 1796–7 (on the basis of unpublished archival documents)]. CGV, no. 1439 (1898).

Kovalevsky, E. "Pismo iz Ukrainy" [Letter from Ukraine]. *Sorevnovatel prosveshcheniia*, no. 7 (1819): 43–54.

Kovalsky, I. S. "Heneralnyi opys 1765–1769 rr.—dzherelo dlia vyvchennia sotsialno-ekonomichnykh vidnosyn na livoberezhnii Ukraini" [The "General Description" of 1765–9: a source for the study of socio-economic relations in Left-Bank Ukraine]. UIZh, no. 2 (1962): 97–101.

Kowal, Areta O. "Danilo Samoilowitz: An Eighteenth-Century Ukrainian Epidemiologist and His Role in the Moscow Plague." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 27 (1972): 434–46.

Kozak, Stefan. *U źródeł romantyzmu i nowożytnej myśli społecznej na Ukrainie* [The origins of romanticism and modern social thought in Ukraine]. Wrocław, Warsaw, Cracow and Gdansk, 1978.

Kozlov, V. P. *Kolumby rossiiskikh drevnostei* [The Columbuses of Russian antiquities]. Moscow, 1981.

Kozmenko, I. V., ed. "Dnevnik F. V. Chizhova 'Puteshestvie po slavianskim zemliam' kak istochnik" [F. V. Chizhov's diary "A journey through the Slavic lands" as a source]. *Slavianskii arkhiv*, ed. S. A. Nikitin et al., 127–260. Moscow, 1958.

Kravets, E. M. "Iz istorii russko-ukrainskikh sviazei v oblasti etnografii v XIX veke" [From the history of Russo-Ukrainian ties in the sphere of ethnography in the nineteenth century]. *Sovetskaia etnografiia*, no. 4 (1954): 132–41.

Kravtsov, N. I. "Russko- ukrainskie literaturnye sviazi" [Russo-Ukrainian literary ties]. *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta slavianovedeniia AN SSSR* 16 (1955): 34–66.

Krestova, L. V. "S. P. Rumiantsev—pisatel i publitsist (1755–1838)" [S. P. Rumiantsev—writer and publicist (1755–1838)]. *Vosemnadtsatyi vek* 6 (1964): 91–128.

Kross, A. G. "Russkoe posolstvo v Londone i znakomstvo anglichan s russkoi literaturoi v nachale XIX v." [The Russian Embassy in London and Englishmen's acquaintance with Russian literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century]. In *Sravnitelnoe izuchenie literatur*, ed. A. S. Bushmin et al., 99–107. Leningrad, 1976.

Kukolnik, N. V., and N. Lavrovsky, eds. *Gimnaziia vysshikh nauk i litsei kniazia Bezborodko* [The Prince Bezborodko gymnasium of higher learning and lycée]. 2d. ed. St. Petersburg, 1881.

Kuliabko, E. S. *Zamechatelnye pitomtsy akademicheskogo universiteta* [Notable graduates of the academy university]. Leningrad, 1977.

Kulichenko, M. I. "Osnovnye zakonomernosti formirovaniia i razvitiia novoi istoricheskoi obshchnosti—sovetskogo naroda" [The basic stages in the formation and development of a new historical community, the Soviet people]. *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 6 (1980): 26–45.

Kulish, P. A. *Chernaia rada: khronika 1663 goda* [The Black Council: a chronicle of the year 1663]. 2d Russian ed. St. Petersburg, 1908.

_____. *Mikhailo Charnyshenko, ili Malorossiia vosemdesiat let nazad* [Mykhailo Charnyshenko, or Little Russia eighty years ago]. 3 vols. Kiev, 1843.

_____. *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi* [Notes on southern Rus']. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1856–7.

Kulzhinsky, I. "Nekotorye zamechaniia kasatelno istorii kharaktera Malorossiiskoi poezii" [Certain observations concerning the history and character of Little Russian poetry]. *Ukrainskii zhurnal* 5 (1825): 43–54, 89–101, 178–87.

_____. *O znachenii Rossii v semeistve evropeiskikh narodov* [On the significance of Russia in the family of European peoples]. Moscow, 1840.

_____. *Malorossiiskaia derevnia* [The Little Russian countryside]. Moscow, 1827.

_____. "Vospominaniia uchitelia" [The recollections of a teacher]. *Moskvitianin* 6, no. 21 (1854), 5th pagination: 1–16.

Kurakin, F. A., ed. *Vosemnadtsatyi vek* [The eighteenth century]. 2 vols. Moscow, 1904–5.

Kvitka, G. F. "Ukraintsy" [Ukrainians]. In his *Sochineniia*, ed. A. A. Potebnia. 6 vols. Kharkiv, 1887–94. Vol. 4: 457–65.

Kyryliuk, Ie. "Bibliohrafiia prats P. O. Kulisha ta pysan pro noho" [A bibliography of the works of P. O. Kulish and of writings about him]. *Ukrainska bibliohrafiia* 2 (1929): 1–122.

Lapteva, L. P. "Osnovnye linii razvitiia nauchnogo slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX–nachale XXv." [Basic lines of development of academic Slavic studies in Russia in the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta, seriia Istoriia*, no. 2 (1977): 52–66.

Lavrinenko, Iu. *Vasyl Karazyn: arkhitekt vidrodzhennia* [Vasyl Karazyn: architect of rebirth]. Munich, 1975.

Lavrovsky, N. A. *Gimnaziia vysshikh nauk kn. Bezborodko v Nezhine (1820–32gg.)* [The Prince Bezborodko gymnasium of higher learning in Nizhyn (1820–32)] Kiev, 1879.

Lazarevsky, A. M. "Aleksandr Mikhailovich Markovich (1790–1865)." In his *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 4: 40–94.

_____."Ivan Romanovich Martos (ok. 1760–1831): biograficheskii ocherk" [Ivan Romanovych Martos, c. 1760–1831: a biographical essay]. in *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 3: 21–44.

_____."Kniaz Potemkin i malorusskie pesni" [Prince Potemkin and Little Russian songs]. In *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 1: 128–9.

_____., ed. *Liubetskii arkhiv* [Liubetskii archive]. Kiev, 1898.

_____."Liudi staroi Malorossii" [Men of old Little Russia]. KS (January 1882): 101–25; (March 1882): 479–98; (August 1882): 243–58.

_____.*Malorossiiskie pospolitye krestiane (1648–1783): istoriko-iuridicheskii ocherk po arkhivnym istochnikam* [Little Russian commoner peasants (1648–1783): a historico-juridical essay on the basis of archival sources]. Chernihiv, 1866.

_____., ed. *Motyzhinskii arkhiv* [Motyzhynskii archive]. Kiev, 1890.

_____."Ocherki iz byta Malorossii v XVIII veke" [Essays from the life of Little Russia in the eighteenth century]. RA (1871): 1884–1905, and RA 1 (1873): 341–88.

_____."Ocherki malorusskikh familii: materialy dlia istorii obshchestva v XVII i XVIII vekakh" [Essays on Little Russian families: materials for the history of society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. RA 1 (1875): 91–7, 311–25, 439–52; 2 (1875): 248–64, 402–9; 3 (1875): 297–308; 3 (1876): 437–55.

_____."Ocherki stareishikh dvorianskikh rodov Chernigovskoi gubernii" [Essays on the oldest gentry clans of Chernihiv province]. *Zapiski Chernigovskogo gubernskogo statisticheskogo komiteta* 2 (1868): 35–148.

_____.*Ocherki, zametki, i dokumenty po istorii Malorossii* [Essays, notes and documents on the history of Little Russia]. 5 vols. Kiev, 1892–9.

_____.*Opisanie staroi Malorossii: materialy dlia istorii zaseleniia, zemlevladeniia i upravleniia* [A description of old Little Russia: materials for the history of its settlement, land ownership and government]. 3 vols. Kiev, 1888–1902.

_____."Otryvki iz semeinogo arkhiva Poletik" [Fragments from the

family archive of the Poletykas]. In *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 1: 32–51.

———."Pavel Polubotok: ocherk iz istorii Malorossii XVIII veka" [Pavlo Polubotok: an essay in the history of eighteenth-century Little Russia]. RA 18, no. 1 (1880): 137–209.

———."Po povodu sta let ot dnia smerti grafa P. A. Rumiantseva" [On the occasion of the centenary of P. A. Rumiantsev's death]. In *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 4: 1–26.

———."Prezhnie izyskateli malorusskoi stariny" [Former investigators of Little Russian antiquity]. In *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 2: 78–140.

———."Statisticheskie svedeniia ob ukrainskikh narodnykh shkolakh i gospitaliakh v XVIII veke" [Statistical information about Ukrainian popular schools and hospitals in the eighteenth century]. *Osnova*, no. 5 (1862), 3rd pagination: 82–9.

———.,ed. *Sulimovskii arkhiv* [Sulimovskii archive]. Kiev, 1884.

———."Vasilii Grigorevich Ruban." In *Ocherki*... (q.v.) 4: 36–7.

———.*Zamechaniia na istoricheskie monografii D. P. Millera o malorusskom dvorianstve i o statutovykh sudakh* [Observations on D. P. Miller's historical monographs about the Little Russian gentry and the Statute courts]. Kharkiv, 1898.

———., and N. Konstantinovich. *Obozrenie rumiantsovskoi opisi Malorossii* [A survey of Rumiantsev's "Description" of Little Russia]. 4 vols. Chernihiv, 1866–85.

Lazarevsky, M. "Pamiati moi" [My recollections]. *Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 2 (1927): 19–55.

Lebedev, A. S. "Kharkovskii kollegium kak prosvetitelnyi tsentr Slobodskoi Ukrainy do uchrezhdeniia v nei universiteta" [The Kharkiv Collegium as an educational centre for Slobodian Ukraine before the establishment of a university there]. ChOIDR, no. 4 (1885), 1st pagination: 1–103.

Le Donne, J. P. "Appointments to the Russian Senate 1762–1796." CMRS 16, no. 1 (January-March 1975): 27–56.

———."Catherine's Governors and Governors-General 1763–1796." CMRS 20, no. 1 (January-March 1979): 15–42.

———."The Provincial and Local Police under Catherine the

Great, 1775–1796." *Canadian Slavic Studies* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1970): 513–28.

Leighton, L. G. *Russian Romanticism: Two Essays*. The Hague and Paris, 1975.

Lemercier-Quelquejay, C. "Un condottiere lithuanien du XVIe siècle le prince Dimitrij Višneveckij et l'origine de la *Seč'* Zaporogue d'après les Archives ottomanes." In *La Russie et l'Europe XVIe–XXe siècles*, ed. F. Braudel et al., 149–67. Paris, 1970.

Lenin, V. I. "Ukraina" [Ukraine]. In his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 32: 341–2. 5th ed. 55 vols. Moscow, 1958–65.

Leskov, N. S. "Administrativnaia gratsiia" [Administrative grace]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii v odinnatsati tomakh*, 9:388–96. Moscow, 1958.

Lesur, C.-L. *Histoirie des Kosaques: Épreuve*. Paris, 1813.

_____. *Histoire des Kosaques, précédée d'une introduction ou coup d'oeil sur les peuples qui ont habité le pays des Kosaques, avant l'invasion des Tartares*. 2 vols. Paris, 1814.

Lewin, P. "Polish-Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations of the Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries: New Approaches." SEEJ 24, no. 3 (1980): 256–69.

Liashchenko, A. "Lyst H. F. Kvitky do I. M. Snehiriova" [A letter of H. F. Kvitka to I. M. Snegirev]. *Ukraina*, no. 5 (1925): 103–7.

Lileev, M. "Iz nachalnoi istorii raskola v Starodube" [From the early history of the Schism in Starodub]. KS 26 (1889): 377–401.

Linage de Vauciennes, P. *L'Origine véritable du soulèvement des Cosaques contre la Pologne*. Paris, 1674.

Lincoln, W. Bruce. *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia's Enlightened Bureaucrats 1825–1861*. DeKalb, 1982.

Listovsky, I. "Graf Petr Vasilevich Zavadovsky" [Count Petro Vasylovych Zavadovsky]. RA 2 (1883): 81–174.

Liubimenko, I. I. "Proekt 1779g. ob ustroistve filiala Akademii nauk v Glukhove i o napisanii istorii Ukrainy" [A project of 1779 on setting up a branch of the Academy of Sciences in Hlukhiv and on writing a history of Ukraine]. *Vestnik AN*

SSSR, no. 5 (1935): 47–54.

———., ed. *Uchenaia korrespondentsiia Akademii nauk 1766–1782* [The academic correspondence of the Academy of Sciences, 1766–1782]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1937. (*Trudy arkhiva AN SSSR* 2).

Liubimov, S. "Borba mezhdu predstaviteliami velikorusskogo i malorusskogo napravleniia v Velikorossii v kontse XVII i nachale XVIII vekov" [The struggle between representatives of the Great Russian and Little Russian tendencies in Great Russia at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries]. ZhMNP 180 (August 1875): 117–52; 181 (September 1875): 74–104.

Loboiko, I. N. *O vazhneishikh izdaniiakh Gerbershteina zapisok o Rossii s kriticheskim obozreniem ikh soderzhaniia* [On the most important editions of Herberstein's notes on Russia, with a critical survey of their contents]. St. Petersburg, 1818.

———.*Vzgliad na drevniuiu slovesnost skandinavskogo severa* [A look at the ancient literature of the Scandinavian north]. St. Petersburg, 1821.

Łojek, J. "Catherine II's Armed Intervention in Poland: Origins of the Political Decisions at the Russian Court in 1791 and 1792." *Canadian Slavic Studies* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1970): 547–69.

Longinov, M. "Mikhail Matveevich Kheraskov." RA, no. 8 (1873): 1453–79.

Lord, R. H. *The Second Partition of Poland.* Cambridge, Mass., 1915.

Losky, I. "Ukraintsi na studiiakh v Nimechchyni v XVI–XVIII st." [Ukrainians who studied in Germany from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries]. ZNTSh 151 (1931): 99–110.

Lotman, Iu. M. "Pisatel, kritik i perevodchik Ia. A. Galinkovsky" [The writer, critic and translator Ia. A. Halynkovsky]. *Vosemnadtsatyi vek* 4 (1959): 230–56.

Lototsky, O. "Suspilne stanovyshche biloho (svitskoho) dukhoventsva na Ukraini i Rosii v XVIII v." [The social condition of the white (secular) clergy in Ukraine and Russia in the eighteenth century]. ZNTSh 21 (1898), 2d

pagination: 1–46.

Lubianovsky, F. P. *Vospominaniia* [Recollections]. Moscow, 1872.

Luciani, G. *Le Livre de la genèse du peuple ukrainien.* Paris, 1956.

_____. *La société des slaves unis (1823–1825): panslavisme et solidarité slave au XIX siècle.* Bordeaux, 1963.

Luckyj, George S. N. *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798–1847.* Munich, 1971.

Lukashevich, P. A. *Malorossiiskie i chervonorusskie dumy i pesni* [Little Russian and Red Russian ballads and songs]. St. Petersburg, 1836.

Lukomsky, G. K. *Baturinskii dvorets, ego istoriia, razrushenie i restavratsiia* [The palace of Baturyn, its history, destruction, and restoration]. St. Petersburg, 1912.

Luzianina, L. N. "Epigramma na Karamzina" [An epigram on Karamzin]. In *Literaturnoe nasledie dekabristov*, ed. V. G. Bazanov and V. E. Vatsuro, 260–5. Leningrad, 1975.

Lvov, F. P. *O penii v Rossii* [On singing in Russia]. St. Petersburg, 1834.

Lytvynenko, M. A. *Dzherela istorii Ukrainy XVIII st.* [Sources for the history of eighteenth-century Ukraine]. Kharkiv, 1970.

_____." 'Topograficheskoe opisanie Kharkovskogo namestnichestva' iak dzherelo dlia vyvchennia istorii Slobidskoi Ukrainy druhoi polovyny XVIII stolittia" [The "Topographical Description of Kharkiv province" as a source for the study of the history of Slobodian Ukraine in the second half of the eighteenth century]. UIZh, no. 1 (1966): 131–5.

Mace, James E. "Politics and History in Soviet Ukraine, 1921–1933." *Nationalities Papers* 10, no. 2 (Fall 1982): 157–79.

Madariaga, I. de. "Catherine II and the Serfs: A reconsideration of some problems." SEER 52, no. 126 (January 1974): 34–62.

_____."The Foundation of the Russian Educational System by Catherine II." SEER 57, no. 3 (July 1979): 369–95.

_____."Power to the Panins." *Times Literary Supplement* (25 June 1976): 788.

_____. *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great.* London, 1981.

Magocsi, P. R. "The Language Question as a Factor in the National Movement in Eastern Galicia." In *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*, ed. Andrei S. Markovits and Frank E. Sysyn, 220–38. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

———. *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848–1948*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1978.

———., ed. *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States: A Symposium*. Cambridge, Mass., 1979.

Maikov, P. M., ed. *Pisma A. A. Bezborodko k grafu P. A. Rumiantsovu, 1775–93gg.* [The letters of O. A. Bezborodko to Count P. A. Rumiantsev, 1775–93]. St. Petersburg, 1900.

———., ed. *Pisma grafa P. V. Zavadovskogo k feldmarshalu grafu P. A. Rumiantsevu, 1775–91 godov* [Count P. V. Zavadovsky's letters to Field-Marshal Count P. A. Rumiantsev, 1775–91]. St. Petersburg, 1901.

———."Rumiantsov, Nikolai Petrovich." RBS, vol. "Romanova-Riasovsky," 492–520. Petrograd, 1918.

Makhnovets, L. "Epistoliarnyi dokument 1824 roku pro Skovorodu" [An epistolary document of 1824 about Skovoroda]. *Narodna tvorchist ta etnohrafiia*, no. 5 (1972): 37–44.

Makogonenko, G. P., ed. *Pisma russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka* [Letters of eighteenth-century Russian writers]. Leningrad, 1980.

Maksimovich, G. A. *Deiatelnost Rumiantseva-Zadunaiskogo po upravleniiu Malorossii* [Rumiantsev-Zadunaisky's activity in the administration of Little Russia]. Vol. 1. Nizhyn, 1913.

———.*Obuchenie gramote i voinskoi eksertsitsii v Staroi Malorossii v kontse XVIII veka* [Instruction in literacy and military exercises in old Little Russia at the end of the eighteenth century]. Kiev, 1913.

———.*Vybory i nakazy v Malorossii v zakonodatelnuiu kommissiiu 1767g. Chast pervaia: vybory i sostavlenie nakazov* [Elections and instructions in Little Russia for the Legislative Commission of 1767. Part one: the elections and the drawing-up of the instruetions]. Nizhyn, 1917.

Maksimovich, M. A. "Kritiko-istoricheskoe issledovanie o russkom iazyke" [A historico-critical study of the Russian language]. ZhMNP 17 (1838): 533–63.

_____."O poeme Pushkina 'Poltava' v istoricheskom otnoshenii" [On Pushkin's poem "Poltava" from a historical point of view]. *Atenei*, no. 2 (1829): 501–15.

_____."O prichinakh vzaimnogo ozhestocheniia poliakov i malorossiian, byvshego v XVII veke (pismo k M. A. Grabovskomu)" [On the reasons for the reciprocal bitterness between Poles and Little Russians in the seventeenth century (a letter to M. Grabowski)]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii* 1: 248–76. Kiev, 1876.

_____."Ob istoricheskom romane G. Kulisha 'Chernaia Rada' 1857g." [On Mr. Kulish's historical novel of 1857, *The Black Council*]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii* 1: 515–31. Kiev, 1876.

_____."Predislovie k sobraniiu Malorossiiskikh pesen" [Preface to a collection of Little Russian songs]. VE 154, no. 15 (1827): 184–200.

_____.*Ukrainskie narodnye pesni, chast pervaia* [Ukrainian folksongs, part one]. Moscow, 1834.

Malaniuk, Evhen. "Hohol-Gogol." *Ukrainian Review* 14, no. 3 (1967): 55–69.

Malash-Aksamitova, L. A. "Dolenga-Khodakovsky (Adam Charnotsky) i ego nasledie" [Dołega Chodakowski (Adam Czarnocki) and his legacy]. *Lud* 51, no. 1 (1967 for 1966): 123–63.

Malcolm, Neil. "Ideology and Intrigue in Russian Journalism under Nicholas I: 'Moskovskii telegraf' and 'Severnaya pchela'." Unpublished D. Phil. dissertation, Oxford University: 1974.

Malgin, T. "Opisanie Malorossiiskogo tabachnogo proizrasteniia" [A description of the way tobacco is grown in Little Russia]. *Trudy Volnogo Ekonomicheskogo Obshchestva* 24 (1773): 144–70.

Manzenko, P. T., et al., eds. *Ideinye sviazi ukrainskikh i russkikh revoliutsionnykh demokratov* [Ideological bonds between Ukrainian and Russian revolutionary democrats]. Kiev, 1981.

Marchenko, M. I. *Ukrainska istoriohrafiia (z davnykh chasiv do seredyny XIX st.)* [Ukrainian historiography (from remote times to the middle of the nineteenth century)]. Kiev, 1959.

———., and L. K. Polukhin. *Vydatnyi istoryk Ukrainy O. M. Lazarevsky* [The outstanding historian of Ukraine O. M. Lazarevsky]. Kiev, 1958.

Margolis, Iu. D. *Istoricheskie vzgliady T. G. Shevchenko* [The historical views of T. H. Shevchenko]. Leningrad, 1964.

Marker, G. J. "Novikov's Readers." *Modern Language Review* 77, no. 4 (October 1982): 894–905.

———."Publishing and the Formation of a Reading Public in Eighteenth-Century Russia." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley: 1977.

———."Russia and the 'Printing Revolution': Notes and Observations." SR 41 (1982): 266–83.

Markevich, N. A. "Arkhiv N. A. Markevicha" [M. A. Markevych's archive]. *Otechestvennye zapiski*, no. 2 (1851), *Smes*: 328–36.

———.*Istoriia Malorossii* [History of Little Russia]. 5 vols. Moscow, 1842–3.

———.*Ukrainskie melodii* [Ukrainian melodies]. Moscow, 1831.

Markovich, Ia. M. *Zapiski o Malorossii, eia zhiteliakh i proizvedeniiakh: chast pervaia* [Notes on Little Russia, its inhabitants and products: part one]. St. Petersburg, 1798.

Markovits, Andrei S., and Frank E. Sysyn, eds. *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia.* Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

Martynov, I. F. *Knigoizdatel Nikolai Novikov* [The book publisher Nikolai Novikov]. Moscow, 1981.

———."Provintsialnye knigoliuby XVIII veka (Po materialam knigovedcheskogo obsledovaniia bibliotek, muzeev i arkhivov Vologdy, 1976g.)" [Eighteenth-century provincial book-lovers (Based on materials derived from a 1976 inspection of books in the libraries, museums and archives of Vologda)]. In *Russkie biblioteki i chastnye knizhnye sobraniia XVI–XIX vekov*, ed. D. V. Ter-Ovanesian, 125–40. Leningrad, 1979.

———."Zhurnalist, istorik i diplomat XVIII veka Grigorii

Leontevich Braiko" [The journalist, historian and diplomat Hryhorii Leontiovych Braiko]. *Vosemnadtsatyi vek* 12: 225–41.

Martynov, I. I., ed. *Severnyi vestnik* [The northern herald]. 8 vols. St. Petersburg, 1804–5.

_____."Zapiski" [Memoirs]. *Zaria*, no. 6–8 (1871), *Prilozheniia*: 69–185.

Masanov, I. F. *Slovar psevdonimov* [A Dictionary of pseudonyms]. 4 vols. Moscow, 1956–60.

Maślanka, J. *Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski: jego miejsce w kulturze polskiej i wpływ na polskie piśmiennictwo romantyczne* [Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski: his place in Polish culture and influence on Polish Romantic literature]. Wrocław, Warsaw and Cracow, 1965.

Maslov, V. "Ukrainska etnohrafiia pershoi polovyny XIX stolittia (Sotsialno-ekonomichne tlo etnohrafichnykh studii)" [Ukrainian ethnography in the first half of the nineteenth century (The socio-economic background of ethnographic studies)]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu istorii materialnoi kultury VUAN* 2 (1934): 93–134.

Maslovich, V. *Zamechaniia i chuvstvovaniia ili puteshestvie, kakikh malo, ili kakikh ochen mnogo, iz Kharkova do Sanktpeterburga* [Observations and sentiments, whether few or very many, or a journey from Kharkiv to St. Petersburg]. St. Petersburg, 1818.

Mastak, I. (Bodiansky, O.). "Malorossiiskie poslovitsy i pogovorki, sobrannye V. N. S. Kharkov, 1834" [Little Russian proverbs and sayings, collected by V. N. S. Kharkiv, 1834]. *Teleskop* 21 (1834): 336–48.

Medvedeva, I. N. "Gnedich v obshchestvennoi i literaturnoi borbe pervoi chetverti XIX veka" [Hnidych in the social and literary struggle of the first quarter of the nineteenth century]. Unpublished candidate's dissertation. 2 vols. Leningrad, 1949.

_____."N. I. Gnedich i dekabristy (iz istorii literaturnykh programm i obedinenii dekabristov)" [M. I. Hnidych and the Decembrists (from the history of the literary programmes and societies of the Decembrists)]. In

Dekabristy i ikh vremia: materialy i soobshcheniia, ed. M. P. Alekseev and B. S. Meilakh, 101–55. Moscow and Leningrad, 1951.

Metlinsky, A. (Mogila, A.). *Iuzhnyi russkii sbornik* [A south Russian compendium]. 5 pts in one vol. Kharkiv, 1848.

———. *Narodnye iuzhnorusskie pesni* [South Russian folksongs]. Kiev, 1854.

Meynieux, A. *La littérature et le métier d'écrivain en Russie avant Pouchkine*. Paris, 1966.

Miakotin, V. A. (Mjakotin, V. A.). *Ocherki sotsialnoi istorii Ukrainy v XVII–XVIII vv.* [Essays on the social history of Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. 1 vol. in 3 parts. Prague, 1924–6.

———. "Prikreplenie krestianstva levoberezhnoi Malorossii v XVIII stoletii" [The enserfment of the peasantry of Left-Bank Little Russia in the eighteenth century]. *Russkoe bogatstvo*, no. 2 (1894): 29–52; no. 3 (1894): 202–28; no. 4 (1894): 129–55.

———. "Prikreplenie krestianstva levoberezhnoi Ukrainy v XVII–XVIII vv." [The enserfment of the peasantry of Left-Bank Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. *Godishnik na Sofiiskiia universitet* 28, no. 1 (1931–2), 1st pagination: 1–172.

Mijakovskyj, V. "Ševčenko in the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius." In *Taras Ševčenko 1814–1861: A Symposium*, ed. V. Mijakovskyj and George Y. Shevelov, 9–36. The Hague, 1962.

Mikhail Semenovich Shchepkin 1788–1863g.: Zapiski ego, pisma, rasskazy, materialy dlia biografii i rodoslovnaia [Mikhail Semenovich Shchepkin 1788–1863: memoirs, letters, stories, materials for a biography and a genealogy]. St. Petersburg, 1914.

Mikhailovsky-Danilevsky, A. I. "Iz vospominanii: 1824 god" [From my memoirs: the year 1824]. RS, no. 10 (1900): 201–18.

Miller, D. P. *Aleksei Grigorevich Razumovsky: istoricheskii rasskaz* [Oleksa Hryhorovych Rozumovsky: a historical tale]. 2d. ed. Kharkiv, 1901.

———. *Ocherki iz istorii i iuridicheskogo byta staroi Malorossii:*

Prevrashchenie kozatskoi starshiny v dvorianstvo [Essays on the history and juridical life of old Little Russia: the transformation of the Cossack starshyna into gentry]. Kiev, 1897.

Mitiurov, B. N. *Razvitie pedagogicheskoi mysli na Ukraine v XVI–XVII vv.* [The development of pedagogical thought in Ukraine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries]. Kiev, 1968.

Mjakotin, V. A. (Miakotin, V. A.). "La fixation des paysans à la glèbe aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siecles." *Le monde slave*, new series 4 (October-December 1932): 31–58, 182–207.

Mochulsky, M. "Kn. Mykola Andreievych Tsertelev: biohrafichno-literaturnyi narys" [Prince Mykola Andriiovych Tsertelev: a literary-biographical sketch]. *Ukraina*, no. 3–4 (1917): 43–76.

Modzalevsky, B., ed. "Pisma Georgiia Konisskogo k V. G. Rubanu" [Heorhii Konysky's letters to V. H. Ruban]. RS 88 (1896): 467–71.

_____."Vasilii Grigorevich Ruban" [Vasyl Hryhorovych Ruban]. RS 91 (1897): 393–415.

Modzalevsky, V. L. *Malorossiiskii rodoslovnik* [A Little Russian genealogical register]. 4 vols. Kiev, 1908–14.

Mogila, A. (Metlinsky, A.). *Dumky i pisni ta shche de-shcho* [Ballads and songs and a little more]. Kharkiv, 1839.

Mogilevsky, I. "O drevnosti i samobytnosti Iuzhno-Russkogo iazyka" [On the antiquity and distinctive character of the South Russian language]. In *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi*, ed. P. Kulish, 2: 257–79. St. Petersburg, 1857.

Mogiliansky, N. M. "Tragediia Ukrainy (Iz perezhitogo v Kieve v 1918 godu)" [Ukraine's tragedy (my experience in Kiev in 1918)]. *Arkhiv russkoi revoliutsii* 11 (1923): 74–105.

Mohyliansky, M. "Kulish and Shevchenko." In *Shevchenko and the Critics*, ed. George S. N. Luckyj, 190–211. Toronto, Buffalo, and London, 1980.

Moiseeva, G. N. "M. V. Lomonosov na Ukraine" [M. V. Lomonosov in Ukraine]. In *Russkaia literatura XVIII veka i slavianskie literatury*, ed. P. N. Berkov and

I. Z. Serman, 79–101. Moscow and Leningrad, 1963.

———."Russkaia istoricheskaia proza pervoi poloviny XVIIIv. i polskie istoriki" [Russian historical prose of the first half of the eighteenth century and Polish historians]. In *Polsko-russkie literaturnye sviazi*, ed. N. I. Balashov et al., 83–106. Moscow, 1970.

———."Slavistika v Rossii XVIII v." [Slavic studies in eighteenth-century Russia]. In *Istoriia, kultura, etnografiia i folklor slavianskikh narodov*, ed. I. I. Kostiushko et al., 511–16. Moscow, 1978.

———.*Spaso-Iaroslavskii khoronograf i "Slovo o polku Igoreve"* [The Spaso-Iaroslavskii chronograph and "The Lay of Igor's Campaign"]. Leningrad, 1976.

Molodyk [The New Moon]. See Betsky, I., ed.

(Myklashevsky, M. P.). "Iz bumag senatora M. P. Miklashevskogo" [From the papers of Senator M. P. Myklashevsky]. KS 28 (1890): 120–4, 526–32; 29 (1890): 148–53; 35 (1891): 129–33.

Mykytas, V. L. *Cherez hory i kordony (Kulturni i literaturni zviazky Zakarpattia z Ukrainoiu ta Rosiieiu u XIX–XX st.* [Across mountains and frontiers (Cultural and literary ties of Transcarpathia with Ukraine and Russia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries)]. Kiev, 1977.

Mylnikov, A. S. " 'Slovo o polku Igoreve' i slavianskie izucheniia kontsa XVIII–nachala XIX veka" ["The Lay of Igor's Campaign" and Slavic studies at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries]. VI, no. 8 (1981): 35–48.

Nakonechny, M. "Persha hramatyka 'novoi' literaturnoi movy" [The first grammar of a "new" literary language]. *Movoznavstvo*, no. 5 (1968): 43–51.

Narezhny, V. T. "Bursak: malorossiiskaia povest" [The seminarist: a Little Russian tale]. In his *Izbrannye sochineniia v dvukh tomakh*, 2: 5–296. Moscow, 1956.

Neustroev, A. N. *Istoricheskoe razyskanie o russkikh povremennykh izdaniiakh i sbornikakh za 1703–1802 gg.* [A historical quest for Russian periodicals and miscellanies, 1703–1802]. St. Petersburg, 1874.

Nevsky, V. A. "A. F. Shafonsky: odin iz pionerov otechestvennoi sanitarii (Kratkaia biograficheskaia spravka)" [O. F. Shafonsky: one of the pioneers of native hygiene]. *Gigiena i sanitariia*, no. 11 (1950): 42–5.

Nichik, V. M., et al., eds. *Ideinye sviazi progressivnykh myslitelei bratskikh narodov (XVII–XVIII vv.)* [Ideological links between the progressive thinkers of brother peoples (17–18th centuries)]. Kiev, 1978.

Niederhauser, E. "Literature and the Arts in the Movements of National Revival amongst the Peoples of Eastern Europe in the first half of the Nineteenth Century." ESR 3 (1973): 347–68.

_____. *The Rise of Nationality in Eastern Europe*. Budapest, n.d. (Hungarian ed. 1976).

Nikiforovskaia, N. A. *Bibliograficheskoe opisanie v Rossii* [Bibliographical description in Russia]. Leningrad, 1981.

Nikolai Mikhailovich, Grand Duke. *Imperator Aleksandr I* [The Emperor Aleksandr I]. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1912.

_____. *Russkie portrety XVIII i XIX stoletii* [Russian portraits of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries]. Vol. 5. St. Petersburg, 1909.

Obolensky, D. *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe 500–1453*. Pbk. ed. London, 1974.

Ohloblyn, O. "American Revolution and Ukrainian Liberation Ideas During the Late Eighteenth Century." *Ukrainian Quarterly* 11 (1955): 203–12.

_____. " 'Annales de la Petite-Russie' Sherera i 'Istoriia Rusov' " [Scherer's *Annales de la Petite-Russie* and the *Istoriia Rusov*]. *Naukovyi zbirnyk Ukrainskoho vilnoho universitetu* 5 (1948): 87–94.

_____. "Ancestry of Mykola Gogol (Hohol)." AUAAS 12, nos. 1–2 (33–4) (1969–72): 3–43.

_____. "Berlinska misiia Kapnista 1791 roku: Istoriohrafiia i metodolohiia pytannia (Z pryvodu novoi "teorii" Prof. Viliiama Edzhertona)" [Kapnist's Berlin mission of 1791: the historiography and methodology of the question (Concerning the new "theory" of Professor William Edgerton)]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk* 11, no. 1–3 (41–3) (1974):

85–103.

———."Fedir Tumansky i ioho proiekt akademichnoi knyharni v Hlukhovi kintsia 1770-kh rr." [Fedir Tumansky and his plan to set up an academy bookshop in Hlukhiv at the end of the 1770s]. *Naukovyi zbirnyk Ukrainskoi vilnoi Akademii nauk u SShA* 2 (1953): 106–14.

———.*Liudy staroi Ukrainy* [Men of old Ukraine]. Munich, 1959.

———.*Opanas Lobysevych 1732–1805*. Munich and New York, 1966.

———.*Spysky "Istorii Rusiv"* [Copies of the *Istoriia Rusov*]. Munich, 1956.

———."Ukrainian Autonomists of the 1780s and 1790s and Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky." AUAAS 6, nos. 3–4 (1958): 1313–26.

———."Ukrainian Historiography 1917–1956." AUAAS 5–6, nos. 4 (18)—1, 2 (19–20) (1957): 305–435.

Okenfuss, M. L. "Education and Empire: School Reform in Enlightened Russia." JFGO 27, no. 1 (1979): 41–68.

———."The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education." In *The Eighteenth Century in Russia*, ed. J. G. Garrard, 106–30. Oxford, 1973.

Okinshevich, L. (Okinshevych, L., Okynshevych, L.). *Ukrainian Society and Government 1648–1781*. Munich, 1978.

Okinshevych, L. (Okinshevich, L., Okynshevych, L.). "Znachne viiskove tovarystvo v Ukraini-Hetmanshchyni XVII–XVIII st." [The noble army fellows in Hetman Ukraine of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. ZNTSh 157 (1948): 1–231.

Okynshevych, L. (Okinshevich, L., Okinshevych, L.). "Heneralna rada na Ukraini-Hetmanshchyni XVII–XVIII st." [The general council in Hetman Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. *Pratsi komisii dlia vyuchuvannia istorii zakhidno-ruskoho ta ukrainskoho prava* 6 (1929): 253–425. (*Zbirnyk sotsiialno-ekonomichnoho viddilu Ukrainskoi akademii nauk* 18).

———."Heneralna starshyna na livoberezhnii Ukraini XVII–XVIII vv." [The Cossack chief officers in Left-Bank Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries].

Pratsii komisii dlia vyuchuvannia istorii zakhidno-ruskoho ta ukrainskoho prava 2 (1926): 84–175. (*Zbirnyk sotsiialno-ekonomichnoho viddilu Ukrainskoi akademii nauk* 6).

_____."Natsional-demokratychna kontseptsiia istorii prava Ukrainy v pratsiakh akad. M. Hrushevskoho" [The national-democratic conception of the history of Ukrainian law in the works of Academician M. Hrushevsky]. *Ukraina*, nos. 1–2 (January–June 1932): 93–109.

_____."Rada starshynska na Hetmanshchyni" [The council of Cossack officers in the Hetmanate]. *Ukraina*, no. 4 (1924): 12–27.

_____."Tsentralni ustanovy Ukrainy-Hetmanshchyny XVII–XVIII st., ch. II: Rada starshyny" [Central institutions of Hetman Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, pt. 2: The council of Cossack officers]. *Pratsi komisii dlia vyuchuvannia istorii zakhidno-ruskoho ta ukrainskoho prava* 8 (1930): i–ii, 1–352. (*Zbirnyk sotsiialno-ekonomichnoho viddilu Ukrainskoi akademii nauk* 35).

Oliinyk, L. V. "Dekabrystskyi rukh na Ukraini v radianskii istoriohrafii" [The Decembrist movement in Ukraine in Soviet historiography]. UIZh, no. 12 (1965): 11–23.

Orlai, I. S. "Istoriia o Karpato-Rossakh" [History of the Carpatho-Russians]. *Severnyi vestnik* 1 (1804): 158–72, 261–76; 3 (1804): 267–94.

Orlov, V. N. "Nikolai Polevoi i ego 'Moskovskii telegraf'." [Nikolai Polevoi and his "Moscow telegraph"]. In his *Puti i sudby: literaturnye ocherki*, 313–448. Leningrad, 1971.

_____., ed. *Nikolai Polevoi: materialy po istorii russkoi literatury i zhurnalistiki tridtsatykh godov* [Nikolai Polevoi: materials relating to the history of Russian literature and journalism of the (eighteen-) thirties]. Leningrad, n.d.

Osnova [Foundation]. St. Petersburg, 1861–2.

Ostrianyn, D. *Svitohliad M. O. Maksymovycha* [The outlook of M. O. Maksymovych]. Kiev, 1960.

Ostrovskaia, N. K. "Istoricheskaia povest O. Somova 'Gaidamak' " [O. Somov's historical story "Haidamak"]. *Pratsi Odeskoho derzhavnoho universitetu* 148, vyp. 2 (1958): 45–53.

Palkin, B. N. *Russkie gospitalnye shkoly XVIIIv. i ikh vospitanniki* [Eighteenth-century Russian hospital schools and their pupils]. Moscow, 1959.

Panashenko, V. V. "Navchannia kozatskykh ditei hramoty ta viiskovoi spravy na livoberezhnii Ukraini v XVIII st." [Teaching Cossack children literacy and the martial art in eighteenth-century Left-Bank Ukraine]. UIZh, no. 2 (1972): 103–8.

Pankratev, P. P. "Zamechanie o Kievskoi akademii" [A comment on the Kiev Academy]. ChOIDR, no. 1 (1861), *Smes*: 166–72.

Pashuk, A. I. *Sud i sudochynstvo na Livoberezhnii Ukraini v XVII–XVIII st. (1648–1782)* [The court and legal procedure in Left-Bank Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (1648–1782)]. Lviv, 1967.

(Passek, V. V.). *Putevye zapiski Vadima* — [The travel notes of Vadim —]. Moscow, 1834.

Pauls, John P. *Historicity of Pushkin's "Poltava"*. 2d ed. N.p., 1962.

Pavlov-Silvansky, N. P. "Materialisty dvadtsatykh godov" [Materialists of the (eighteen-) twenties]. In his *Sochineniia* 2: 239–88. 3 vols. St. Petersburg, 1909–10/The Hague, 1966.

Pavlovsky, A. *Grammatika malorossiiskogo narechiia* [A Grammar of the Little Russian dialect]. St. Petersburg, 1818.

_____. *Pribavlenie k grammatike malorossiiskogo narechiia, ili, otvet na retsenziiu, zdelannuiu na onuiu grammatiku* [A Supplement to the grammar of the Little Russian dialect, or a reply to the review of this grammar]. St. Petersburg, 1822.

_____. *Stikhi na konchinu ego svetlosti Kantslera . . . Aleksandra Andreevicha Bezborodko* [Verses on the death of his excellency Prince Oleksander Andriiovych Bezborodko]. St. Petersburg, 1805.

Pavlovsky, I. F. *K istorii Malorossii vo vremia general-gubernatora kn. N. G. Repnina* [Toward a history of Little Russia in the time of Governor-General Prince N. G. Repnin]. Poltava, 1905.

_____. *Ocherk deiatelnosti malorossiiskogo general-gubernatora kniazia A. B. Kurakina (1802–8gg.)* [An essay on the activity of the Governor-General of Little Russia, Prince A. B. Kurakin (1802–8)]. Poltava, 1914.

_____. "Prikhodskie shkoly v staroi Malorossii i prichiny ikh unichtozheniia" [Parish schools in old Little Russia and the reasons for their elimination]. KS 84 (1904): 1–40.

Pelech, O. "Towards a Historical Sociology of the Ukrainian Ideologues in the Russian Empire of the 1830's and 1840's." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1976.

Pelenski, J. "The *Haidamak* Insurrections and the Old Regimes in Eastern Europe." In *The American and European Revolutions, 1776–1848: Sociopolitical and Ideological Aspects*, ed. J. Pelenski, 228–47. Iowa City, 1980.

_____. "The Origins of the Official Muscovite Claims to the 'Kievan Inheritance'." HUS 1, no. 1 (1977): 29–52.

_____. "Shelest and His Period in Soviet Ukraine (1963–1972): A Revival of Controlled Ukrainian Autonomism." In *Ukraine in the Seventies*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj, 283–305. Oakville, Ontario, 1975.

_____. "Soviet Ukrainian Historiography after World War II." JFGO 12 (1964): 375–418.

Penchko, N., ed. *Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Moskovskogo universiteta vtoroi poloviny XVIIIv.* [Documents and materials on the history of Moscow University in the second half of the eighteenth century]. 3 vols. Moscow, 1960–3.

Peretts, V. N. *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovaniia i materialy 1, ch. 1: Nachalo iskusstvennoi poezii v Rossii: Issledovaniia o vliianii malorusskoi virshevoi i narodnoi poezii XVI–XVIIIv. na velikorusskuiu* [Historico-literary studies and materials 1, pt. 1: The beginning of artistic poetry in Russia: Studies in the influence on Great Russian poetry of Little Russian syllabic and folk poetry of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries]. St. Petersburg, 1900.

Peshtich, S. L. *Russkaia istoriografiia XVIII veka* [Eighteenth-century Russian historiography]. 3 vols. Leningrad, 1961–71.

———." 'Sinopsis' kak istoricheskoe proizvedenie" [The "Synopsis" as a work of history]. TODRL 15 (1958): 284–98.

Petrov, N. I., ed. *Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi Akademii, otdelenie II (1721–95)* [Statements and documents pertaining to the history of the Kiev Academy, division II (1721–95)] 5 vols. Kiev, 1904–8.

———.*Kievskaia akademiia v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II (1762–1796gg.)* [The Kiev Academy in the reign of Catherine II (1762–1796)]. Kiev, 1906.

———.*Ocherki iz istorii ukrainskoi literatury XVII i XVIII vekov: Kievskaia iskusstvennaia literatura XVII–XVIII vv., preiumushchestvenno dramaticheskaia* [Essays on the history of Ukrainian literature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Kievan artistic literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially drama]. Kiev, 1911.

———."Odin is predshestvennikov Iv. Petr. Kotliarevskogo v ukrainskoi literature XVIII veka, Afanasii Kirillovich Lobysevich" [One of Iv. Petr. Kotliarevsky's predecessors in eighteenth-century Ukrainian literature, Opanas Kyrylovych Lobysevych]. In *Stati po slavianovedeniiu* 1, ed. V. I. Lamansky, 59–63. St. Petersburg, 1904.

———."Pervyi (malorossiiskii) period zhizni i nauchno-filosofskogo razvitiia Grigoriia Savicha Skovorody" [The first (Little Russian) period of the life and academic-philosophical development of Hryhorii Savych Skovoroda]. *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (December 1902): 588–618.

Picheta, V. I. "K istorii slavianovedeniia v SSSR" [A contribution to the history of Slavic studies in the USSR]. *Istorik-marksist*, no. 3 (1941): 36–62.

Piksanov, N. "Ukrainskie povesti Gogolia" [Gogol's Ukrainian stories]. In his *O klassikakh: sbornik statei*, 43–148. Moscow, 1933.

Pintner, W. M., and D. K. Rowney. *Russian Officialdom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth*

to the Twentieth Century. Chapel Hill, 1980.

Pipes, R. "Catherine II and the Jews: The Origins of the Pale of Settlement." *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 5, no. 2 (1975): 3–20.

Pliushch, V. *Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi medychnoi nauky ta osvity 1 (vid pochatkiv ukrainskoi derzhavnosty do 19 stolittia)* [Essays in the history of Ukrainian medical science and education 1 (from the beginnings of Ukrainian statehood to the nineteenth century)]. Munich, 1970.

Plotho, C. von. *Die Kosaken*. Berlin, 1811.

Pokrovsky, S. A. *Politicheskie i pravovye vzgliady S. E. Desnitskogo* [The political and juridical views of S. Ie. Desnytsky]. Moscow, 1955.

Polenov, D. V. "Opisanie Borozdinskogo sobraniia risunkov k ego arkheologicheskomu puteshestviiu po Rossii v 1809–1810 godakh" [A description of Borozdin's drawings related to his archaeological journey through Russia in 1809–10]. In *Trudy pervogo arkheologicheskogo sezda v Moskve, 1869g.*, ed. A. S. Uvarov, 1, *Prilozheniia*: 62–74. Moscow, 1870.

Polevoi, N. A. "Istoriia Maloi Rossii (Sochinenie D. N. Bantysh-Kamenskogo)" [D. M. Bantysh-Kamensky's History of Little Russia]. *Moskovskii telegraf*, no. 17 (1830): 74–97; no. 18 (1830): 224–57.

_____. *Ocherki russkoi literatury* [Essays on Russian literature]. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1839.

Polonska-Vasylenko, N. D. "The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine." AUAAS 4–5 (Summer–Fall 1955): 1–350.

_____. *Zaporizhzhia XVIII stolittia ta ioho spadshchyna* [Eighteenth-century Zaporizhzhia and its legacy]. 2 vols. Munich, 1965.

Polukhin, L. K. *Formuvannia istorychnykh pohliadiv M. I. Kostomarova* [The formation of the historical views of M. I. Kostomarov]. Kiev, 1959.

Popkov, B. S. "Ioakhim Lelevel i Ukraina" [Joachim Lelewel and Ukraine]. *Voprosy istorii slavian* 5 (1977): 69–77.

Popov, A. N., ed. "Zapiska D. P. Troshchinskogo ob uchrezhdenii ministerstv" [D. P. Troshchynsky's memorandum on the establishment of ministries]. SIRIO 3 (1868): 1–162.

Potepalov, S. G. "Puteshestvie P. I. Keppena po slavianskim zemliam" [P. I. Köppen's journey through the Slavic lands]. In *Iz istorii russko-slavianskikh literaturnykh sviazei XIXv.*, ed. M. P. Alekseev, 5–22. Moscow and Leningrad, 1963.

Potichnyj, Peter J., ed. *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present.* Edmonton and Toronto, 1980.

Potter, S. *Some Notes on Lifemanship.* Penguin edn. London, 1962.

Poznansky, V. V. *Ocherk formirovaniia russkoi natsionalnoi kultury: pervaia polovina XIX veka* [An essay on the formation of Russian national culture: the first half of the nineteenth century]. Moscow, 1975.

Priima, F. Ia. "N. I. Nadezhdin i slaviane" [N. I. Nadezhdin and the Slavs]. In *Slavianskie literaturnye sviazi*, ed. M. P. Alekseev, 5–28. Leningrad, 1968.

_____. *Shevchenko i russkaia literatura XIX veka* [Shevchenko and nineteenth-century Russian literature]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1961.

_____. "'Slovo o polku Igoreve' v otsenke 1814g. V. G. Anastasevicha" [*The Lay of Igor's Campaign* in V. H. Anastasevych's 1814 evaluation]. In *Slovo o polku Igoreve: sbornik issledovanii i statei*, ed. V. P. Adrianova-Perets, 296–303. Moscow and Leningrad, 1950.

_____. *"Slovo o polku Igoreve" v russkom istoriko-literaturnom protsesse pervoi treti XIX v.* [*The Lay of Igor's Campaign* in the Russian historico-literary process of the first third of the nineteenth century]. Leningrad, 1980.

Pritsak, Omeljan, and John S. Reshetar. "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-building." SR 22 (1963): 224–55.

Puchkivsky, O. "Try fundatory rosiiskoi medytsyny: Petro Zahorsky, Nestor Maksymovych-Ambodyk i Danylo Vellansky-Kavunnyk" [Three founders of Russian medicine: Petro Zahorsky, Nestor Maksymovych-Ambodyk and Danylo Vellansky-Kavunnyk]. *Ukraina*, no. 4 (1924): 27–34.

Pushkarev, L. N. "Kulturnye sviazi Ukrainy i Rossii posle ikh vossoedineniia (vtoraia polovina XVII v.)" [Cultural links between Ukraine and Russia after their reunion (the second

half of the seventeenth century)]. *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 3 (1979): 85–95.

Pushkin, A. S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete works]. 17 vols. Moscow and Leningrad, 1937–59.

Putro, O. I. "Heneralnyi opys 1765–1769 rr. iak dzherelo dlia vyvchennia sotsialno-ekonomichnykh vidnosyn na livoberezhnii Ukraini u druhii polovyni XVIII st." [The General Description of 1765–9 as a source for the study of socio-economic relations in Left-Bank Ukraine in the second half of the eighteenth century]. UIZh, no. 7 (1982): 143–7.

_____."Vlada heneralnoi viiskovoi starshyny na livoberezhnii Ukraini u druhii polovyni XVIII st." [The authority of the Cossack chief officers in Left-Bank Ukraine in the second half of the eighteenth century]. *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, no. 5 (1969): 11–20.

Pypin, A. N. *Istoriia russkoi etnografii* [A history of Russian ethnography]. 4 vols. St. Petersburg, 1890–2. Vol. 3: *Etnografiia malorusskaia* [Little Russian ethnography].

_____."Metsenaty i uchenye aleksandrovskogo vremeni" [Patrons and scholars of Alexander I's time]. In his *Issledovaniia i stati po epokhe Aleksandra I* 2: 411–59. Petrograd, 1917.

_____."Zorian Dolęnga-Khodakovsky: biograficheskii ocherk" [Zorian Dołega Chodakowski: a biographical essay] VE, no. 6 (November–December 1886): 305–57.

Raeff, M. "The Bureaucratic Phenomenon of Imperial Russia." AHR 84 (1979): 399–411.

Ransel, D. L. *The Politics of Catherinian Russia: The Panin Party*. New Haven and London, 1975.

Razumovsky, K. G. "Chastnoe pismo k ego ziatiu grafu Gudovichu" [A private letter to his son-in-law, Count Hudovych]. RA 1 (1873): 467–8.

Redko, F. "Dzherela do istorychnoho atlasa pivdennoukrainskykh zemel druhoi polovyny XVIII st." [Sources for a historical atlas of the south Ukrainian lands in the second half of the eighteenth century]. *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, no. 2 (1968): 84–7.

_____."Istoryko-heohrafichna kharakterystyka nyzhnoho podniprovia 70–80-kh rokiv XVIII st." [A historico-geographical description of the lower Dnieper region in the 1770s

and 1780s]. *Ukrainskyi istoryko-heohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 2 (1972): 70–84.

Repnin, N. G. "Donesenie o vooruzhenii malorossiiskikh kozakov protiv Polshi" [A report on arming the Little Russian Cossacks against Poland] ChOIDR, no. 1 (1863), *Smes*: 176–7.

_____."Kratkaia zapiska o malorossiiskikh kozakakh" [A short memorandum on the Little Russian Cossacks]. ChOIDR, no. 2 (1864), *Smes*: 85–130.

_____."Rech . . . pri otkrytii dvorianskikh vyborov v Chernigove, 25 sentiabria, 1823g." [A speech at the opening of the gentry elections in Chernihiv, 25 September 1823]. KS 29 (1890): 373–5.

Riabinin-Skliarevsky, O. (Riabynyn-Skliarevsky, O.). "Ukrainski motyvy v poemi O. S. Pushkina 'Poltava' (kilka dyskysiinykh uvah do stolitnykh rokovyn poemy)" [Ukrainian motifs in A. S. Pushkin's poem "Poltava" (certain points of discussion to mark the poem's centenary)]. *Ukraina*, no. 1 (1928): 34–56.

Riabynyn-Skliarevsky, O. (Riabinin-Skliarevsky, O.). "Zaporozka kozachchyna i I. P. Kotliarevsky" [The Zaporozhian Cossacks and I. P. Kotliarevsky]. *Ukraina*, no. 2–3 (1926): 159–63.

Riasanovsky, N. V. *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–55*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1959.

_____.*A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–55*. Oxford, 1976.

Rogger, H. *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia*. Cambridge, Mass., 1960.

Roider, K. A. *Austria's Eastern Question, 1700–1790*. Princeton, 1982.

Romanovich-Slavatinsky, A. *Dvorianstvo v Rossii ot nachala XVIII veka do otmeny krepostnogo prava* [The gentry in Russia from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the emancipation of the serfs]. St. Petersburg, 1870.

Rossiiskii magazin [A Russian store]. Ed. F. Tumansky. 3 vols. St. Petersburg, 1792–4.

Rostopchin, F. V. "Pisma k grafu S. R. Vorontsovu" [Letters to Count S. R. Vorontsov]. AKV 8 (1876): 37–457.

Rotach, P. " 'Biblioteku moiu zaveshchaiu . . . ': dar N. I. Gnedicha Poltave" ["I bequeathe my library . . . ": M. I. Hnidych's gift to Poltava]. In *Vstrechi s knigoi*, ed. E. I. Osetrov et al., 183–203. Moscow, 1979.

Rovniakova, L. N. "Russko-polskii etnograf i folklorist Z. Dolenga-Khodakovsky i ego arkhiv" [The Russo-Polish ethnographer Z. Dołęga Chodakowski and his archive]. In *Iz istorii russko-slavianskikh literaturnykh sviazei XIXv.*, ed. M. P. Alekseev, 58–94. Moscow and Leningrad, 1963.

Rozenfeld, I. B. *Prisoedinenie Malorossii k Rossii (1654–1793)* [The annexation of Little Russia to Russia (1654–1793)]. Petrograd, 1915.

Rozhdestvensky, F. "Samuil Mislavsky, mitropolit kievskii" [Samiilo Myslavsky, metropolitan of Kiev]. *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii*, no. 3 (1876): 510–63; no. 11 (1876): 505–36; no. 4 (1877): 3–39; no. 5 (1877): 301–59; no. 6 (1877): 529–77.

Rozner, I. G. (Rozner, I. H.). "Pridvornye krugi nakanune i vo vremia krestianskoi voiny 1773–5gg." [Court circles on the eve and during the peasant war of 1773–5]. VI, no. 5 (1974): 105–12.

Rozner, I. H. (Rozner, I. G.). "Omelian Puhachov i Ukraina" [Emelian Pugachev and Ukraine]. UIZh, no. 9 (1973): 63–74.

Ruban, V. G. "Istoricheskie izvestiia, polskikh pisatelei, o provintsiiakh i gorodakh Rossiiskikh, byvshikh nekogda vo vladenii Polskom, i potom opiat Rossiianami vziatykh, prinadlezhashchie k Rossiiskoi istorii" [Historical information taken from Polish writers but pertaining to Russian history, on Russian provinces and towns which were once under Polish rule and then taken once more by the Russians]. *Parnasskii shchepetilnik* (December 1770): 290–319.

———. *Kratkaia letopis Malyia Rossii s 1506 po 1776 god* [A Short chronicle of Little Russia from 1506 to 1776]. St. Petersburg, 1777.

———. *Kratkie geograficheskie, politicheskie i istoricheskie izvestiia o Maloi Rossii* [Brief geographical, political and historical information concerning Little Russia]. St. Petersburg, 1773.

———. *Moskovskii liubopytnyi mesiatseslov na 1776 god* [A Moscow almanac of curious information for 1776]. Moscow, 1776.

———. *Pismo . . . Samuilu, Mitropolitu Kievskomu i Galitskomu . . . iz Sanktpeterburga, 20 Avgusta 1795 goda* [A letter from St. Petersburg to Samiilo, metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia, 20 August 1795]. St. Petersburg, 1795.

———., ed. *Starina i novizna* [Things old and new]. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1772–3.

———. *Zemleopisanie Malyia Rossii* [A description of the land of Little Russia]. St. Petersburg, 1777.

Rubinshtein, N. L. "Topograficheskie opisaniia namestnichestv i gubernii XVIII v.—pamiatniki geograficheskogo i ekonomicheskogo izucheniia Rossii" [Eighteenth-century topographical descriptions of vicegerencies and provinces: memorials of the geographical and economic study of Russia]. *Voprosy geografii* 31 (1953): 39–89.

Rudnytsky, Ia. B. (Rudnyckyj, J. B.). *Slovo i nazva "Ukraina"* [The word and name "Ukraine"]. Winnipeg, 1951.

Rudnytsky, Ivan L. "The Fourth Universal and its Ideological Antecedents." In *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*, ed. T. Hunczak, 186–219. Cambridge, Mass., 1977.

———."The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine." AUAAS 6, no. 3–4 (21–2) (1958): 1381–1405.

———., ed. "Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings." AUAAS 2, no. 1 (3) (Spring, 1952): 1–224.

———."Reply [to the articles by Adams and Pritsak and Reshetar, q.v., above]." SR 22 (1963): 256–62.

———., ed. *Rethinking Ukrainian History*. Edmonton, 1981.

———."The Role of the Ukraine in Modern History." SR 22 (1963): 199–216.

Rumiantsev, A. "Order ob ustroistve pevcheskoi shkoly v Glukhove" [An order to set up a choir school in Hlukhiv]. KS 16

(1886): 579–80.

Rumiantsev, P. A. "Perepiska o vosstanii v Ukraine 1768g." [Correspondence on the 1768 rising in Ukraine]. KS (September–October 1883): 254–86.

Rumiantseva, E. M. *Pisma k eia muzhu* [Letters to her husband]. Ed. D. A. Tolstoy. St. Petersburg, 1888.

R(usanova), S. "Kharkovskaia zhurnalistika nachala nastoiashchego stoletiia" [Kharkiv journalism at the beginning of the present century]. KS 38 (1892): 168–98.

Russov, S. *O kritike G. Artsybasheva na Istoriiu Gosudarstva Rossiiskogo, sochinennuiu N. M. Karamzinym* [On G. Artsybashev's criticism of N. M. Karamzin's *History of the Russian State*] St. Petersburg, 1829.

_____. *Obozrenie kritiki Khodakovskogo na istoriiu rossiiskogo gosudarstva, sochinennuiu Nikolaem Mikhailovichem Karamzinym* [A review of Chodakowski's criticism of Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin's *History of the Russian State*]. St. Petersburg, 1820.

Rybakov, I. "До kharakterystyky doby kryzy 'ancienne regime' [*sic*] na Ukraini" [Toward a picture of the old regime's crisis in Ukraine]. *Naukovyi zbirnyk Leninhradskoho tovarystva doslidnykiv ukrainskoi istorii, pysmenstva ta movy* 2 (ZIFV VUAN 74b) (1929): 47–63.

_____. "1825-i rik na Ukraini" [1825 in Ukraine]. *Ukraina*, no. 6 (1925): 5–24.

Rytsareva, M. *Kompozitor D. Bortniansky* [The composer D. Bortniansky]. Leningrad, 1979.

Saitov, V. I., and P. N. Sheffer, eds. *Ostafevskii arkhiv kniazei Viazemskikh* [The Ostafev archive of the princes Viazemsky]. 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1899–1913.

Saltykov, A. "Dve Rossii i ukrainskii vopros" [The two Russias and the Ukrainian question]. In his *Dve Rossii: natsionalno-psikhologicheskie ocherki*, 75–117. Munich, n.d.

(Samovidets). *Letopis Samovidtsa po novootkrytym spiskam, s prilozheniem trekh malorossiiskikh khronik* [The chronicle of Samovydets with the addition of three Little Russian chronicles]. Kiev, 1878.

Sarbei, V. H. *Istorychni pohliady O. M. Lazarevskoho* [The historical views of O. M. Lazarevsky]. Kiev, 1961.

Saunders, D. "Contemporary Critics of Gogol's *Vechera* and the Debate about Russian *narodnost'* (1831–1832)." HUS 5, no. 1 (March 1981): 66–82.

_____."Historians and Concepts of Nationality in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia." SEER 60, no. 1 (January 1982): 44–62.

_____."Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski and the Unity of Slavonic Culture." *Nationalities Papers* 11, no. 2 (Fall 1983): 284–97.

Savchenko, F. "Kozachchyna u frantsuzkomu pysmenstvi ta kozakofilstvo Merime" [The Cossacks in French literature and the Cossackophilia of Mérimée]. *Ukraina*, no. 5 (1925): 38–59.

_____."Novi vidomosti pro neopublikovanu istoriiu Ukrainy Oleksy Martosa" [New information about the unpublished Ukrainian history of Oleksa Martos]. *Za sto lit* 6 (1930): 7–14.

_____."Pershyi zbirnyk ukrainskykh pisen Maksymovycha" [Maksymovych's first collection of Ukrainian songs]. *Ukraina*, no. 6 (1927): 25–79.

_____."Ukrainska mova pered Ros. Akademiieiu nauk u 1805 r." [The Ukrainian language before the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1805]. *Za sto lit* 5 (1930): 3–5.

_____.*Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 r.* [The proscription of things Ukrainian in 1876]. Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies 14. Munich, 1970 (first pub. Kiev, 1930).

Scherer, J.-B. *Annales de la Petite-Russie*. 2 vols. Paris, 1788.

Schumann, H. "Der Hetmanstaat (1654–1764)." JFGO 1 (1936): 499–548.

Seaman, G. "Folk-song in Russian Opera of the 18th Century." SEER 41 (1962–3): 144–57.

Semenov, P. P. *Geograficheskо-statisticheskii slovar Rossiiskoi imperii* [A geographical-statistical dictionary of the Russian Empire]. 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1863–85.

Semevsky, V. I. *Krestiane v tsarstvovanie Imperatritsy Ekateriny II* [The peasants in the reign of Empress Catherine II]. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1881–1901.

Senkovsky, O. I. "Otryvok iz puteshestviia" [A fragment from a travelogue]. VE 109, no. 1 (1820): 19–33.

Serebrennikov, V. *Kievskaia akademiia s poloviny XVIII veka do preobrazovaniia eia v 1819 godu* [The Kiev Academy from the mid-eighteenth century to its transformation in 1819]. Kiev, 1897.

Severnyi vestnik [The northern herald]. See Martynov, I. I., ed.

Shafonsky, A. F. *Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie* [A Topographical description of Chernihiv province]. Ed. M. Sudienko. Kiev, 1851.

_____. *Opisanie morovoi iazvy, byvshei v stolichnom gorode Moskve s 1770 po 1772 god* [A description of the plague which beset the capital city Moscow from 1770 to 1772]. Moscow, 1775.

Shakhovskoi, A. A. *Komedii, stikhotvoreniia* [Comedies, verse]. Leningrad, 1961.

_____. *Kozak stikhotvorets* [The Cossack poet]. St. Petersburg, 1815.

Shamrai, A., ed. *Kharkivska shkola romantykiv* [The Kharkiv school of Romantics]. 3 vols. Kharkiv, 1930.

_____. *Kharkivski poety 30–40 rokiv XIX stolittia* [The Kharkiv poets of the 1830s and 1840s]. Kharkiv, 1930.

Shchapov, Ia. N. *Sobranie I. Ia. Lukashevicha i N. A. Markevicha: opisanie* [The collection of I. Ia. Lukashevych and M. A. Markevych: a description]. Moscow, 1959.

Shchipanov, I. Ia., and S. Ia. Shtraikh, eds. *Izbrannye sotsialno-politicheskie i filosofskie proizvedeniia dekabristov* [Selected socio-political and philosophical works of the Decembrists]. 3 vols. Moscow, 1951.

Shebalsky, P. "Literator starogo vremeni" [An old-style littérateur]. *Russkii vestnik* 96 (1871): 295–320.

Shevchenko, F. P. *Rol Kyieva v mizhslovianskykh zviazkakh u XVII–XVIII st.* [Kiev's role in inter-Slav relations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. Kiev, 1963.

———."Zakarpattsi—studenty Kyivskoi akademii XVIII st." [Transcarpathian students at the Kiev Academy in the eighteenth century]. UIZh, no. 6 (1965): 95–8.

Shevchenko, Taras. *Povne zibrannia tvoriv* [Complete works]. 6 vols. Kiev, 1964.

Shevelov, George Y. "Die 'Grammatik der kleinrussischen Mundart' von Pavlovskij und ihr Autor." In his *Teasers and Appeasers: Essays and Studies on Themes of Slavic Philology*, 261–96. Munich, 1971.

———.*Teasers and Appeasers: Essays and Studies on Themes of Slavic Philology*. Munich, 1971.

Shilder, N. K. *Imperator Aleksandr I* [The Emperor Alexander I]. 4 vols. St. Petersburg, 1897–8.

Sholom, F. Ia. "Prosvetitelskie idei v ukrainskoi literature serediny XVIII veka" [Ideas of the Enlightenment in mid-eighteenth-century Ukrainian literature]. In *Problemy russkogo prosveshcheniia v literature XVIII veka*, ed. P. N. Berkov, 45–62. Moscow and Leningrad, 1961.

Shreier-Tkachenko, O. "Rozvytok ukrainskoi muzychnoi kultury v XVI–XVIII storichchiakh" [The development of Ukrainian musical culture from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries]. *Ukrainske muzykoznavstvo*, no. 6 (1971): 5–14.

Shteinpress, B. S., ed. *Golosa ukrainskikh pesen, izdannye Mikhailom Maksimovichem* [The tunes of the Ukrainian songs published by Mykhailo Maksymovych]. Moscow, 1961.

Shtohryn, D. M. *Kataloh vydan Ukrainskoi Akademii nauk 1918–1930* [A catalogue of the publications of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences 1918–1930]. Chicago, 1966.

Shtrange, M. M. *Demokraticheskaia intelligentsiia Rossii v XVIII veke* [Russia's eighteenth-century democratic intelligentsia]. Moscow, 1965.

Shtromas, A. "The Legal Position of Soviet Nationalities and their Territorial Units according to the 1977 Constitution of the USSR." *Russian Review* 37, no. 3 (1978): 265–72.

Shyp, N. A. "Rol vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv Moskvy ta Peterburha v rozvytku rosiisko-ukrainskykh zviazkiv (druha polovyna XVIII st.)" [The role of the higher educational institutions of Moscow and St. Petersburg in the development of Russo-Ukrainian relations (the second half of the eighteenth century)]. UIZh, no. 8 (1976): 122–30.

Sichynsky, Volodymyr. *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions from the VIth to XXth Century*. New York, 1953.

Simoni, P. K. *Kamer-guslist V. F. Trutovsky i izdannyi im pervyi russkii notnyi pesennik* [Court husli-player V. F. Trutovsky and the first Russian song-book with music which he published]. Moscow, 1905.

Simpson, George W. *The names "Rus'," "Russia" and "Ukraine" and Their Historical Background*. Slavistica: Proceedings of the Institute of Slavistics of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, no. 10. Winnipeg, 1951.

Sinitsky, L. "Malorossiia po rasskazam puteshestvennikov kontsa proshlogo i nachala nyneshnego stoletiia" [Little Russia in travellers' accounts of the end of the last and the start of the present century]. KS, no. 2 (1892): 226–59.

Sipovsky, V. V. (Sypovsky, V. V.). "Iz proshlogo russkoi tsenzury" [From the past history of Russian censorship]. RS, no. 4 (1899): 161–75; no. 5 (1899): 435–53.

Slabchenko, M. E. *Malorusskii polk v administrativnom otnoshenii: istoriko-iuridicheskii ocherk* [The Little Russian regiment from the point of view of administration: a historico-juridical essay]. Odessa, 1910.

Slabchenko, T. "Do istorii 'Malorossiiskogo Obshchestva'" [A contribution to the history of "The Little Russian Society"]. *Ukraina*, no. 6 (1925): 46–9.

Sliusarsky, A. G. *V. N. Karazin: ego nauchnaia i obshchestvennaia deiatelnost* [V. N. Karazyn: his scholarly and social activity]. Kharkiv, 1955.

S(mirnitsky), V. N. "Pismo ot izdatelia Malorossiiskikh poslovits i pogovorok" [A letter from the publisher of Little Russian proverbs and sayings]. *Molva* 22 (1834): 38–36.

Smolensky, I. "Biurokratychna verkhivka na Ukraini naprykintsi XVIII i na pochatku XIX st." [The leadership of the bureaucracy in Ukraine at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries]. *Ukraina*, nos. 7–8 (1930): 70–80.

Sobol, S. L. *Istoriia mikroskopa i mikroskopicheskikh issledovanii v Rossii v XVIII veke* [A history of the microscope and of studies making use of it in eighteenth-century Russia]. Moscow and Leningrad, 1949.

———."Osnovopolozhnik otechestvennoi gistologii A. M. Shumliansky (1748–1795)" [A. M. Shumliansky (1748–1795), founder of native histology]. *Nauchnoe nasledstvo, estestvenno-nauchnaia seriia* 2 (1951): 399–496.

Sofronenko, K. A. *Malorossiiskii prikaz Russkogo gosudarstva vtoroi poloviny XVII—nachala XVIII veka* [The Russian state's Little Russian chancery in the second half of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries]. Moscow, 1960.

Soimonov, A. D. *P. V. Kireevsky i ego sobranie narodnykh pesen* [P. V. Kireevsky and his collection of folksongs]. Leningrad, 1971.

Solchanyk, Roman. "Lex Jusephovicia 1876: Z pryvodu 100–littia zaborony ukrainstva" [The Lex Jusephovicia of 1876: On the occasion of the centenary of Ukrainianism's proscription]. *Suchasnist*, no. 5 (1976): 36–68.

Solovev, S. M. *Zapiski* [Memoirs]. N.p. or d.

Speransky, M. *Odin iz uchitelei N. V. Gogolia (I. G. Kulzhinsky)* [One of N. V. Gogol's teachers (I. H. Kulzhynsky)] Nizhyn, 1906.

Sreznevsky, I. I. *Zaporozhskaia starina* [Zaporizhian antiquity]. 5 vols. Kharkiv, 1833–8.

Sreznevsky, V. I. "G. F. Kvitka i I. I. Sreznevsky" [H. F. Kvitka and I. I. Sreznevsky]. In *Sertum Bibliologicum*, ed. A. Poliakov, 197–213. Petrograd, 1922.

———."I. E. Betsky, izdatel Molodyka" [I. E. Betsky, the publisher of *The New Moon*]. ZhMNP (1900): 1–32.

———."Iz pervykh let nauchno-literaturnoi deiatelnosti I. I. Sreznevskogo: 1831–1839" [The first years of the literary

and scholarly activity of I. I. Sreznevsky: 1831–1839]. ZhMNP 315 (January 1898): 1–39.

_____."Pro zbyrachiv ukrainskykh pisen: Z hurtka I. I. Sreznevskogo na pochatku 1830–kh rokiv" [On the collectors of Ukrainian songs: from the circle of I. I. Sreznevsky at the beginning of the 1830s]. ZIFV UAN 13–14 (1927): 76–82.

_____., ed. "Vadim Vasilevich Passek i ego pisma k I. I. Sreznevskomu (1837–1839)" [Vadim Vasilevich Passek and his letters to I. I. Sreznevsky]. RS, no. 5 (1893): 377–402, and no. 9 (1893): 545–62.

Starchevsky, A. "O zaslugakh Rumiantseva" [On Rumiantsev's services]. ZhMNP, no. 1 (1846).

Starina i novizna [Things old and new]. Ed. V. G. Ruban. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1772–3.

Starr, S. Frederick. *Decentralization and Self-Government in Russia, 1830–1870.* Princeton, 1972.

Steblau, Erich Lassota von. *Habsburgs and Zaporozhian Cossacks: Diary.* Ed. L. R. Wynar. Trans. O. Subtelny. Littleton, Colorado, 1975.

Steblii, F. I., and S. M. Trusevich. "Sviazi zapadno-ukrainskikh zemel s Rossiei v kontse XVIII—nachale XX veka" [Links between the West Ukrainian lands and Russia from the end of the eighteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century]. VI, no. 4 (1980): 36–48.

Steletsky, N. (Stelletsky, N.). "Protoierei A. A. Samborsky (Zakonouchitel Imperatora Aleksandra I)" [Archpriest A. O. Samborsky (Emperor Alexander I's religion teacher)]. *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* 3 (October-December 1896): 182–202, 342–63, 486–526.

Stelletsky, N. (Steletsky, N.). "Kharkovskii kollegium do preobrazovaniia ego v 1817 godu" [Kharkiv Collegium before its 1817 transformation]. *Vera i razum*, no. 11 (1895): 644–66; no. 12 (1895): 713–42; no. 14 (1895): 93–124; no. 16 (1895): 222–39; no. 17 (1895): 287–305; no. 18 (1895): 331–54; no. 19 (1895): 411–31; no. 21 (1895): 507–36; no. 23 (1895): 632–58.

Stolpiansky, P. N. "Na zare ukrainofilskogo dvizheniia" [At the dawn of the Ukrainophile movement]. In *Istoriko-literaturnyi sbornik posviashchennyi V. I. Sreznevskomu*, 421–6. Leningrad, 1924.

Storozhenko, A. Ia. (Tsarynnyi, A.). "Ubezhdenie" [Credo]. ChOIDR, no. 2 (1871), *Smes*: 86–96.

Storozhenko, N. "Istoriia sostavleniia 'Topograficheskogo opisaniia chernigovskogo namestnichestva' Shafonskogo (Epizod iz iuzhno-russkoi istoriografii)" [The history of the composition of Shafonsky's *Topographical description of Chernihiv province* (An episode from South Russian historiography)]. *Kievskie universitetskie izvestiia*, no. 10 (1886): 135–68.

S(torozhenko), N. "K istorii malorossiiskikh kozakov v kontse XVIII i v nachale XIX veka" [Toward a history of the Little Russian Cossacks at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century]. KS 57 (1897): 124–56, 460–83; 59 (1897): 115–31, 143–56, 332–50.

Storozhenko, N. "K portretu kniazia Nikolaia Grigorevicha Repnina" [A note on a portrait of Prince Nikolai Grigorevich Repnin]. KS (1898): 1–8.

S(torozhenko), N. "Materialy dlia istorii dvorianskogo zemlevladeniia v Poltavskoi gubernii" [Materials on the history of gentry landownership in Poltava province]. KS 48 (1895): 405–18.

S(torozhenko), N. "Poltavskii gubernskii marshal S. M. Kochubei" [Poltava provincial marshal S. M. Kochubei]. KS (January 1894): 135–41.

Storozhenko, N. "Reformy v Malorossii pri gr. Rumiantseve" [Reforms in Little Russia under Count Rumiantsev]. KS 32 (1891): 478–93; 34 (1891): 455–65.

Storozhevsky, N. K. *Nezhinskie greki* [The Greeks of Nizhyn]. Kiev, 1862.

Subtelny, Orest. *The Mazepists: Ukrainian Separatism in the Early Eighteenth Century*. Boulder, 1981.

Sukhobrus, H. S. *Ukrainsko-rosiiski folklorni zviazky v osvitlenni vitchyznianoi nauky pershoi polovyny XIX st.* [Links between Ukrainian and Russian folklore in the light of native

scholarship of the first half of the nineteenth century]. Kiev, 1963.

Sulotsky, A. I. "Starinnyi tobolskii uchitel Silvestrovich i uchenik ego V. Mirovich" [The old Tobolsk teacher Sylvestrovych and his pupil V. Myrovych]. RS, no. 7 (1879): 512–14.

Sumarokov, P. *Dosugi Krymskogo Sudi, ili vtoroe puteshestvie v Tavridu* [The leisure of a Crimean judge, or a second journey to Taurida]. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1803–5.

Sumner, B. H. *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford, 1949.

Suny, R. G. "Georgia and Soviet Nationality Policy." In *The Soviet Union Since Stalin*, ed. S. F. Cohen, A. Rabinowitch, and R. Sharlet, 200–26. London and Basingstoke, 1980.

Sushkov, N. "Iz zapisok" [From my memoirs]. VE, no. 2 (1867): 175–200.

Sushkov, N. V. *Moskovskii universitetskii blagorodnyi pansion* [Moscow University gentry pension]. Moscow, 1858.

Sventsitsky, I. S. *Materialy po istorii vozrozhdeniia Karpatskoi Rusi, 1: Snosheniia Karpatskoi Rusi s Rossiei v 1-uiu polovinu XIX v.* [Materials on the history of the rebirth of Carpathian Rus' 1: Relations between Carpathian Rus' and Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century]. Lviv, 1905.

———. *Obzor snoshenii Karpatskoi Rusi s Rossiei v pervuiu polovinu XIXv.* [A survey of relations between Carpathian Rus' and Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century]. St. Petersburg, 1906.

Svetlov, L. B. "M. I. Antonovsky." In *Moskovskii universitet i razvitie filosofskoi i obshchestvenno-politicheskoi mysli v Rossii*, ed. I. Ia. Shchipanov, 95–104. Moscow, 1957.

Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoi pechati XVIII veka 1725–1800 [A summary catalogue of eighteenth-century Russian books printed in civil type, 1725–1800]. 6 vols. Ed. I. P. Kondakov et al. Moscow, 1962–75.

Swoboda, V. "Shevchenko and Belinsky." In *Shevchenko and the Critics*, ed. George S. N. Luckyj, 303–23. Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1980.

———., and R. Martin. "Shevchenko and Belinsky Revisited." SEER 56 (1978): 546–62.

Sydorenko, Alexander. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. Ottawa, 1977.

———."Kievan Scholars in Muscovy." *Horizons: Ukrainian Students' Review* 8, no. 1 (1967): 31–42.

Sypovsky, V. (Sipovsky, V.). *Ukraina v rosiiskomu pysmenstvi: Chastyna I (1801–1850 rr.)* [Ukraine in Russian literature: pt. 1 (1801–1850)]. ZIFV UAN 58. Kiev, 1928.

Sysyn, Frank. "The Problem of Nobilities in the Ukrainian Past: The Polish Period, 1569–1648." In *Rethinking Ukrainian History*, ed. Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 29–102. Edmonton, 1981.

Telichenko, I. *Protest slobodskoi starshiny i kozakov protiv reformy 1765g.* [The protest of the Sloboda gentry and Cossacks against the 1765 reform]. Kiev, 1888.

Teplov, G. N. "Zapiska chlena Malorossiiskoi kollegii" [Memorandum by a member of the Little Russian College]. In *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi*, ed. P. Kulish, 2: 169–96. St. Petersburg, 1857.

Thackeray, Frank W. *Antecedents of Revolution: Alexander I and the Polish Kingdom, 1815–1825*. Boulder, 1980.

Thaden, Edward C. "The Beginnings of Romantic Nationalism in Russia." *American Slavic and East European Review* 13 (1954): 500–21.

Tikhii, N. "V. N. Karazin." KS 88 (1905): 1–47, 263–301, 349–72; 89 (1905): 1–35, 234–91, 321–60; 90 (1905): 1–58, 383–9.

Tikhomirov, M. N., and M. V. Nechkina. *Ocherki istorii istoricheskoi nauki v SSSR* [Essays on the history of historical scholarship in the USSR]. 4 vols. Moscow, 1955–66.

Timchenko-Ruban, I. R. "Iz vospominanii o prozhitom" [From my recollections of the past]. *Istoricheskii vestnik* 40 (May–June 1890): 332–54, 610–33; 41 (July-September 1890): 94–114, 304–33.

Timkovsky, I. F. *Opyt k filosoficheskomu poznaniiu Rossiiskogo iazyka* [An attempt at a philosophical understanding of the Russian language]. Kharkiv, 1811.

_____."Zapiski" [Memoirs]. RA, no. 6 (1874): 1377–1466.

Timkovsky, R. F. *Letopis Nestorova, po drevneishemu spisku Mnikha Lavrentiia* [Nestor's chronicle in its oldest recension, that of the monk Lavrentii]. Ed. K. Kalaidovich. Moscow, 1824.

Titov, Kh. (Titov, F. I.). *Stara vyshcha osvita v kyivskii Ukraini XVI - poch. XIX v.* [Old-style higher education in Kievan Ukraine (from the sixteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth centuries)]. ZIFV UAN 20. Kiev, 1924.

Tkach, A. P. *Istoriia kodyfikatsii dorevoliutsiinoho prava Ukrainy* [A history of the codification of prerevolutionary Ukrainian law]. Kiev, 1968.

Tomashevsky, B. V. "Epigrammy Pushkina na Karamzina" [Pushkin's epigrams on Karamzin]. *Pushkin: issledovaniia i materialy* 1 (1956): 208–15.

Troshchinsky, D. P. "Mnenie . . . o proekte ulozheniia" [An opinion on the projected law code]. ChOIDR, no. 3 (1859), *Smes*: 1–24.

_____."Pisma k A. R. Vorontsovu (1785–1802)" [Letters to A. R. Vorontsov (1785–1802)]. AKV 12 (1877): 369–408.

_____."Pisma k I. R. Martosu" [Letters to I. R. Martos]. KS 55 (1896): 225–33.

_____."Zapiska ob uchrezhdenii ministerstv" [A memorandum on the establishment of ministries]. Ed. A. Popov. SIRIO 3 (1868): 1–162.

Trubitsyn, N. *O narodnoi poezii v obshchestvennom i literaturnom obikhode pervoi treti XIX veka* [Folk poetry in the social and literary usage of the first third of the nineteenth century]. *Zapiski istoriko-filologicheskogo fakulteta imperatorskogo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta* 110. St. Petersburg, 1912.

Tsapenko, M. *Zemlia Brianskaia* [The Briansk region]. Moscow, 1972.

Tsarynny, A. (Storozhenko, A. Ia.). *Mysli malorossiianina po prochtenii povestei Pasichnika Rudogo-Panka* [Thoughts of a Little Russian on reading the stories of Rudy-Panko]. St. Petersburg, 1832.

Tsertelev, N. A. *Opyt sobraniia starinnykh malorossiiskikh pesnei* [An attempt at a collection of old Little Russian songs]. St. Petersburg, 1819.

Tsimbaev, N. I. *I. S. Aksakov v obshchestvennoi zhizni poreformennoi Rossii* [I. S. Aksakov in the social life of post-reform Russia]. Moscow, 1978.

Tumansky, F. O. *Ego prevoskhoditelstvu milostivomu gosudariu Petru Vasilevichu Zavadovskomu* [To his excellency the gracious gentleman Petro Vasylovych Zavadovsky]. St. Petersburg, 1791.

———., ed. *Rossiiskii magazin* [A Russian store]. 3 vols. St. Petersburg, 1792–4.

———., ed. *Zerkalo sveta* [Mirror of the world]. 6 vols. St. Petersburg, 1786–7.

Tumansky, V. I. *Stikhotvoreniia . . . 1817–39* [Verse, 1817–39]. Ed. G. A. Miloradovich. St. Petersburg, 1881.

Tymoshenko, P. D., ed. "Vidpovid O. Pavlovskoho na retsenziiu M. Tserteleva" [O. Pavlovsky's reply to M. Tsertelev's review]. *Movoznavstvo*, no. 5 (1968): 52–60.

Tyshchenko, M. "Z istorii torhivli knyzhkamy u XVIII storichchi" [From the history of the eighteenth-century book trade]. *Ukraina*, no. 4 (1929): 38–44.

Ukrainskii vestnik [Ukrainian herald]. 16 vols. Kharkiv, 1816–19.

Ukrainskii zhurnal [Ukrainian journal]. 8 vols. Kharkiv, 1824–5.

Ulashchik, N. N. *Ocherki po arkheografii i istochnikovedeniiu istorii Belorussii feodalnogo perioda* [Essays in the archaeography and source study of Belorussian history in the feudal period]. Moscow, 1973.

Ulei [Beehive]. Ed. V. H. Anastasevych. 4 vols. St. Petersburg, 1811–12.

U(strialov), F., trans. *Opisanie Ukrainy* [A Description of Ukraine]. (Translation of Beauplan, q.v., above.) St. Petersburg, 1832.

Uvarov, S. S. "Tsirkuliarnoe predlozhenie G. Upravliaiushchego Ministerstvom Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia Nachalstvam Uchebnykh Okrugov, o vstuplenii v upravlenie Ministerstvom" [A circular from the minister of education to the heads of educational districts, concerning his

assumption of the direction of the ministry]. ZhMNP 1 (1834): xlix–l.

Vasilchikov, A. A. *Semeistvo Razumovskikh* [The Rozumovsky family]. 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1880–94.

Vasilenko, N. (Vasylenko, N. P.). *O. M. Bodiansky i ego zaslugi dlia izucheniia Malorossii* [O. M. Bodiansky and his services to the study of Little Russia]. Kiev, 1904.

Vasylenko, N. P. (Vasilenko, N.). "Zbirka materiialiv do istorii Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy ta ukrainskoho prava XVII–XVIII vv." [A collection of materials pertaining to the history of Left-Bank Ukraine and Ukrainian law in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. *Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 1 (1926): 50–164.

Vatsuro, V. E. "Pushkin i Arkadii Rodzianka [*sic*] (Iz istorii grazhdanskoi poezii 1820-kh godov)" [Pushkin and Arkadii Rodzianko (From the history of civic poetry in the 1820s)] *Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii* 1969 (1971): 43–68.

Veikart, Dr. "Iz zapisok" [From my memoirs]. RA 1 (1886): 229–68.

Venelin, Iu. I. *Drevnie i nyneshnie bolgare* [The ancient and modern Bulgarians]. 2 vols. Moscow, 1829–41.

———."O spore mezhdu iuzhanami i severianami na schet ikh rossizma" [On the dispute between southerners and northerners concerning their Russianness]. ChOIDR, no. 4 (1847), *Issledovaniia*: 1–16.

———."Ob istochnikakh narodnoi poezii voobshche i iuzhno-russkoi v osobennosti" [On the sources of folk poetry in general and south Russian in particular]. *Teleskop* 22 (1834): 430–44, 506–26, 555–78.

Vernadsky, George. *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age*. New York and London, 1959.

Vernet, I. "Mysli o Kharkove" [Thoughts on Kharkiv]. *Ukrainskii vestnik* 8 (1817): 184–94.

Viazemsky, P. A. "Pismo v Parizh" [A letter to Paris]. *Moskovskii telegraf* 6, no. 22 (1825): 182–3.

———.*Zapisnye knizhki (1813–48)* [Notebooks (1813–48)]. Ed. V. S. Nechaev. Moscow, 1963.

Vigel, F. F. *Zapiski* [Memoirs]. Ed. S. Ia. Shtraikh. 2 vols. Moscow, 1928.

Vinsky, G. S. *Moe vremia* [My time]. St. Petersburg, 1914.

Vishnevsky, D. K. "Iz byta studentov staroi Kievskoi akademii" [From the life of students at the old Kiev Academy]. KS 52 (1896): 177–208, 309–33.

Volkov, N. V. *K istorii russkoi komedii 1: Zavisimost "Revizora" Gogolia ot komedii Kvitki "Priezzhii iz stolitsy"* [Toward a history of Russian comedy 1: The dependence of Gogol's *The Government Inspector* on Kvitka's comedy *The Man who Came from the Capital*]. St. Petersburg, 1899.

Volynsky, P. K. *Ivan Kotliarevsky: zhyttia i tvorchist* [Ivan Kotliarevsky: life and works]. 2d ed. Kiev, 1955.

———. *Teoretychna borotba v ukrainskii literaturi (persha polovyna XIX st.)* [The theoretical struggle in Ukrainian literature (the first half of the nineteenth century)]. Kiev, 1959.

Vozniak, M. *Psevdo-Konysky i psevdo-Poletyka ("Istoriia Rusov" u literaturi i nautsi)* [The pseudo-Konysky and the pseudo-Poletyka (The *Istoriia Rusov* in literature and scholarship)]. Lviv and Kiev, 1939.

Walker, Franklin A. "Reaction and Radicalism in the Russia of Tsar Alexander I: The Case of the Brothers Glinka." CSP 21 (1979): 489–502.

Wandycz, Piotr S. *The Lands of Partitioned Poland, 1795–1918.* Seattle and London, 1974.

Whittaker, Cynthia J. H. "Count S. S. Uvarov: Conservatism and National Enlightenment in pre-Reform Russia." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Wilson, Duncan. *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić 1787–1864: Literacy, literature and national independence in Serbia.* Oxford, 1970.

Wołoszyński, Ryszard W. *Polsko-rosyjskie związki w naukach społecznych 1801–1830* [Polish-Russian ties in the social sciences 1801–1830]. Warsaw, 1974.

Yakovliv, A. "'Istoriya Rusov' and its Author." AUAAS 3 (Fall-Winter 1953): 620–69.

(Zagorovsky, N.). *Topograficheskoe opisanie Kharkovskogo namestnichestva* [A topographical description of Kharkiv province]. Moscow, 1788.

Zaionchkovsky, P. A. *Kirillo-Mefodievskoe obshchestvo (1846–47)* [The Cyrillo-Methodian Society (1846–47)]. Moscow, 1959.

Zaitseva, A. A. "'Kabinety dlia chteniia' v Sankt-Peterburge kontsa XVIII – nachala XIX veka" [Reading rooms in St. Petersburg at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries]. In *Russkie biblioteki i chastnye knizhnye sobraniia XVI–XIX vekov*, ed. D. V. Ter-Ovanesian, 29–46. Leningrad, 1979.

Zakhara, I. S. *Borba idei v filosofskoi mysli na Ukraine na rubezhe XVII–XVIII vv. (Stefan Iavorsky)* [The conflict of ideas in philosophical thinking in Ukraine at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Stepan Iavorsky)]. Kiev, 1982.

Zaldkin, A. *Ivan Ivanovich Martynov (1771–1833), deiatel prosveshcheniia v nachale XIX veka* [Ivan Ivanovich Martynov (1771–1833), an exponent of enlightenment at the beginning of the nineteenth century]. Tiflis, 1902.

Zamkov, N. K. "'Ulei', zhurnal V. G. Anastasevicha: bibliograficheskoe opisanie" [*Beehive*, V. H. Anastasevych's journal: a bibliographical description]. In *Sertum Bibliologicum*, ed. A. Poliakov, 39–70. Petrograd, 1922.

Zamotin, I. I. *Romanticheskii idealizm v russkom obshchestve i literature 20–30–kh godov XIX stoletiia* [Romantic idealism in Russian society and literature in the 1820s and 1830s]. *Zapiski istoriko-filologicheskogo fakulteta imperatorskogo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta* 87. St. Petersburg, 1907.

"Zapiska iz dela . . . kasatelno prav na dvorianstvo byvshikh Malorossiiskikh chinov" [A memorandum from the dossier dealing with the rights to gentry status of former Little Russian rank-holders]. ChOIDR, no. 2 (1861), *Smes*: 80–139.

Zaslavsky, I. Ia. *Pushkin i Ukraina* [Pushkin and Ukraine]. Kiev, 1982.

Zavadovskaia, V. N. "Dva pisma k grafu A. R. Vorontsovu" [Two letters to Count A. R. Vorontsov]. AKV 12 (1877): 311–15.

Zavadovsky, P. V. "Pisma k A. S. Miloradovichu" [Letters to A. S. Myloradovych]. CGV, no. 84–7 (1886).

_____."Pisma k bratiam grafam Vorontsovym" [Letters to the brothers, Counts Vorontsov]. AKV 12 (1877): 1–310.

_____.*Pisma k feldmarshalu grafu P. A. Rumiantsevu, 1775–91 godov* [Letters to Field-Marshal Count P. A. Rumiantsev, 1775–91]. Ed. P. M. Maikov. St. Petersburg, 1901.

_____."Polozhenie o pravakh i preimushchestvakh Senata" [Statute on the rights and privileges of the Senate]. *Sbornik arkheologicheskogo instituta* 1 (1878): 70–8.

_____."Tri pisma k Grigoriiu Grigorevichu Fridrikevichu" [Three letters to Hryhorii Hryhorovych Fridrikevych]. CGV, no. 49 (1883).

Zbanduto, S. F. "Kievskaia akademiia XVI–XVIII vv." [The Kiev Academy from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries]. *Sovetskaia pedagogika*, no. 7 (1946): 59–75.

Zerkalo sveta [Mirror of the world]. Ed. F. O. Tumansky. 6 vols. St. Petersburg, 1786–7.

Zharkevich, N. M. *Tvorchestvo F. N. Glinki v istorii russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei* [The output of F. N. Glinka in the history of Russo-Ukrainian literary ties]. Kiev, 1981.

Zhemchuzhnikov, L. "Neskolko zamechanii po povodu narodnykh pesen" [A few remarks in connection with folksongs]. *Osnova*, no. 2 (1862): 87–100.

Zolotov, V. A. *Vneshniaia torgovlia iuzhnoi Rossii v pervoi polovine XIX veka* [Southern Russia's external trade in the first half of the nineteenth century]. Rostov on Don, 1963.

Zubkov, S. D. *Russkaia proza G. F. Kvitki i E. P. Grebenki v kontekste russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei* [The Russian prose of H. F. Kvitka and Ie. P. Hrebinka in the context of Russo-Ukrainian literary ties]. Kiev, 1979.

Zuev, V. *Puteshestvennye zapiski ot S. Peterburga do Khersona v 1781 i 1782 godu* [Notes on a journey from St. Petersburg to Kherson in 1781 and 1782]. St. Petersburg, 1787.

Index

Academy of Arts, 60
Aksakov, I. S., 240, 324 n. 33
Aksakov, K. S., 240–1
Aksakov, S. T., 2, 239
Alexander I, 83, 97, 104–5, 189, 191, 194, 242
Alexander II, 251
Alexander Nevsky monastery, 59
Alvarez, E., 45, 47
Ambodyk-Maksymovych, N., 159
Anastasevych, V., 31–2, 48, 61, 84, 91, 151, 154, 177, 196, 209–10; and *Ulei*, 140–4
Andrusovo, armistice of (1667), 26
Anna Ioannovna, 16, 31–2
Antonovsky, M., 58–9, 210; literary career of, 136–9
Apostol, D., 16
Apraksina, V. N., 83
Artsybashev, N. S., 190
Austria, increasingly difficult relations with, 4
Azov, 3

Baisky, P., 171
Bakurynsky, Ia., 19
Baludiansky, M., 225, 228
Bantysh-Kamensky, A., 184
Bantysh-Kamensky, D., 23, 92, 180, 237; historiographical activity of, 182–8
Bantysh-Kamensky, M., 37, 58, 184
Baturyn, 20, 23, 26, 43
Beauplan, Sieur de, 186
Bekleshov, A. A., 100, 104
Belinsky, V. G., 236–9, 246, 249
Belorussia, 4–5, 72, 85, 134, 158, 191, 196, 205, 208, 228; N. P. Rumiantsev and, 215–23

Berezovsky, M., 46
Berlynsky, M. F., 32, 140–1, 215; N. P. Rumiantsev and, 209–12
Bezborodko, A. Ia., 75
Bezborodko, I., 63, 75, 92, 109
Bezborodko, O. A., 19, 28, 30, 65–7, 87, 89, 94, 101–3, 107, 109, 124, 157, 206, 237; Ukrainian identity of, 69–81
Biletsky-Nosenko, P. P., 246
Bilhorod, 49, 56, 119, 128, 130, 213
Bilozersky, V., 248, 251
Bodiansky, O. M., 38, 124, 133, 159, 161, 197, 201–3, 228, 229–30, 237, 246, 251
Bohdanovych, I. F., 115, 237
Bolkhovitinov, E., 11, 32, 134, 142–3, 154, 185, 196, 209, 211, 219
Boltin, I. N., 181
Borovykovsky, V. L., 60, 95
Borozdin, K. M., 215
Boryspolets, 115
Braiko, H., 48, 116
Britain, alarmed by eighteenth-century Russian expansion, 4
Brock, P., 192–3
"Brotherhoods" (*bratstva*), 45
Bulgakov, Ia. I., 91, 94
Bulgarin, F. V., 170

Catherine the Great, 3–4, 16–21, 65, 94
Chaika (Ukrainian folksong), 93
Charles XII of Sweden, 3
Chepa, A. I., 26–7, 130, 180, 184, 211
Chernihiv, 19, 25, 34, 41, 43, 81, 95–6, 104, 109, 111, 120, 127, 130, 136, 138, 156, 215, 251; proposal for a university in town of (1786), 42, 84
Chernyshev, I. G., 59, 136–8
Chevalier, P., 186
Chichagov, P. V., 84
Chizhov, F., 249–50
Chodakowski, Z. D. (pseudonym of Adam Czarnocki), 151, 161, 202, 206, 209–13, 217, 223–5, 229; and N. M. Karamzin, 189–99
Christoff, P., 146, 250
Chulkov, M. D., 160
Cossacks, 3, 44, 89, 141, 251, 286 n. 54, 309 n. 2; Antonovsky on, 137–9; Bantysh-Kamensky on, 185–7; Bezborodko on, 76–7; decline of Cossack regime in Ukraine and its aftermath, 15–29; early historical writings about, 177–81. *See also* Zaporozhian Cossacks.
Crimea, 123, 132, 138, 193, 206; annexation of (1783), 4, 67; Catherine the Great's journey to (1787), 35, 102, 130; locusts in, 108; origins of Kochubei family in, 101
Cyrillo-Methodian Society, 11,

233, 247–51
Czacki, T., 37, 85, 141–3, 192–3
Czarnocki, A. *See* Chodakowski, Z. D.
Czartoryski, A. A., 30–3, 37, 61, 104, 191, 196, 209, 211

Danilov, Kirsha, 92, 153
Dashkova, E. R., 69
Decembrist uprising (1825), 27–8, 93
Derzhavin, G. R., 131
Desnytsky, S. Ie., 115, 296 n. 11
Dikanka, 102–3, 106–8
Dmitriev, I. I., 135
Dnieper river, 3–4, 31, 33–4, 36, 44, 123, 172, 195, 228
Dobrovský, J., 229
Dolgorukov, I. M., 29, 161
Doroshkevych, A. M., 218–19
Drahomanov, M., 231

Elizabeth, Empress, 16, 61, 80
Euler, L., 128, 133

Falkovsky, I., 48
Fauriel, C., 164
French Revolution and Ukraine, 22
Fus, N., 196

Galicia, 6, 156, 172, 224, 228, 252
"General Description" of Ukraine (1765), 18–19
Glinka, F. N., 150–2
Gogol, N. V., 2, 42, 91, 102, 161–2, 188, 197, 201, 239, 241; his *Vechera* (1831–2), 166–75, 245
Golitsyn, A. M., 50
Golitsyn, M. M., 49
Gortinsky, N.. 218
Grabowski, M., 38
Granovsky, T. N., 2, 235
Grech, N. I., 192

Halynkovsky, Ia., 46, 48, 118, 128, 130, 178
Hanka, V., 229
Herzen, A. I., 235–6
Hetmanate, 3, 101–3, 242; end of, 15–19
Hettun, V. N., 62–3
Hlukhiv, 20–1, 60, 69, 89, 111, 214
Hnidych, M., 3, 49, 96, 149–50, 157, 229; on Ukrainian and Greek folksongs, 163–4
Homel, 196, 208–9, 212–13, 216–17, 219, 221
Horbachevsky, I., 27
Horkusha, S., 3, 22
Hrabianka, 133
Hrebinka, Ie., 44, 64, 171, 326 n. 49
Hrushevsky, M., 10, 12, 253
Hryhorovych, I., 209, 212, 216–19
Hryhorovych, V. I., 230
Hryhorovych-Barsky, V., 51, 92, 121–2, 124
Hudovych, I. V., 324 n. 23
Hulak, M., 248
Hulak-Artemovsky, P., 156
Hun, O., 92

Iaşi, 67, 70, 76, 78
Iavorsky, M., 12
Iavorsky, S., 53
Ikhav Kozak za Dunai (Ukrainian folksong), 149, 161, 303 n. 17
Istoriia Rusov, 28, 76–7, 186, 210, 237, 250
Iuzhnaia Rus', 7, 201, 262 n. 31
Ivan VI, 21
Izmailov, V. V., 92

Jews, 4–5

Kachenovsky, M. T., 49, 148–9, 155–7, 190
Kalaidovych, K. F., 92, 154, 194, 197, 215, 219, 222
Kalynovsky, H. I., 63, 122–4
Kantemir, A., 153
Kapnist, M. V., 22
Kapnist, V. V., 22, 91–2, 96, 116, 130, 229
Karamzin, N. M., 135, 163, 169, 172, 184, 224; and Z. D. Chodakowski, 224–30
Karazyn, V. N., 84, 96, 141, 148, 151, 155, 208, 214, 222, 242–3
Khalansky, I. I., 213–14, 221
Kharkiv, 2, 61, 92, 149, 156, 208, 221, 228, 230, 251; Collegium, 44, 49–50, 56, 60–1, 63, 209; emergence of Ukrainian Romanticism in, 242–5, 326 n. 49; University, 18, 29, 36, 42, 44, 148, 214, 221, 228, 242, 325 n. 37
Kharlampovych, K. V., 14
Kheraskov, M. M., 59, 115
Khilkova, Princess, 96
Khmelnytsky, B., 3, 15, 20–1, 76, 133, 137, 150–1, 185–6, 239–40, 244, 251
Khokhol (abusive Russian term for a Ukrainian), 63, 111
Khomiakov, A. S., 239, 249–50
Kiev, 18, 20, 31–2, 43, 45, 93, 121, 133, 138, 140–1, 157, 172, 210–12, 215; Academy, 28, 31, 44–51, 53–4, 56–8, 62, 66, 116, 118–22, 129–30, 133, 136–7, 141, 209–11, 278 n. 22; Gymnasium, 31–2, 37; University, 36, 210
Kireevsky, I. V., 240
Kireevsky, P. V., 160–1, 239
Kobzar (1840), 11, 96, 247–8
Kochubei, A. P., 79, 110
Kochubei, D. V., 111
Kochubei, P. V., 71, 73
Kochubei, S. M., 22, 110–11, 295 n. 240
Kochubei, V. L., 101
Kochubei, V. P., 22–4, 30, 32, 61, 63–7, 70, 73, 78–9, 93–4, 127, 183, 187, 208, 237; Ukrainian identity of, 101–11
Kohl, J. G., 10, 23, 29
Kohut, Z., 11
Kołakowski, L., 249
Kollár, J., 197, 229
Koltsov, A. V., 160

Konysky, H., 37, 50–1, 85, 120–1, 124, 130, 216, 219
Kopitar, J., 229
Köppen, P. I., 38, 92, 140, 212, 217, 221, 227–9
Kostomarov, M., 8–9, 230, 247–8, 251–2
Kostrov, E. I., 130
Kotliarevsky, I. P., 26, 111, 150, 154, 157, 228, 244, 246
Kovalevsky, E. P., 151
Kozelsky, Ia. P., 50, 115, 125, 127
Kozodavlev, O. P., 128, 130
Krzemieniec, 37, 45, 140
Kukolnyk, N., 225
Kulish, P., 8, 91, 247–9, 251
Kulzhynsky, I., 38, 171, 244–5
Kurakin, A. B., 19, 22–3, 66, 93–4, 102, 107, 109, 111
Kvitka, H., 262 n. 32
Kybyntsi, 90–3, 96, 213

Latin, at the Kiev Academy, 45; in eighteenth-century Europe, 46; "Latin schools" (church schools in Ukraine), 42
Lazarevsky, M., 27
Lazarevsky, O., 9–10, 16
Legislative Commission of 1767, 21, 27, 48
Lelewel, J., 37
Lenin, V. I., 8
Leskov, N., 2
Lesur, C.-L., 23, 151, 179
Levytsky, D. H., 60
Lialychi, 22, 51, 82, 85
Linnaeus, 3
Lithuanian Statute, 19, 75, 127, 143
Little Russia (term for Ukraine), 2–3
Lobanov-Rostovsky, Ia. I., 19, 93
Loboiko, I., 158, 192, 203, 209, 213, 217–18, 228; and N. P. Rumiantsev, 220–3
Lobysevych, O., 51
Lobysevych, V. O., 63
Locusts in Ukraine, 108
Lomonosov, M., 48
Longinov, N., 61
Lubianovsky, F. P., 63
Luckyj, G., 12
Lukashevych, P. A., 161
Lviv, 32, 44, 228
Lvov, F. P., 164–5
Lvov, N. L., 164

Madariaga, I. de, 66, 68
Maksymovych, M. O., 9, 38, 154–6, 160–2, 197–8, 210, 227, 246
Markevych, M., 22, 160, 167, 172, 178–81; Belinsky's hostility towards, 236–9
Markovych, Ia., 64, 92, 96, 118, 180–1, 237
Markovych, Oleksander, 96
Markovych, Opanas, 235
Martos, I. P., 60, 96
Martos, I. R., 25, 96
Martos, O. I., 96, 185
Martos, P. I., 96
Martynov, I. I., 58–9, 63, 84,

117, 225
Maślanka, J., 192
Mazepa, 3, 9, 15, 20–1, 101, 154–5
Medical Chancery (St. Petersburg), 46, 57, 86
Metlynsky, A., 246
Miakotin, V., 10
Mohyla, P., 45
Mohyliansky, N. M., 14
Molodyk, 211, 243, 247
Mordvinov, N. S., 105
Morkov, A. I., 70, 76, 78, 87
Moscow, 42, 124; University, 2, 46, 57–9, 61, 64, 136, 155
Muravev, N. M., 189
Muravev-Apostol brothers, 23, 27, 93
Mykhailovsky-Danilevsky, O. I., 23
Myklashevsky, M. P., 19, 22, 71
Myloradovych, A. S., 84, 95, 130
Myloradovych, H. P., 74, 80, 95–6, 109
Myloradovych, M. A., 96
Myrovych, V., 21
Myslavsky, S., 47–9, 55, 58, 62, 130, 237

Nadezhdin, N. I., 174, 198, 235, 245
Napoleon I and Ukraine, 23
Narizhny, V. T., 44, 92, 166, 171
Narodnost, concept of, 36, 167, 173–4, 231–6, 240, 248, 251–2. *See also* Official Nationality.
Naruszewicz, 140–3
Neustroev, A. N., 115
Nicholas I, 35–6, 183, 232–3
Niemcewicz, J., 37
Nikon, Patriarch, 53
Nizhyn, 27, 45, 80, 130, 213, 215, 225
Normanist controversy (in Russian historiography), 181, 195, 226
Novhorod-Siversky, 56, 130, 213–14, 222
Novikov, N., 114
Novosiltsev, N. N., 104
Novytsky, M., 63

Odessa, 4
Odyntsov, Ia., 47, 129
Official Nationality, Nicholas I's doctrine of, 36, 38, 160, 165, 167–8, 233. *See also Narodnost*.
Ohloblyn, O., 10–11, 69, 128
Okenfuss, M., 54
Orlai, I. S., 213, 224–5, 227
Orlov, A. F., 247
Orlyk, P., 15, 20
Orsha, 32, 85
Osnova, 251

Panin, N., 3, 67, 83
Pashchenko, O., 52
Paskevych, H., 51
Paskevych-Erivansky, I. F., 63
Passek, V. V., 235–6
Pastorius ab Hirtemberg, 186
Paul I, 19, 66, 94, 103, 127

Pavlovsky, O., 157–9, 228–9
Pelech, O., 11
Pereiaslav, treaty of (1654), 13; seminary of, 56
Peter the Great, 3, 101
Petrov, A., 247–8
Petrov, N. I., 114
Pleshcheev, S. I., 131
Plotho, C. von, 151
Pogodin, M. P., 36–7, 154, 167–8, 225
Pohorilsky, A., 171
Poland, 3–5, 45, 62, 67, 76, 85–6, 93, 120, 140, 142–3, 154, 173–4, 184, 191–4; interaction with Ukraine, 30–9
Poletyka, H., 21, 28, 48
Poletyka, V. H., 21, 28, 148, 211
Polevoi, K., 198
Polevoi, N. A., 146, 169–70, 174, 246; on D. Bantysh-Kamensky, 186–7; and Z. D. Chodakowski, 197–8
Polotsk, 133–4, 158, 218
Poltava, battle of (1709), 3, 101, 149, 244; province of, 19, 22, 90, 93–5, 156–7, 228, 251; town of, 19, 51, 63, 95
Poltava (poem by Pushkin), 101, 154, 171
Polubotok, P., 15, 20
Potemkin, G., 4, 70, 103, 119, 161
Preis, P. I., 230
Priima, F. Ia., 192
Prokopovych, A., 44, 49
Prokopovych, T., 53, 153, 163, 186
Prokopovych-Antonsky, A., 59, 137
Public Library (St. Petersburg), 136, 138–9, 163
Pugachev, E., 22, 67
Pushkin, A. S., 101, 189, 197
Pypin, A. N., 191, 198, 205, 233

Radishchev, A., 128, 136
Ransel, D., 68
Razin, S., 251
Repnin, N. G., 19, 23–5, 30, 66, 93, 109, 111, 182, 185
Repnin, N. V., 90
Riga, 123, 127, 129, 135
Rigelman, M., 180
Rodzianko, A., 96
Rossiiskii magazin (journal of F. O. Tumansky), 131–4
Rostopchin, F., 69, 80
Rozumovsky, K., 16, 20–1, 73, 78, 83
Rozumovsky, O., 61, 122
Ruban, Ia., 80, 137
Ruban, V., 37, 48, 58, 75, 92, 119, 130, 133, 136–7, 180, 185, 210; literary career of, 119–26
Rudnytsky, I. L., 10
Rumiantsev, N. P., 28, 44, 92, 191, 193, 195, 237; and Slavic studies in Russia, 201–30
Rumiantsev, P. A., 16–19, 23–5, 65, 69, 72, 83–4, 121–2,

133, 206, 214, 237
Rumiantsev, S. P., 104, 109, 208, 217, 219
Rus', 262 n. 31, 32
"Russian Italy" (Russian description of Ukraine), 3, 35, 149, 259 n. 10
Ryleev, K. F., 151, 158, 220, 228, 237

Šafařík, P. J., 229
Samarin, Iu., 250
Samborsky, A. O., 60, 80
Scherer, J. B., 117, 124, 151, 178–80, 184
Schools Commission (1782), 42–3, 47–8, 55–6, 211
Shafonsky, O., 41, 140–1
Shakhovskoi, A. A., 149–50, 152, 161, 163
Shakhovskoi, Ia. P., 94
Shalikov, P. I., 92
Shchepkin, M. S., 2, 239
Shcherbatov, M. M., 116, 141
Shelekhov, G. I., 57
Shevchenko, T. H., 11, 96, 235–6, 247–9, 251
Shishkov, A. S., 150, 158, 192, 197, 203–4, 226, 229
Shtrange, M. M., 11, 62
Sinopsis (1674), 28
Skoropadsky family, 22, 108
Skovoroda, H. S., 3, 26, 49, 50–1, 96, 138, 161, 186, 244
Slovo o polku Igoreve, 32, 142, 153–4, 244
Smirnytsky, V. N., 201, 203, 229
Somov, O., 150–1
Speransky, M. M., 59, 95, 97, 106–7
Sreznevsky, I. I., 32, 38, 133, 160–1, 228–30
Starodub, 22, 27, 63, 158
Starshyna (Ukrainian gentry), 15, 66, 71, 83, 91, 102, 110
Storozhenko, A. (real name of Andrii Tsarynnyi), 38, 42–3, 170–4, 201
Strasbourg, 42, 46
Stroev, P. M., 212, 214, 219–20
Stroganov, P. A., 104
Sub-Carpathian Ukrainians, 6, 54, 156, 213, 224–8, 321 n. 101
Sverbeev, D. N., 59
Swoboda, V., 236
Symonovsky, P., 211

Teachers' Seminary (St. Petersburg), 55–8, 210
Teplov, G. N., 20–1, 70, 79
Terekhovsky, M., 46, 87, 159
Thaden, E., 145–6
Topolnicki, A., 32
Trokhymovsky, M. Ia., 148
Troshchynsky, D. P., 8, 19, 22–3, 25, 28, 51, 65–7, 71, 78, 84, 89, 101, 104–5, 180, 211, 213; Ukrainian identity of, 90–100
Trutovsky, V., 61
Tsarynnyi, A. *See* Andrii Storozhenko.
Tsertelev, M., 92, 157–9, 161–2, 228–9

Tumansky, F. O., 47, 91, 124, 139, 180, 185, 206, 210; literary career of, 127–35
Tumansky, I. H., 62
Turgenev, N. I., 189
Tutolmin, P. V., 62
Tymkovsky, I., 44, 59, 214, 243
Tymkovsky, R., 214

Ukraina (Ukrainian journal of the 1920s), 10
Ukraine, Soviet historiography of, 12–14
Ukrainskii vestnik (1816–19), 243–4
Ukrainskii zhurnal (1824–5), 244
Ulei (1811–12), 31, 140–3, 211
Uniate Church, 30, 37, 45, 134, 184, 194, 218
United Slavs, Society of, 27
Ustrialov, N. G., 36–7
Uvarov, S. S., 37, 154, 187, 232–3, 323 n. 4

Vechera na khutore bliz Dikanki (1831–2), 166–75
Venelyn, Iu., 224–7, 250–1
Vestnik Evropy (1802–30), 148, 155–7, 167, 190, 194, 196–7
Viazemsky, A. A., 16, 81
Viazemsky, P. A., 166, 189–90, 231
Vigel, F. F., 83, 102
Vilnius, 31–2, 35–6, 140, 158, 217, 221–2
Vinsky, H., 3
Vitebsk, 33, 210
Voeikov, A. F., 198
Volkonsky, S. G., brother of N. G. Repnin, 25
Vorontsov, A. R., 69, 76, 78, 81, 87, 100
Vorontsov, S. R., 69, 70, 78, 85–6, 103–4, 107, 206
Voskresenie mertvykh (play by Konysky), 50–1

Wandycz, P., 193

Yakovliv, A., 76

Zagoskin, M. N., 150, 168–70
Zaporozhian Cossacks, 4, 16, 26, 76, 83, 119–20, 133, 173, 179, 244. *See also* Cossacks.
Zavadovsky, P. V., 22, 31–2, 43, 51, 55, 58, 65–7, 70–1, 75, 78, 91, 93, 101, 129, 206, 211, 213; Ukrainian identity of, 82–9
Zerkalo sveta (1786–7), 129–32
Zhukovsky, V. A., 150
Zinoviev, V. I., 76
Zubov, P., 70, 76, 81, 87, 94

This study, based largely on original research in the archives of Moscow and Leningrad, sheds new light on the role played in Russian cultural development by those Ukrainians who chose to identify themselves with the Russian Empire. By stressing the native, Slavic aspects of imperial culture, Ukrainians modified the Russians' understanding of what it meant to be Russian, preventing them from becoming wholly dependent on contemporary Western Europe. In a wide-ranging, richly detailed analysis, David Saunders shows how this impact was achieved by Ukrainian educators, writers, journalists, scholars and political figures.

Although significant, the Ukrainian impact was short-lived. The concluding chapter explains the tsarist government's imposition of an increasingly rigid conception of nationality on all its subjects, which led Ukrainians to reassert their separate identity.

As the most comprehensive study of its subject, this book makes an important contribution to both Ukrainian and Russian history.

David Saunders is Lecturer in History at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, England. He has published several articles in professional journals and contributed to the recent CIUS publication *Loyalties in Conflict*. The present work is based on his doctoral dissertation, which was completed at St. Antony's College, Oxford University.