

THE CONSTRUCTION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL SPACE
BY THE INTELLECTUALS OF RUSSIAN UKRAINE, 1860S-1870S

by

Anton Kotenko

Submitted to
Central European University
History department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Yaroslav Hrytsak

Second reader: Professor Alexei Miller

Budapest, Hungary

2008

Statement of Copyright

“Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author”.

Abstract

Imagining the nation requires addressing two basic components – space and time, or, better to say, if it deals with historical imagination, – space-time. Considering the notion of “national space” as a crucial component for the process of nation-building this investigation emphasizes its constructed nature and explores the practices of its creation. Using a concept of a “mental map”, I would like to focus my research on creation of Ukrainian national space, underlying its constructed character. During the thesis I argue that there was no stable vision of Ukraine in the course of the nineteenth century. Although the first lively discussions started only at the beginning of the 1860s, already in the 1870s they resulted not only in the mental image of Ukraine, but were even reinforced with the cartographic image of Ukrainian national space.

Table of Contents:

Introducing the subject.....	5
Chapter 1. Space and Nationalism: basic theoretical premises.....	12
Chapter 2. Space in the Romanov Empire in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century: Territorial Detachment of “Ukraine”	20
Chapter 3. Imagining Ukraine: Ukrainian national project in 1860s. <i>Osnova</i> as Ukrainian “National Geographic” (1861-2)	38
Chapter 4. Mapping Ukraine in the 1870s. Ethnographical-Statistical Expedition into the Southern-Western Provinces (1869-70) and the role South-Western Department of Russian Geographical Society (1874-76) in Ukrainian national space creation.....	49
Conclusions	59
Bibliography.....	63

Introducing the subject

“The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space...
The anxiety of our era has to do fundamentally with space,
no doubt a great deal more than with time”
(Michel Foucault)

Nationalism is a hot issue in today's world. Since 1980s intellectuals around the globe produced an enormous amount of papers dealing with the concepts of nation and nationalism. Only at CEU from 1995 to 2007 students defended 62 MA theses' directly related to this issue in their titles. Still, the subject I would like to start investigating is not entirely covered not only by them, but also by professional historians.

In this research I primarily want to follow a perspective on history of nationalism which focuses scholar's attention on one of its constitutive parts, which is a national territory. On the one hand this approach is not that a novel one, because there are books¹, articles collections², and unpublished PhD dissertations³, which employ it. On the other hand, first of all, not all of them deal with the issue properly⁴. Secondly, the Ukrainian example still remains undiscovered, with the story of formation of Ukrainian national space

¹ Vytautas Petronis. *Constructing Lithuania: Ethnic Mapping in Tsarist Russia, ca. 1800-1914*. Stockholm, 2007. White, George. *Nationalism and Territory: Constructing Group Identity in Southeastern Europe*. Lanham, 2000.

² David Hooson, ed. *Geography and National Identity*. Cambridge, 1994.

³ Steven Seegel. *Blueprinting Modernity: Nation-state Cartography and Intellectual Ordering in Russia's European Empire, Ukraine, and former Poland-Lithuania, 1795-1917*. Providence, 2006. Irina Popova. *Nationalizing spatial practices: Hungarians and the Habsburg Empire, 1700-1848*. Budapest, 1999.

⁴ E.g., Petronis in his book simply gets two concepts of “ethnos” and “nation” mixed, not making any distinction between them, which is a mistake by default. White concentrates mainly on identifying the most significant places and territories and works with them: why are they significant, what can be done to be able to solve some problems around them etc. Together with Popova they focus mainly on cartographic sources, undeservedly leaving the very important set of verbal descriptions of national space aside.

being yet untold⁵.

Therefore, the aim of my exploration is to analyse part of the Ukrainian long nineteenth century in the context of the history of ideas, through the birth of the Ukrainian national project. At this part I have to admit that the concept of “project” does not have to push to the conclusion that this has indeed been a project *stricto senso*, planned and determined in advance. In this paper a “project” means “ideologically similar views, intellectual reactions and reflections, present in some limited period of time, which sooner or later either transform into a socially important and established system, or lose their social significance and turn into a solely historiographic artifact”⁶. In this meaning the notion of “project” both unites a moment of spontaneity of above mentioned reactions or reflections and at the same time gives signals of presence of purposeful activity. Examining in the light of this project a wider problem, the process of the creation of modern Ukrainian identity, I would like to concentrate only on one part, the notion of national space. Traditionally, imagining the nation requires addressing two basic components – space and time, or, better to say, if it deals with historical imagination, – space-time. Consequently, considering the notion of “national space” as a crucial component for nation-building, I would like to scrutinize here the process of Ukrainian “nationalizing” of multiethnic (according to Andreas Kappeler) space. To put it simply, I would like to investigate how separate, very different territories, sometimes located at a great distance from each other, turned into the Ukrainian national space.

⁵ The only example I have found is an article by Ihor Stebelsky, deliciously titled as “National identity of Ukraine” in: *Geography and National Identity*, pp. 233-248, but it does not touch upon the question really much, appearing to be a standard account of Ukrainian national narrative. The one specific work, which employs a novel approaches towards Ukrainian national space is by Serhy Yekelchuk: “Creating a Sacred Place: The Ukrainofiles and Shevchenko’s Tomb in Kaniv (1861 – ca. 1900)”. In: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 1-2 (1995). Partially the questions of Ukrainian national space are also dealt with by Iaroslav Hrytsak. *Prorok u svoii vitchyzni: Franko ta ioho spilnota (1856-1886)* [A prophet in his motherland: Franko and his community (1856-1886)] Kyiv, 2006.

⁶ Georgiy Kasianov. “Natsional’ne vidrodzhennia”: *termin, ideologemy, naukovi interpretacii* [National revival: a term, ideology, scientific interpretations]. Kyiv, 2006 (Manuscript), p. 20.

As far as I support the thesis that a national territory, the same as a national identity, is not a fixed and indissoluble entity, using the concept of a “cognitive map” I will try to cover here *who* of the intellectuals of Russian Ukraine and *how* they tried to change the idea of Ukrainians about their national territory⁷. It means that unlike historical geography, which investigates real changes of space, my aim here is to try to reconstruct the visions of space in the past⁸. And even more: a conscious attempt to influence a formation of such visions. Having in mind Valerie Kivelson’s warning that “if one studies geographical sources, the resultant claim that geography played a crucial role ... may not carry either the force or the credibility that one might want”⁹, I tried to use here an interdisciplinary approach, combining intellectual history with geography, psychology, and literary studies.

Therefore, the tasks of my research are as follows:

1. First of all, I will analyze the published *oeuvre* of Ukrainian intellectuals in order to learn what their idea of space was, starting from the middle of the nineteenth century.
2. Secondly, I will try to understand what has changed during the 1860-1870s with the unfolding of “Ukrainian” national project: did its representatives try and how then to treat Little Russia, the South-Western provinces of the Russian Empire, New Russia, Galicia, Bukovyna and Transcarpathia as a single national space?

⁷ Generally speaking, “cognitive map” is a means with the help of which people acquire, encode, recall, and decode data of the locations and phenomena in their daily lives in order to improve study and perceive the information of their own *imago mundi*. The term itself was introduced by Edward Tolman in his article “Cognitive maps in rats and men”. In: *Psychological Review*, No 50 (1948). As stressed by psychologists, “most cognitive maps not only fail to reflect all the details of the environment they represent, but also have systematic errors caused by the processes that encode them into memory” – Robert Lloyd. “Understanding and Learning Maps”. In: Rob Kitchin and Scott Freundschuh, eds. *Cognitive Mapping*. London and New York, 2003, p. 84.

⁸ Reinhart Koselleck. “Prostir ta istoriia” [Space and history]. In: *Chasovi plasty. Doslidzhennia z teorii istorii* [Time layers. Explorations in the theory of history]. Kyiv, 2006, p. 103.

⁹ Valerie Kivelson. *Cartographies of Tsardom: the Land and Its Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Russia*. Ithaca, 2006, p. 211.

What and *why* was intentionally or unintentionally being stressed, omitted or invented?

3. To come down to the individual level, third set of my questions would deal with knowing *who* was the most “responsible” for the stipulation of the nation’s spatial dimension? *How* was the identity and loyalty of creators of this space and their proponents revealed through their work?
4. Fourth, *how* were the nation’s boundaries defined and marked, when tying different parts of the nation together? Did it imply exclusively Ukrainian belonging of these lands and is there any connection between this process and modern Ukrainian territorial identity problems?
5. Fifth, but not least, I would like to pay attention to the role of empire in this process: are they indeed “breeding” nations or, on the contrary, in every way possible opposing them?

In order to present an entire picture of Ukrainian national space creation, it would be more logical and justifiable to carry out this research in the chronological parentheses of the whole “long” nineteenth century. Still, my chronological framework is more limited. I concentrate here more precisely on the process of Ukrainian nationalists’ acquiring the territory from the 1860s till the 1870s, from the first lively discussions and attempts to define Ukrainian national space in 1861-1862 until the 1878, when it had been articulated in the first Ukrainian political program – “*Perednie Slovo do Hromady*” [Foreword to *Hromada*].

One of the main issues for this paper is an understanding of the very concept of the notion “Ukraine”. And here, in my opinion, Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytsky’s statement that the main question for a historian is not that much about terminology (the history of which in the

case of Ukraine is already more or less covered¹⁰), but about its content, is absolutely right. One needs to focus on the meaning of the nineteenth century “Ukraine”, rather than the word usage. This is exactly why I try here to use a toponym “Ukraine” and ethnonym “Ukrainian” to label those people who perceived the main aim of their activities in the creation (or restoring in their rhetoric) of the Ukrainian state. Consequently, I use “Little Russia” and “Little Russians” to describe those people who rejected the Ukrainian project, and perceived themselves as a part of a united “Great Russian” or any other nationality at the same time standing apart from the pejorative shade of these¹¹, characterizing it only as a vision, which was competing and alternative to the Ukrainian one, having the integration of Ukraine to the Romanov empire as its main aim. The same applies to the term “nationalism”, which I regard as evaluatively neutral¹², at least trying, if it is possible at all, not to give my personal preference to any of these national projects.

According to the suggested aim and tasks, the object and primary sources of my analysis are the most significant printed works of the participants of nationalist discourse, which mean predominantly texts, testifying the existence of a consequent project and allowing to trace its intellectual origins together with its main ideas, myths and symbols, which their authors appeal to; these are histories, geographies, articles and essays from newspapers and magazines. Besides, to understand the context of the reception better, this corpus of sources is supplemented with the epistolary, autobiographies and memoirs. Naturally, since my text deals with space a very important group of sources for me were geographical guides and cartographical materials.

¹⁰ The latest account can be found in Serhii Plokhy. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Cambridge, 2006, pp. 299-353.

¹¹ Meaning coined by Ievhen Malaniuk in “Malorosiistvo” [Little Russianism]. In: *Knyha sposterezhen’* [Book of observations]. Kyiv, 1995, pp. 210-233.

¹² “Nationalism as a political principle that holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent” – Ernest Gellner. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford, 1983, p. 1.

The thesis is structurally divided into three parts. It commences with the summary of the most important theoretical premises, needed to have in mind before writing / reading any paper on nationalism. The second chapter offers a picture of overall situation with space in the Russian Empire in the first half of the nineteenth century and also tries to demonstrate how Ukrainian / Little Russian intellectuals perceived the space around them. The third part directly deals with the issues of 1861-62, when the discourse of Ukrainian national space started to emerge in the *Osnova* journal. The last chapter is examining the impact of the Ethnographical-Statistical Expedition into the Western provinces of the Romanov Empire and also the role of the South-Western Department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society, which existed in Kyiv in 1874-76. In the conclusion I will sum everything and express some of my ideas on the possibilities of expanding this project.

Although studies of the Ukrainian national project started as early as the nineteenth century itself, the whole previous historiography mainly concentrated upon other issues, its largest part is still being written within the dominating framework of “lacrimogenesis” (von Hagen) national narrative style and popularizes the concept of “national revival” of the “eternally” existing Ukrainian nation, without a consensus though on what a “nation” indeed is. Yet, in the end, a long-standing statement by Ukrainian émigré scholar, Ivan Lysiak Rudnytsky, that the nineteenth century remains the most unexplored period of Ukrainian history is still relevant¹³. Thus the topic raised is indeed interesting for me first of all as an intellectual challenge, as a possibility to engage in the process of re-rethinking established stereotypes and conceptions; a process, which some day will not only allow the overcoming of the complex of intellectual inferiority and hamletism of contemporary Ukrainian historiography, but also contribute to nationalism studies in general. What makes this case

¹³ Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, “Struktura Ukraïns’koiï istorii v 19 stolitti” [A Structure of Ukrainian History in the 19 century]. In: *Istorychni ese* [Historical Essays]. Kyiv, 1994, p. 193.

particularly interesting for any historian, dealing with Central Europe, is that all of its nowadays territories were contested in the nineteenth century by the multiple actors: Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, Great Russian, Little Russian, and Jewish projects in a similar way were all engaged into the struggle for this space. Thus, in spite of its being just an exemplary case study, the investigation of the Western borderlands of the Russian empire is very important in the broader context of East-Central Europe, for the problem Ukrainian nationalists dealt with was not solely Ukrainian one¹⁴.

¹⁴ See, for instance, a “Petition to the Emperor against the Unification of Bohemia and Moravia”, where Moravians constantly denied their belonging to the Czech nation. In: Balázs Trencsényi, and Michal Kopeček, eds. *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*. Budapest, 2006.

Chapter 1. Space and Nationalism: basic theoretical premises

He cherished this map as the darling of his heart. It represented to him a great and living ideal to the service of which his life was devoted. He could talk for hours about it, elaborating this point and that point, recalling historical events and folklore, and place-names and heroes of the past. Here he was born. Here his life was born. Here a battle was fought. And so on... He revelled in frontiers, and, taking a pen, he proceeded to draw a great many more...

A. MacCullum Scott, describing a Belarusian nationalist¹⁵

A question of surrounding spaces has interested humanity for a long time. The first explorations of such an obvious yet intangible substance were started by the philosophers and mathematicians of antiquity, which resulted in Aristotle's detachment of place as one of his ten basic metaphysical categories. "Except for the extraordinary cases of the Unmoved Mover and the heavens taken as a single whole, every perishable sublunar substance (including the earth as a whole) is placebound, having its own 'proper place' as well as existing in the 'common place' provided by heavens"¹⁶. His theory of space survived until the seventeenth century, when Descartes separated space from traditional metaphysics. After him these ideas were picked up by Newton, Leibniz and Spinoza with their own, very different concepts, but at the same time common understanding of the relativity of space, its acquired character; each of them agreed that first of all space is a psychological phenomenon; moreover, it directly depends on the surrounding environment. Everything was summarized by Kant, who proposed the idea of relative and *a priori* character of spatial notions of a man, which, as temporal ideas, have not been a kind of absolute and empirical facts, but merely a human specific way of a world perception¹⁷.

¹⁵ Anne Applebaum. *Between East and West: Across the Borderlands of Europe*. New York, 1994, p. 142.

¹⁶ Edward Casey. *The Fate of Place: a Philosophical History*. Berkeley, 1998, p. 50.

¹⁷ John O'Keefe, and Lynn Nadel. *Hippocampus as a Cognitive Map*. Oxford, 1978, pp. 5-62.

Later on such investigations shifted from philosophy to psychology, representatives of which started to define two spatial types: physical and psychological. Another version of the spaces typology depended on its inherited or acquired nature (*a priori* and *a posteriori* spaces): if the former was defined by genetic information, the latter by the concrete experience of an individual. In the twentieth century this gave birth to the “mental map” conception, which in its turn led to the emergence of cognitive geography through the medium of a behaviourist psychology¹⁸. Generally speaking, mental (or cognitive) map is a way with the help of which people acquire, encode, recall, and decode data of the locations and phenomena in their daily lives in order to improve study and perceive the information of their own *imago mundi*. Therefore one might conclude that through their lives people create and operate with their own mental maps: not real space, but only ideas about it. That is why psychologists stress that “most cognitive maps not only fail to reflect all the details of the environment they represent, but also have systematic errors caused by the processes that encode them into memory”¹⁹.

As stated by François Walter, exactly between the Enlightenment and the Romantic epoch (eighteenth century) the perceptual shift that converted natural spaces into “landscapes” in the minds of beholders occurred. He writes that since 1750 landscapes had ceased to be just an objective category, turning instead, according to the formula by Orvar Löfgren, into “mindsapes”, whose borders were established not by cannons or political borders, but by the ideas, images, and imagination²⁰. Mindsapes which, being too large to be perceived and immediately imagined by the human senses, are thus classified by

¹⁸ Representatives of this trend in psychology consider all people to be born as equal *tabula rasa*, but becoming different under the influence of their environment. Even more closer to the mental map concept was gestalt psychology, which adherents claimed that a person always depends more on its imagined world, than on a real one.

¹⁹ Lloyd 2003, p. 84.

²⁰ Peter Jones. “Walter, F. Les figures paysagères de la nation: Territoire et paysage en Europe, 16-e–20-e siècle. Paris: Editions EHESS, 2004”. In: *Journal of Modern History*, 2 (2006), p. 467.

psychologists as transperceptual, i.e. possible to be seized only through reduction in the symbolical images – maps as the most known and universal example of spatial representation of phenomena.

As everything in our world, nations also exist in space and need a territory. They are shaped by spatial processes and have spatial components. On a banal level, as White puts it, “the nation-state ideal is premised on the belief that ... nations can be free and the world at peace only when all nations are able to govern themselves. Self-governance, however, implies sovereignty over a piece of the earth’s territory, for how can a nation govern itself without control over a territory of its own?”²¹. As Robert Kaiser agrees, “whatever else it may be, nationalism is always a struggle for control of land; whatever else the nation may be, it is nothing if not a mode of constructing and interpreting a social space. ... ‘The land’ occupies a much more pervasive place in the ideology and enterprise of nations and nationalism, and manifest itself in ways that go far beyond such simple explanations, being intrinsic to the very concept of a national identity”²².

Consequently, an idea of a space and territory could be found in the majority of nation definitions. Although this text is mainly written under the inspiration and influence of the modernist paradigm of nation building established by the “1983 books” by Benedict Anderson and Ernest Gellner, much attention is needed to be paid to the national space as described by Anthony Smith²³. In his description of the components of “each individual Self”, Smith calls the category of space or territory as of secondary importance, emphasising in particular the spread of local and regional identities, though noticing that in most cases

²¹ White 2000, p. 1.

²² Quoted in: Alexander Motyl, ed. *Encyclopedia of nationalism*. Vol. 1. San Diego, 2000, p. 316.

²³ Benedict Anderson. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London-New York, c1983, 1991; Ernest Gellner. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford, 1983. Notion of national space and territory was also widely discussed aside from them by another scholars, especially by Karl Deutsch. *Nationalism and Social Communication: an Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge, 1953.

ordinary regionalism is unable to sustain the mobilisation of its population²⁴. This is exactly why depicting a new type of a community – modern, territorial nation, – Smith remarks that

it also suggests a definite social space, a fairly well demarcated and bounded territory, with which the members identify and to which they feel they belong. ... Western or 'civic' model of a nation is a predominantly spatial or territorial conception. According to this view, nations must possess compact, well-defined territories. People and territory must, as it were, belong to each other²⁵.

On the same level with the emphasis on ethnicity Smith points out that

a space described cannot be just an ordinary part of a land. It has to be 'historical' land, 'motherland', 'cradle' of our people, even if this land is not one of pristine origin, as in the case of the Turks. 'Historical land' is where an area and people exercise mutual influence for some generations. "The homeland becomes a repository of historic memories and associations, the place where 'our' sages, saints and heroes lived, worked, prayed and fought. All this makes the homeland unique²⁶.

This very relationship with a territory, according to Smith, is an important difference of two types of territorial communities, "*ethnie*" and "nation"; if in the former case this relationship with territory could be only historical and symbolical, in the latter it is physical and actual: "nations possess territories... they are inconceivable without some common myths and memories of a territorial home" (contrary to *ethnos* which does not necessarily require living in "its" territorial motherland)²⁷. Smith believes that thus it is the duty of intellectuals to construct the national maps of the world. Such intellectuals will employ two strategies – the use of landscape or poetic spaces as the first and history or golden ages as the second – to establish a new time-space framework for creating a new ideology, language and symbolism of a complicated abstraction – national identity²⁸. It is needed to add here

²⁴ Smith, Anthony. *National Identity*. Reno, 1991, p. 4.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 9.

²⁶ Ibid, p. 9.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 40.

²⁸ Ibid, p. 78.

that such framework can be of two types: manifested mental maps have to be separated from the unmanifested, which exist only in the mind and are not expressed anywhere²⁹.

The place of a space in the process of nation-building is more interestingly explained by Benedict Anderson in his, at the moment, the most required reading for everyone who starts exploring anything connected to nationalism. According to Anderson, construction of a national space appears as a second part of a nation's imagining after the idea of a nation in general appears. Basing a chapter "Census, map, and museum" of his classical theory on the material of East-Southern Asia, Anderson characterizes these three factors as very important ways "in which the colonial state imagined its dominion – the nature of the human beings it ruled, the geography of its domain, and the legitimacy of its ancestry"³⁰. He points out that since the 1761 invention of the chronometer, "the entire planet's curved surface had been subjected to a geometrical grid which squared off empty seas and unexplored regions in measured boxes. The task of, as it were, 'filling in' the boxes was to be accomplished by explorers, surveyors, and military forces"³¹. In the aftermath general surveillance of space had started.

Explaining the role of territory description and its mapping for the nation's creation, Anderson, quoting a Thai scholar, Thongchai Winichakul, mentions that

in terms of most communication theories and common sense, a map is a scientific abstraction of reality. A map merely represents something that already exists objectively 'there'. In the story I have described, this relationship was reversed. A map anticipated spatial reality, not vice versa. In other words, a map was a model for, rather than a model of, when it purported to represent. ... It had become a real instrument to concretize projections on the earth's surface. A map was now necessary for the new administrative mechanisms and for the troops to back up their claims. ... The discourse on mapping was the paradigm which both administrative and military operations worked within and served³².

²⁹ This distinction is pointed at by Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past*. New Haven, 1997, p. 1.

³⁰ Anderson 1991, p. 164.

³¹ Ibid, p. 173

³² Ibid, pp. 173-174.

In this way with the help of a map an absolutely new concept of the spatial reality appeared, which, in its turn, could become of extraordinary importance in the nation's consciousness formation due to the map's ability to witness the nation's reality in space, and also, mentioning historical atlases and maps, – in time. As Jeremy Black notices, from the nineteenth century people have wanted and needed different kinds of maps, which ceased to be a secret and well-protected property of the state; they

were more used to seeing maps, not least in bibles, newspapers and magazines, and on stamps and consumer products, especially tins. Children saw maps displayed at schools, often as a visual centre in classrooms, a splash of colour and a suggestion of new horizons in spaces otherwise drained of imaginative potency. Like their newspaper-reading parents, children learned to read maps³³.

Dealing with the question which territory a nation will get inevitably leads the representatives of national movements to strive for control over their own territories in the way of either re-ordering existing maps, or creating new ones. Therefore, one faces the question of geography's role in this process.

In particular, the subject matter of geography sought to instil a sense of homeland in a population that had retained an overwhelmingly localized sense of place and identity. Even relatively descriptive geography textbooks, with their emphasis on the boundaries, physical geography, and natural regions and characteristics of the state in question, assisted in the territorial nationalization of school-aged children toward the image of the state as a homeland of a nation in the making – as something natural and eternal³⁴.

In their shaping of national space maps also define a subject for a future detailed study by other disciplines: ethnography, economics, topography, geology, demography, or history. Or, as Geoffrey Cubitt underlines, “in serving such governmental projects, maps facilitate the imaginative ‘nationalization’ of territory, habitat, and resources. By submitting the diversities of local physical and human geography to standard representational codes, they

³³ Black 1997, p. 53.

³⁴ Motyl 2000, Vol. 1, p. 318.

encourage the imaginative interpretation of these diversities as the internal relations and variations of a ‘national’ system”³⁵.

The case I explore in particular are the Western borderlands of the Russian empire, with the parallel unfolding of interconnected, still different Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, Great Russian and Jewish projects of nation-building excellently demonstrates this point well, because all of them competing with each other, included into this process also a struggle for a national territory, their own holy and ideal motherland, the same time interfering into a *Lebensraum* of the other turning this Other into its external constituting part.

Unlike modern psychologists and sociologists, who use different specially designed inquiries and organise different surveys, historians of the nineteenth century cannot interview the objects of their research. That is why they have to use cultural studies methods of gaining scientific knowledge. Hereby I imply poststructuralist approaches, for nationalism indeed is, among other things, a ‘discursive formation’ (after Michel Foucault) – “a way of speaking that shapes our consciousness”³⁶. Representatives of this trend usually notice that every text is a constitutive part of the wider cultural text, the same time being full of allusions, quotations and references (according to Iuliia Kristeva). In some sense any culture in general is primarily a constant return to the initial text, standard, verification based on it. That is why the ‘text’, which the culture is reading, has for a long time determined its face. Thus in this work I am trying to investigate first of all published texts of the main nineteenth century Ukrainian intellectuals embedded in their context³⁷. Texts that were read by a particular audience, with the help of which “‘jihad of writers’ groups” (by

³⁵ Geoffrey Cubitt, ed. *Imagining Nations*. Manchester 1998, p. 10.

³⁶ Craig Calhoun. *Nationalism*. Buckingham, 1997, p. 3.

³⁷ Eley, Geoff. “Is All the World a Text?”. In: Terrence McDonald, ed. *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor, 1996, p. 208.

Gellner) took place, which in its turn led to the nationalisation of spatial practices, and, consequently, creation of a Ukrainian national “mental” space.

Chapter 2. Space in the Romanov Empire in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century: Territorial Detachment of “Ukraine”

At the turn of the seventeenth century Europe witnessed the intensive rethinking of space. Under the influence of the Renaissance, Ptolemy's *Geography* in particular and the scientific revolution in general, knowledge of space entered the scene and became essential to a variety of professions. Although the term “cartography” in the modern sense was coined by Manuel de Souza in 1839 and appeared in print in English only in 1843, various maps, which originated from the sailors' portolans, were disseminated widely in Italy by the third quarter of the sixteenth century (substantial numbers existed in Milan, Florence and the Papal state), in sixteenth century England (Saxton's countrywide topographical survey of England and Wales) and the mid-seventeenth century France. A slightly different case was the Spanish Habsburgs, since here cartographic resources were heavily used to meet the needs of the overseas empire, not the metropolis. Finally, by the mid-eighteenth century the first projects to create general imperial maps, and not just of separate territories of Graz or Salzburg as was the case before, launched in the Austrian Habsburg lands³⁸.

From the very beginning the situation with the Muscovite tsardom and the Romanov Empire was different. First of all, according to Valerie Kivelson, it happened only in the late sixteenth and more extensively in the seventeenth century that Muscovites started to map their territories in some way. Kivelson's main idea is that the population of Muscovy “conceived of their role in the world to a significant degree in spatial terms”³⁹, starting already from the indicated period. She demonstrates her point with the numerous

³⁸ James Vann. “Mapping under the Austrian Habsburgs”. In: David Buisseret, ed. *Monarchs, Ministers, and Maps: the Emergence of Cartography as a Tool of Government in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago, 1992, p. 163.

³⁹ Kivelson 2006, p. 9.

reproductions of maps. However, even a cursory comparison of these maps to their European analogues would reveal the inadequacy of images produced in Moscow; Kivelson's book shows that there were simply no maps in Muscovy with mathematically measured points and coordinates.

Cartographic modernity came to Muscovy only in the epoch of great reforms initiated by Peter I (1682-1725). According to Willard Sunderland, this was exactly the time when in the Romanov empire territory became not just a goal, but a principle of governance⁴⁰. The first responsible person for its improvement was the new emperor, who being very conscious of space during his visit to Holland in 1696-97 not just intensively bought cartographical goods (maps, atlases, globes etc), but also contracted the Dutch printer, Jan Tessing, to establish a Russian press for the publication of maps, charts and secular books. The first text book of geography, which appeared in 1710,⁴¹ was a direct outcome of the Empire's investigations and surveys, based on a Dutch original. In 1734 the first imperial map by Ivan Kirilov was published⁴². As in the rest of Europe cartography was totally considered as an inherent state domain, maps were mostly kept in internal archives, not available for public usage. During the reign of Catherine the II (1762-96), such interest towards space, geo- and cartography started to come into popular consciousness with the special medal produced after the Empress's Crimean expedition of 1787 with the map of her voyage.

In accordance with the ideology of the "well-ordered police state", from Peter I and Catherine II Russian maps were to become a legitimating device of Russian territorial

⁴⁰ Willard Sunderland, "Imperial Space: Territorial Thought and Practice in the Eighteenth Century". In: Jane Burbank, Mark von Hagen, and Anatolii Remnev, eds. *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700-1930*. Bloomington, 2007, pp. 33-66.

⁴¹ Denis Shaw, "Geographical Practice and its Significance in Peter the Great's Russia". In: *Journal of Historical Geography*, 2 (1996), p. 166.

⁴² Leo Bagrow, "Ivan Kirilov, Compiler of the First Russian Atlas, 1689-1737". In: *Imago Mundi*, 2 (1937), p. 78.

acquisitions, but also had to serve the material need of increasing the military capacity of the state and exploiting its natural resources. As a result of this state activity, the Moscow School of Mathematics and Navigation was founded in 1701, in 1797 the Map Depot was established and in 1812 the Military-Topographical Depot followed to facilitate the storage of maps, plans, topographic and statistical descriptions. In 1822 the Corps of Military Topographers joined previous foundations. Finally, in 1845 the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (hereafter IRGO) was founded, resembling similar institutions in Paris (1821), Berlin (1828), and London (1830). It was a typical administrative imperial institution with regional branches in Tiflis (Caucasian department, 1851), Irkutsk (Siberian, 1851), Orenburg (1867-8), Vilno (Northwestern, 1868); Kiev (Southwestern, 1872), Omsk (Western Siberian, 1877), Khabarovsk (1894), Tashkent (1897), and Iakutsk (1913)⁴³.

During this mid-nineteenth century, as a result of the institutional building of Russian geography an absolutely new politics towards the Western provinces of the Romanov Empire started, when the central authorities started to pay intensive attention to the territorial-cartographic activity on the borders. These areas were to be made legible, and their population had to be classified according to religion, spoken language, or presumed racial characteristics. Nevertheless, when the active exploration of the imperial space commenced the situation with geographical knowledge in the Empire remained very poor⁴⁴.

⁴³ A story of the IRGO's creation, which added "Imperial" to its name from 1849, is nicely described by Nathaniel Knight, "Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society". In: Jane Burbank and David Ransel, editors. *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*. Bloomington, 1998, p. 108. His story of IRGO's nationalisation follows in pages 112-116.

⁴⁴ In 1876 the author of historical review of the world and Russian geography schoolbooks considered himself as having a full right to state that "the geographical knowledge even of those people, who gained high education, in most cases does not go beyond those data received from schoolbooks... The overall condition of our geography as a topic of a school course is extremely bad", and altogether "neither science of all school courses is not in the same abnormal situation as geography, which simply did not become a high school science does not play any eminent role even in gymnasium courses" – Leonid Vesin. *Istoricheskii obzor uchebnikov obshchei i russkoi geografii, izdannykh so vremen Petra Velikogo i po 1876 god (1710-1876)* [A Historical review of the textbooks of the world and Russian geography, published from the times of the Peter the Great till the 1876 (1710-1876)]. St. Petersburg, 1876, pp. 1-2. Criticizing those authors and their schoolbooks Vesin wrote that throughout the whole nineteenth century he did not notice any scientific progress, and Russian geography heavily needs scientific arrangement.

There existed no geography chairs at Russian universities. Although according to the University statute of 1804 geography had to be taught by professors of Russian and world history, from the end of the 1820s it disappeared from universities' schedules in favour of statistics. According to the statute of 1835, it was totally excluded from the course list, which made contemporaries to refer to the period of 1835-87 as to the time "without geography"⁴⁵. Therefore the first independent chair of geography emerged at the University of Moscow only in 1885. Altogether it allowed Petr Semenov to state that the pre-1840s Russian geography "was based solely on two hundred dots, sometimes localized in a wrong way"⁴⁶.

Since there existed no established idea of how to present the whole country in schoolbooks, it is reasonable to think that until the second half of the nineteenth century the authorities of the Romanov Empire were not yet convinced of the uniform necessity of teaching its citizens, where the motherland begins. Their different authors divided the Empire all the time into different parts; people, who inhabited its vast terrains, received different names. Neither Evdokim Zyablovskii, whose books prevailed in schools until the 1830s, nor did Konstantin Arseniev, whose book endured 20 editions from 1818 till 1850, pay any attention to the ethnic component of the territories described⁴⁷. Little Russia existed here as Kiev, Poltava, and Chernigov gubernias⁴⁸. The same was the case in Bulgarin's "*Ruchnaia Kniga*" [Handbook], although he added Khar'kov gubernia to Little Russia, also distinguishing Southern Russia (Katerinoslav, Kherson, and Tavria gubernias), and Western Russia (Vitebsk, Vilno, Grodno, Mogilev, Minsk, Podolia, Volhynia gubernias and Belostok

⁴⁵ Natalia Sukhova. *Karl Ritter i geograficheskaia nauka v Rossii* [Karl Ritter and geographical science in Russia]. Leningrad, 1990, pp. 106, 113.

⁴⁶ Petr Semenov, *Istoriia poluvekovoi deiatelnosti Imperatorskogo Russkogo geograficheskogo obzhestva, 1845-1895* [History of half of the century's activity of the IRGO]. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg, 1896, p. 32

⁴⁷ I found only two places in Arseniev, where he made specification. Tyrolians were remarkable for him for their love towards the fatherland, and citizens of Brody for their totally Jewish character – Konstantin Arseniev. *Kratkaia vseobzhaia geografiia* [A Short Universal Geography]. Saint Petersburg, 1827, p. 171.

⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 228.

region)⁴⁹. The next popular schoolbook by Arsenii Obodovsky, was more specific towards the notion of Little Russia. Here the author limited it to Chernigov and Poltava gubernias, although recognizing that “Little Russian dialect” is spread throughout in Volhynia, Kiev, Chernigov, Poltava, Kharkov, Katerinoslav, Kherson, Voronezh (in its one quarter), Podolia gubernias, partly in Bessarabia and in the Land of the Black Sea Cossacks”⁵⁰. Finally, the most famous schoolbook of the 1870s, by Porfirii Beloha, divided population of the Empire only into Slavs and non-Slavs, reserving Chernigov, Poltava, Kiev, Kharkov, parts of Kursk, Voronezh, Katerinoslav, and Kherson gubernias for Little Russians, the same time marking the population of Volhynia and Podolia gubernias as Rutnenians or *Rusnyaks*. Although expanding Little Russia when mentioning that there are “3,150,000 Slavs in Galicia and Hungary”, who speak in Little Russian dialect, Beloha did not say anything on Bukovyna⁵¹. Similar conclusion is given by Marina Loskutova: “School textbooks and manuals from geography at the end of the nineteenth – beginning of the twentieth century in many respects mirrored a vague perception of regional peculiarities of the individual parts of the Empire and hardly could assist in formation of regional self-consciousness among the pupils”⁵².

Besides schoolbooks and maps, Ukraine was “splintered” in the most systematic geographical Russian outcome of the nineteenth century, Semenov’s *Geographical-statistical dictionary of the Romanov Empire* of 1866. In the article “Little Russia” one could find a standard definition of it as “three Dnieper gubernias, Kiev, Chernigov and

⁴⁹ Fadei Bulgarin. *Rossiia v istoricheskoi, statisticheskoi, geograficheskoi i literaturnoi otnosheniakh. Ruchnaia kniga dlia vsekh soslovii* [Russia in Historical, Statistical, Geographical and Literary Terms. A Handbook for All Estates]. Saint Petersburg., 1837, p. 47.

⁵⁰ Arsenii Obodovskii, *Vseobzhei geografii uchebnaia kniga* [Russia in Historical, Statistical, Geographical and Literary Terms. A Handbook for All Estates]. Saint Petersburg., 1852.

⁵¹ Porfirii Beloha, *Uchebnik geografii Rossiiskoi imperii* [A Textbook for Geography of the Russian Empire]. Saint Petersburg, 1864.

⁵² Marina Loskutova. “Where Does Motherland Begin? Teaching Geography in Russian Pre-Revolutionary School and Regional Identity in the Late 19th - Early 20th Century”. In: *Ab Imperio*, 3 (2003).

Poltava, which constitute a central and basic place of living for Little Russian people”⁵³, although the author recognized that Little Russians themselves occupy much larger territories of European Russia, southern-eastern part of Kingdom of Poland and northern-eastern part of the Habsburg Empire⁵⁴. Naturally Semenov refused to use “Ukraine” for marking all this territory. For him “Ukraine” was an old-fashioned name reserved for “frontier zones of the Muscovite tsardom, mostly underpopulated”. Thus he defined “Polish Ukraine”, “Siberian” etc., although acknowledging that the name “Ukraine” in itself is appropriated by the Little Russian areas on the Left Bank of the Dnieper⁵⁵. The same tendency could be traced from the eighteenth century, when in *Geographical Lexicon* there was only a “Ukrainian line”⁵⁶; in such a way it was also present in Zhekatov’s geographical dictionary⁵⁷. Quite the contrary bias was present in the *Geographical Dictionary of the Kingdom of Poland and other Slavonic regions*. It also stipulated that “Ukraine is not a historical name, which has never been a governmental one as ‘Volhynia’ or ‘Podolia’, but rather old-fashioned, which was given to the steppes of the Southern Rus’, that is in the valleys of the Dnieper and Boh”, which means the southern-eastern part of Kiev gubernia together with a small part of Chernigov and Poltava⁵⁸, reserving “Little Russia” for designating territories, which were “torn from Rzechpospolita by Bohdan Khmelnytskii, which means Kiev, Chernigov, Kharkov, and Poltava gubernias”⁵⁹.

.....

⁵³ Petr Semenov, *Geograficheskio-statisticheskii slovar’ Rossiiskoi Imperii* [Geographical-Statistical Dictionary of the Russian Empire]. Vol. 3, Saint Petersburg, 1866, p. 152.

⁵⁴ Semenov 1866, p. 155.

⁵⁵ Petr Semenov, *Geograficheskio-statisticheskii slovar’ Rossiiskoi Imperii* [Geographical-Statistical Dictionary of the Russian Empire]. Vol. 5, Saint Petersburg, 1885, p. 310.

⁵⁶ *Geograficheskii leksikon Rossiiskogo gosudarstva ili slovar’* [Geographical Lexicon of the Russian State or A Dictionary]. Moscow, 1773, pp. 416-417.

⁵⁷ Afanasii Zhekatov. *Slovar’ geograficheskii Rossiiskogo gosudarstva* [Geographical Dictionary of the Russian State]. Moscow, 1808.

⁵⁸ *Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*. T. 12. Warszawa, 1892, s. 773-779.

⁵⁹ *Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*. T. 10. Warszawa, 1889, s. 19.

Meanwhile, in the late eighteenth century, Ukrainian territories of the former Hetmanate were finally absorbed into the Russian Empire; its former functionaries “with no apparent resistance exchanged their heavy swords and colourful Cossack garb for the rapier, the powdered wig, and the provincial imperial uniform”⁶⁰. Besides the Hetmanate, as a result of the 1793-95 divisions of Poland the Romanov Empire also acquired additional territories, inhabited by Ukrainians – Right Bank Ukraine. Both territories were integrated into the Empire by imposition of new administrative order⁶¹. This beginning of the nineteenth century was “littlerussian” for the current elite of Ukrainian lands. “Ukraine or Muscovy”, a vital question of their “colleagues” from the eighteenth century, did not have sense for it was substituted with “provincialism or empire”. Their patriotism was indeed a local one, without any larger extrapolations.

In this situation of overall disregard for space, on the one hand, and without hopes for restoring a separate state, on the other, the representatives of the former Hetmanate elite who entered the imperial bureaucracy, did not pay any precise attention to the spatial issues in their intellectual writings, therefore not demonstrating any conformity on what and where “their” territory indeed was. As much as in *Razgovor Velikorossii s Malorossiei* [A Talk Between Great Russia and Little Russia], the same in the writings by Hryhorii Poletyka (*Istoricheskoe izvestie na kakom osnovanii Malaia Rossiia byla pod respublikoiu Pol'skoiu, i na kakikh dogovorakh otdalas' Rossiiskim Gdriam...*) [A Historical Information on what Grounds Little Russia was under the Polish republic and According to which Agreements she gave up to the Russian Sovereigns], *Rech' 'o popravlenii sostoianiiu' Malorossii* or his

⁶⁰ Zenon Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s-1830s*. Cambridge, 1988, p. 218.

⁶¹ This story of administrative division of the former Cossack territories, which I do not touch upon here, can be very interesting by itself, for, as Alexei Miller points out, closer to the mid-nineteenth century (Little Russia general-governorship was eliminated in 1856) they turned from the contested borderland into the part of the imperial core – Mikhail Dolbilov and Alexei Miller, eds. *Zapadnye okrainy Rossiiskoi imperii* [Western Borderlands of the Russian Empire]. Moscow, 2006, p. 59.

speeches during the Legislative Commission of 1767-68 the authors' space of concern is limited to the three gubernias of the former Hetmanate⁶². The same Left Bank gubernias are dealt with in anonymous *Zamechaniia do Maloi Rossii prinadlezhashchie*, whose author greeted the administrative division of Little Russia into the three gubernias and complained about the irrationality of the borderline established between Kiev and Chernigov areas, "which looks more like a border between two states than between two provinces of one state"⁶³. Any questions of space were also not raised by the "fairy tale" (after Vasyl Skurativskii) and at the same time the best known "what? where? when?" of Ukrainian history, *Istoriia Rusiv*. The only important moment to underline here is the author's mentioning of Galicia as a "southern part of Little Russia"⁶⁴. On the other hand, surprisingly, the author criticised the usage of the toponym "Ukraine", considering it a part of Polish claims for the territory of Little Russia⁶⁵.

.....

⁶² "Razgovor Velikorossii s Malorossiei (literaturnyi pamiatnik vtoroi poloviny 18 veka)" [A Talk Between Great Russia and Little Russia]. In: *Kievskaiia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 2 (1882), pp. 313-365. "Dopolnenie 'Razgovora Velikorossii s Malorossiei'" [An Addition to A Talk Between Great Russia and Little Russia]. In: *Kievskaiia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 7 (1882), pp. 137-148. "Istoricheskoe izvestie na kakom osnovanii Malaia Rossiia byla pod respublikoiu Pol'skoiu, i na kakikh dogovorakh otdalas' Rossiiskim Gdriam..." [Istoricheskoe izvestie na kakom osnovanii Malaia Rossiia byla pod respublikoiu Pol'skoiu, i na kakikh dogovorakh otdalas' Rossiiskim Gdriam...] [A Historical Information on what Grounds Little Russia was under the Polish republic and According to which Agreements she gave up to the Russian Sovereigns]. In: *Ukraiins'kyi arkhieografichnyi zbirnyk VUAN* [Ukrainian Archeographic Collection of VUAN], 1 (1928).], pp. 147-161. "Rech' o 'popravlenii sostoianiiia' Malorossii" [A Speech on the Improvement of the Condition of Little Russia]. In: *Kievskaiia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 10 (1882), pp. 119-125.

⁶³ "Zamechaniia do Maloi Rossii prinadlezhashchie" [Observations on Little Russia]. In: *CHOIDR*, 1 (1848), p. 3.

⁶⁴ *Istoriia Rusiv* [History of the Rus']. Kyiv, 1991, p. 44. Here the author emphasises that Galicia was not simply conquered by the Poles, but was overtaken as a result of a successful matrimonial policy of the Polish kings.

⁶⁵ "[I]t must be said with regret that certain absurdities and calumnies have unfortunately been introduced into Little Russian chronicles themselves by their creators, native born Rus'ians, who have carelessly followed the shameless and malicious Polish and Lithuanian fabulists. Thus, for example, in one textbook vignette, some new land by the Dnieper, here called Ukraine, is brought onto the stage from Ancient Rus' or present-day Little Russia, and in it Polish kings establish new settlements and organise Ukrainian Cossacks; and until then the land was allegedly empty and uninhabited, and there were no Cossacks in Rus'. But it is apparent that the gentleman writer of such a timid little story has never been anywhere except his school, and in the land that he calls Ukraine he has not seen Rus' towns, the oldest ones – or at least much older than his Polish kings, namely: Cherkassy, Krylov, Mishurin and old Kodak on the Dnieper River, Chigirin on the Tiasmin, Uman' on the Ros', Ladyzhin and Chagarlyk on the Bug, Mogilev, Rashkov and Dubossary on the Dniester, Kamennyi Zaton and Belozersk at the head of the

Such intellectuals of noble origin being predominantly melancholic about their former privileges and rights did not try to doubt the tsar's right to rule over them, remaining loyal to the Empire. Seeing themselves as the last debris of society and country, which would soon disappear, they thought similarly to Oleksa Martos, who doomingly noted in 1812, when visiting Hetman Mazepa's grave in Moldavia:

.....

Mazepa died far away from his country, whose independence he defended... After his expulsion from Little Russia, its inhabitants lost their sacred rights, which Mazepa had defended for so long with great enthusiasm and patriotic ardor. He is no more, and the name Little Russia and its brave Cossacks have disappeared from the list of nations who, although small in numbers, are yet famous for their way of life and their constitution. Now rich Little Russia is reduced to two or three provinces. That this is the common destiny of states and republics, we can see from histories of other nations⁶⁶.

The new generation of Ukrainians stepped into a new age with a mood similar to Shevchenko's: "Once there was a Hetmanate, / it passed beyond recall. / Once, it was, we ruled ourselves, / But we shall no more! / Yet we shall never forget the Cossack fame of yore!"⁶⁷.

Even despite the new intellectual estate emerging, which since the middle of the century became a bearer of nationalist ideas and a guide for a peasant nation⁶⁸, the above tendency pointed to the use of various ambiguous names for denoting various territories preserved in the first half of the nineteenth century. Zenon Kohut, supporting the thesis by Marc Bloch that "important characteristics of a national building in the West was the elite's identifying with a particular territory, and what concerns people – with a common name", states that in the case of Ukraine to define its name was a very difficult task because of

[Dnieper] Estuary" – Ibid, pp. 35-36 – Quoted from Serhii Plokhyy. "Ukraine or Little Russia? Revisiting an Early Nineteenth-Century Debate". In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. 3-4 (2006), pp. 340-341.

⁶⁶ Kohut 1988, p. 275. I found it interesting that even after the seventeen years of the partitions of Poland Martos still does not conceive Little Russia as something larger than those three gubernias.

⁶⁷ "Tarasova nich". In: Taras Shevchenko. *Kobzar*. Kyiv, 1974, p. 36.

⁶⁸ Roman Szporluk. "Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State". In: *Daedalus*, 3 (1997).

Ukrainians' usage of a vast variety of names for self-identifying"⁶⁹. Overall confusion in usage of "Rus'", "Little Russia", and "Ukraine", the same as their territorial limits, started already from the Cossack chronicles of the late sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. For instance, already in *Khronika Samovydsia* [Eyewitness Chronicle], written in 1670s-1702, its author "never uses 'Ukraine' in reference to any territory outside the borders of the Zboriv treaty of 1649 and clearly distinguishes Ukraine from Volhynia and Podilia"⁷⁰. Although there are some places in the chronicles by Samiylo Velychko and Hryhorii Hrabianka, which assigns the subject of their writings "on both sides of the *Dnipro*" it is possible to assert that this image was not a permanent one among the Cossack elite. The same inclination preserved in the nineteenth century.

For instance, Nikolai Tseretelev in his song collection of 1819, from which phase "A" of Ukrainian national revival is traditionally launched by historians, directly states that in his understanding Little Russia means the Hetmanate (it was gathered and written down in Poltava)⁷¹. The first song collection by Amvrosii Metlynskii was from the Kharkiv Ukraine, because all its authors gathered their songs there⁷². His second collection, "Southern-Russia folk songs", was much wider, encompassing Dnieper's both Right and Left Banks, territories of the Black Sea Cossacks, and Kaniv⁷³. The same difference and contrast is demonstrated already by the name of the only song collection of the first half of the century,

⁶⁹ Zenon Kohut, Rozvytok malorosiis'koi svidomosti [Development of a Little Russian Consciousness]. In: Zenon Kohut, *Korinniia identychnosti*. [Roots of Identity], Kyiv, 2004, p. 84.

⁷⁰ Serhii Ploky, *The origins of the Slavic nations*, p. 324. This work "leaves the impression that the pre-1648 use of the term with reference to all the border palatinates of the Kingdom of Poland was all but forgotten by the Cossack elite of the Hetmanate" – Ibid.

⁷¹ Nikolai Tseretelev. *Opyt sobraniia starinnykh malorossiiskikh pesnei* [An attempt at collecting ancient Little Russian songs]. Saint Petersburg., 1819, pp. 1, 43.

⁷² Amvrosii Metlinskii, *Iuzhnyi Russkii sbornik* [Southern Russian Collection]. Khar'kov, 1848.

⁷³ Amvrosii Metlinskii, *Narodnye iuzhnorusskie pesni* [Southern Russian Folk Songs]. Kiev, 1854. But, basing on the epistolary of Maksymovych and Kulish, one can doubt the exact geographical location of these places. In one of their letters Maksymovych accused A. Metlinskii not just in stealing songs from Maksymovych's collections, but also in putting the wrong places of their performing – Oles' Fedoruk, "Do kharakterystyky vzaemyn P. Kulisha ta A. Metlynskogo (dva lysty Metlynskogo do Kulisha)" [Characterising Relationship of Kulish and Metlynsky. Two letters of Metlynsky to Kulish]. In: *Panteleimon Kulish. Materialy ta doslidzhennia* [Panteleimon Kulish. Materials and Explorations]. L'viv-New York, 2000, pp. 247-275.

which comprised songs from Galicia – it was published in Saint Petersburg in 1836 by Platon Lukashevych under the title *Malorossiiskie i Chervono-ruskie dumy i pesni*⁷⁴.

As it is possible to judge from the epistolary, “Ukraine”, “Little Russia”, and South-Western gubernias till the middle of the century were conceived as different units. For example, Mykola Kostomarov sent his letters to Izmail Sreznevsky to “Ukraine”, which, in his understanding, was Kharkiv region, where his addressee resided. Kostomarov localised it only there: e.g. in his letter from Rivne in May of 1843 he wrote to “my beloved, dear Mister Izmail Ivanovich from an old Ukrainian Cossack from the remote Volhynia to the darling Ukraine with my best and sincere regards”⁷⁵. Not surprisingly “Ukrainian” almanacs of Kharkov romantics published between the 1830s-1840s bore such names as *Ukrainskii Vesnik* [Ukrainian Herald], *Ukrainskii almanach* [Ukrainian Almanac] (its first pilot name was a more “monumental” one – *Ukrainskii pamiatnik* [Ukrainian Diary]), or *Ukrainskii sbornik* [Ukrainian Collection]⁷⁶.

A few years later, in his letter of 1846 to Mykola Hulak, his cousin, Petr Ashanin, wrote:

I live as earlier in Elisavetgrad... Not too long ago we've had fun here; there were dances and fireworks in the garden. Many girls and ladies were present. I have to admit that there are lots of gorgeous woman here, even if not in the full sense of the word, but still much more than back home, in Little Russia. Come to see Elisavetgrad – although it is a small town, but much better than ours⁷⁷.

.....

In another case, Hulak received a letter from his family living in Kherson gubernia, where he read that “now we get ready to depart for the Mykolaiivka. Mummy recently came back

⁷⁴ Platon Lukashevych, *Malorossiiskie i Chervonoruskie narodnye dumy i pesni*. Saint Petersburg., 1836.

⁷⁵ Kostomarovs letters to Sreznevs'ky. In: *Kharkivs'ka shkola romantykiv* [The Kharkiv school of romantics]. Vol. 3. Kharkiv, 1930, p. 333.

⁷⁶ Taras Koznarsky, *Kharkiv Literary Almanacs of the 1830s: the Shaping of Ukrainian Cultural Identity*. Cambridge, MA, 2001, p. 73.

⁷⁷ *Kyrylo-Mefodiivs'ke tovarystvo* [The Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius]. Vol. 1. Kyiv, 1990, p. 98.

from Little Russia and I had to leave for Odessa to cure Sonya of scrofula” – under Little Russia his father this time meant Poltava gubernia⁷⁸.

The same Kharkiv, Poltava and Katerynoslav gubernias served for gathering sources for the Izmail Sreznevsky's *Zaporozhskaia Starina* [Zaporozhian Antiquity], published in the 1830s. In 1847 on the basis of Kyiv, Chernigov and Poltava gubernias his collection of “Ukrainian folk stories” was published by Panteleimon Kulish. Here he constantly refers to the Right Bank Ukraine as to “Polish or “Western”⁷⁹, using “South Rus” and “Little Russia” as synonyms here. Having published his *Zapiski o Iuznoi Rusi* [Proceedings on the Southern Rus'] in 1856, Kulish expressed his aim as “to create an encyclopaedia of various facts on the people, who speak in Southern Russian language, for the Russian man –, because there exists an increased interest of Northern Russian people towards a closer experience of Little Russia or Southern Rus”⁸⁰; among its towns the author lists Kyiv, Kharkiv, Odessa. The same situation is observed in Kulish's *Khmelnychchyna*. When the author, stating that “our Ukrainian people from the ancient times were in love with grain growing: that is why it possesses the best land from Lublin as far as Saratov, from Putivl to Caucasus”⁸¹, he goes on and further differentiates: “this werewolf Yarema had a great deal of estates in Red Russia, in Volhynia, and in Ukraine. Lubny, Romny, Lokhvytsia, Pryluky

⁷⁸ *Kyrylo-Mefodiivs'ke tovarystvo*, Vol. 1, p. 196. Until their move to the Kherson gubernia Hulaks lived in Poltava gubernia, therefore in their understanding Little Russia is used to denote the latter.

⁷⁹ Panteleimon Kulish. *Ukrainskie narodnye predaniia* [Ukrainian folk legends]. Moscow, 1847, p. 10.

⁸⁰ Panteleimon Kulish. *Zapiski o Iuznoi Rusi* [Notes on Southern Rus']. Kiev, 1994, p. V-VI. In this text the author interestingly writes on the peasants self-identification: “Finally I arrived to Cherkasy – a town, behind which ancient Great Russians called all their *soplemenniks* as Cherkasy. It remains unknown, from that time on this thought established on the north; but it is noteworthy that illiterate people of Little Russia has never acquired themselves this name of Cherkasy, the same as the name Russians. Little Russian common people will answer the question “Where are you from?” in the way “from such gubernia”; but the question of “Who are you? Of what nation?” will not find any other answer except as “We are just a nation [*Liude tak sobi narod*] and this is it”. – “Are you Russians?” – “No”. – “Khokhly?” – “How come? (Khokhol is an abusive word and they reject it). – “Little Russians? [*Malorosiiany*]” – “Who are these *Marosiiany*? It is even hard to pronounce it”. (Little Russian is a bookish word and they don't know it). In other words, our countrymen, allowing to call them as Rus', Cherkasy or whatever else call themselves as people and do not appropriate any personal name” – Ibid, p. 235.

⁸¹ Panteleimon Kulish. *Khmelnychchyna*. Saint Petersburg., 1861, p. 7.

– everything was his property”⁸². Narrating the story of Khmelnytskii’s campaign to Lviv, Zamostia Kulish starts his chapter with the words: “Disaster occurred in Ukraine”, defining the towns of this Ukraine as Bratslav, Vinnytsia, Tchetkasy, Vasylkiv, Ovruch, Kyiv, Pereiaslav, Oster, Nizhyn, Chernigiv, Pogar, Mglyn, Koselets, Novgorod-Siverski and Starodub⁸³. Even Taras Shevchenko in 1847 in a preface to the unpublished edition of *Kobzar*, written by him, stated: “...Gogol grew up in Nizhyn, not in Little Russia, and does not know his own language and Walter Scott in Edinburgh, not in [highland] Scotland”⁸⁴.

The borders of his own “Little Russia” of mid-nineteenth century were described very neatly by the author of a popular History of Little Russia, Mykola Markevych: “Little Russia, an area on earth from Slovechno to Dniester, from Kleven’ to Orel and from both Galicias to Siverskii Donets, by the recognition of all travellers and natural scientists, who visited her, is one of the most beautiful countries in the world”⁸⁵. Its rivers are Dnipro, Sula, Desna, Slovechna and Prypiat, Western Buh and Dniester⁸⁶. At the same time, in 1837, Markevych pointed out that “I like to think that there will be a time when we all would completely unite – all three people: Little Russians, Russians and Poles”⁸⁷. In five years he confidently expressed his lack of any national-patriotic sentiments in the end of the same “History”; enumerating the reasons why Little Russia had to join the Russian Empire (freedom of belief, protection etc), Markevych explained:

After joining Moscow we had to expect that we would not be given freedom, which we had under the Hetmanate; but did we have this freedom with the Poles under Nalyvaiko, Kosynskii, or Pivtorakozhukh? Let us assume that we would be a separate state. – Mazepa would be a tsar... What would we have won in this change of a dynasty? Would risk experiencing the fate of Kotchubei daughter on ours? Being poor when old, because hetman would like our wealth, as in case with Polubotok? Poland would tickle Little Russia from the west, Moscow from east and north, Turks and Tatars from the south. There would not be any quiet day in our life. And what

⁸² Ibid, p. 59.

⁸³ Ibid, pp. 68, 119.

⁸⁴ Ralph Lindheim and George Luckyj. *Towards an Intellectual History of Ukraine: an Anthology of Ukrainian Thought from 1710 to 1945*. Toronto, 1996, p. 193.

⁸⁵ Nikolai Markevych. *Istoriia Malorossii*. Moscow, 1842, vol. 1, p. 3.

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 4.

⁸⁷ Evdokiia Kosachesvkaia. *N. A. Markevych (1804-1860)*. Leningrad, 1987, pp. 109-110.

we have lost? A hope to be a hetman and nothing more... Tsar is one for all and everyone has equal rights; and if a Muscovite would jeer at a belief of someone from Simferopol, if would like to take away his property, daughter or wife – he would suffer the very undesirable fate⁸⁸.

At the end of his text he used the word “Ukraine”, but in a different tone than the others at the second half of the nineteenth century would:

A year of 1793 has come, bringing in the end the second partition of Poland. Russia got 4,553 square miles, 410 cities and towns, 10,081 village and 3,011,688 citizens. We obtained the whole Podolia region, half of Volhynia and ten Kievan districts. Both Ukraines and the Zaporozhian Sich again merged together, but not under the sceptre of Sigizmund. In this way ended a separate life of Little Russia⁸⁹.

Nevertheless, that native of Chernigiv thought of himself as of local patriot, indicating in the epigraph to his “Customs, beliefs, cuisine and beverages of Little Russians [that] fatherland (*otchizna*) is more important than the homeland (*rodina*), for the latter is only its small part; but there can be no fatherland for the one, whose soul lacks a homeland”⁹⁰.

The explanation might lie, as Yaroslav Hrytsak stipulates, when speaking of the nineteenth century, in that one has to distinguish between the notions of a “fatherland” and a “nation”: till the middle of the nineteenth century fatherland meant territory, not people living there (which is typical for a nation). His idea is that the former was being nationalised during the first half of the nineteenth century. As Hrytsak puts it, even Shevchenko was still writing in terms of a “territorial motherland”, not a “national” one, for in his poetry one would found many references to “Ukraine”, but not to “Ukrainian nation”⁹¹.

The situation started to change in the late 1840s after the emergence of The Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius. In one of their program documents, an appeal *Bratitiia Ukraintsi* [To brothers Ukrainians], Kostomarov not merely stipulated a united

⁸⁸ Markevych 1842, vol. 2, p. 584.

⁸⁹ Ibid, p. 673.

⁹⁰ Nikolai Markevych. *Obychai, pover'ia, kuhnia i napitki malorossiian*. Kiev, 1991, p. 174.

⁹¹ Hrytsak 2006, pp. 105-125, 470.

vision of Dnieper Ukraine, vaguely expressed in Cossack chronicles, but also tried to add a national element here, having in mind far wider audience than his predecessors: “This, our brothers Ukrainians on both sides of the Dnieper, we offer for your consideration. Read it carefully and let everyone ponder on how it should be achieved and perfected”⁹². Speaking of the importance of the Brotherhood, George Grabowycz wrote that “in a receptive-pragmatic way their impact would seem really doubtful: main texts remained in the secret police archive and were not widely disseminated. But their main theses and values were distributed to the wider audience – in Shevchenko’s poetry”⁹³. Although it is to be emphasized that the most Western part of Shevchenko’s poetry was Pochaiiv, and its main subject is Ukraine limited to both sides of the Dnieper (mainly located in Poltava gubernia): one would find only one mentioning of Lviv and none of Galicia / Bukovyna / Transcarpathia in his works; the difference is striking in comparison with the towns of the Russian Ukraine – for instance, Kyiv is mentioned 100 times⁹⁴.

Retrospectively and surprisingly it seems that the most important of all intellectuals of the first half of the nineteenth century for the formation of the mental map of united Ukraine was Mykhailo Maksymovych. Besides his renowned 1827 collection of songs, which contained the material from all over the “Southern Rus” and interested its readers with Ukrainian subject⁹⁵, the *Kievlіanin* [Kievan Citizen] almanac, which he edited, was the first

⁹² *Kyrylo-Mefodiivs'ke tovarystvo*. Vol. 1, p. 171. Quoted from: George Luckyj. *Young Ukraine: the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, 1845-1847*. Ottawa, 1991, p. 100.

⁹³ Gryhorii Grabowycz, “Do pytannia pro krytychne samousvidomlennia v ukrains'kii dumci 19 st.: Shevchenko, Kulish, Dragomanov”. In: *Suchasnist*, 12 (1996), p. 91.

⁹⁴ *Slovnyk movy Shevchenka* [A Dictionary of Shevchenko’s Language]. Vol. 1. Kyiv, 1964, pp. 388, 322. Shevchenko also referred four times to “Dniester” (Ibid, p. 183) – the head of this Ukrainian river lies in the Carpathians. Still, I remain unconvinced that this can serve as an argument that Shevchenko included Galicia and Bukovyna into his mental image of Ukraine. First of all, Dniester is not solely a Galician / Bukovynian river, but also for its big part flows also in Podolia. More likely seems that Shevchenko’s formula “from Dniester to Don” is just an indication of Shevchenko’s careful reading of *Istoriia Malorossii* by Nikolai Markevych’s, who did not include any solely Galician or Bukovynian rivers into his description of Little Russia – see footnote 87.

⁹⁵ *Ukrainski pisni vydani Mykhailom Maksymovychem* [Ukrainian songs published by Mykhailo Maksymovych], Kyiv, 1962. On his influence on Kulish and Kostomarov see George Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Sevcenko: polarity in the literary Europe 1798-1847*. München, 1971, pp. 32-33.

to introduce Ukrainians outside of the Romanov Empire to its readers in Kiev. For example, *Kievlianin*'s second issue contained an article on "Red Rus' verses", where its author asserted that "it (Red Rus' – AK) is close to Kiev because of the people and their blood unity: the native people of the Red Rus' is the same as in Kiev; the same Rus' language sounds beyond Dnister, as around Dniپر; the same language is used in the song which is heard in the Carpathians and in Ukrainian steppes and Black Sea shores"⁹⁶. Even more interesting material was published by Maksymovych in the third issue of *Kievlianin*. It was an article by Alexander Deshko, "a natural Carpathian Rus', who moved to Russia six years before (1844 p. – AK)"⁹⁷. This article was mentioned in 1875 during the meeting of the South-Western department of Russian Geographical Society by Mykhailo Levchenko: "We owe him (Maksymovych – AK) the first information on Ruthenians who live in Hungary, whose existence nobody even suspected before. Having met in Kiev one native of those places, the late Mykhailo Oleksandrovych composed a short programme, following which Mr. Deshko wrote his article on Transcarpathian Ruthenians, which was published in *Kievlianin*"⁹⁸. Ruthenian language was the main criterion for their identification ("the language of Transcarpathian people clearly shows that it is a branch of Southern-Russian people, although in its dialect there are some peculiarities between Little Russian and Galician dialects"⁹⁹). However, the author also pointed to the area of their settlement: "From the Moldavian-Transilvanian border, inhabited with Walachians, Ruthenians extend with Carpathian mountains and their valleys through seven capitals (komitats) of the Hungarian kingdom".

⁹⁶ *Kievlianin* [Kievan Citizen]. Book 2. Kiev, 1841, p. 121. As its epigraph the book has Pushkin's: "Let the offsprings of the Orthodox / To know the past story of the native land".

⁹⁷ *Kievlianin*. Book 3. Moscow, 1850, p. 19.

⁹⁸ *Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnogo Otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva* [Proceedings of the Western-Russian Department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society]. Vol. 1 (For 1873), pp. 36-37.

⁹⁹ *Kievlianin*. Book 3, p. 26. Thus Maksymovych deliberately is worth a title of the unconscious founding father of the Ukrainian nationalist irredenta.

Thus, to sum up, the question of “Ukraine, but which?” until the middle of the nineteenth century was answered in different ways. On the one hand, there existed several different ideas of fatherlands – Little Russia, Rus’, Ukraine; each of them had vague borders and was defined in a various ways. In most of the cases, it meant some distinct region – either *Slobozhanshchyna* [Slobidska Ukraine], or three Left Bank gubernias of the former Hetmanate, or sometimes “Ukraine of two banks”. During the next decade the newly born intelligentsia were to transfer this image into a larger territory, making these territories of the former Rzechpospolita and Ottoman Empire a “Little Russia”, creating thus a space, which we today know as Ukraine. “Cossack” Little Russia, “Zaporozhian and Tatar” New Russia, “Polish” Volhynia and Podolia, Austrian Galicia – at the turn of the eighteenth – beginning of the nineteenth centuries, not many people would agree that all these areas have a common history and are inhabited by the same people. To the contrary, across all the “cultural borders” people thought that this was an area of different histories”¹⁰⁰. Having very little attention paid to geography in the Russian educational system, these people, who studied in schools, gymnasiums and universities, did not get any idea of a separate region from their school lessons; moreover, “Ukrainian” gubernias were constantly united with other, Russian. There was no common public space, where the concept of Ukraine could be crystallised – physical contacts between the Ukrainians of Romanov and the Habsburg part until 1870s did not have a frequent character. Among those people who visited Galicia, one can name only Olexander Konysky and Panteleimon Kulish; later the boom started only after Mykhailo Dragomanov’s visits in 1871-73, with the latter’s personal responsibility for intensifying these contacts. In general there were also no people in Ukraine in those times like the Polish scholar Joachim Lelewel, who would carry out a systematic work collecting

¹⁰⁰ Oleksii Tolochko, “Kyievo-Rus’ka spadshchyna v istorychnii dumci Ukraïny pochatku 19 stolittia” [Kyivan Rus’ legacy in Ukrainian historical thought at the beginning of the 19 century]. In: *Ukraïna i Rosiia v istorychnii retrospektyvi* [Ukraine and Russia in historical retrospective]. Vol. 1. Kyiv, 2004, pp. 275-276.

cartographic images of Ukraine, having a futurist, and, perhaps, unconscious, logic, foreseeing that the idea of Ukraine deserved to be preserved in a material way, and later to spread it among a wider receptive public, although in those times it existed only as a memorialized commodity¹⁰¹.

¹⁰¹ Steven Seegel, “Cartography and the Collected Nation in Joachim Lelewel’s Geographical Imagination: a Revised Approach to *Intelligentsia*”. In: *Words, Deeds and Values. The Intelligentsias in Russia and Poland during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Lund, 2005, p. 29. In a way Lelewel personally represented the Polish Geographical Society. Due to his systematic collecting of maps and publishing them he turned Polish geography and cartography from the antiquarian activity into science. During his lifetime Lelewel managed to collect more than 300 thousand volumes, which contained more than ten thousand maps – Stefan Kanevich, *Lelewel*. Moscow, 1970, p. 96. In verbal his ideas were reinforced by Adam Mickiewicz (“Bo od Ponarskich gór i bliźnich Kowna wód / Szerszę się sławą mą aż za Prypeci bród / Mnie w Nowogródku, mnie w Mińsku czytuje młodź / I nie leniwa est przepisać wiele-króć” – quoted from Andrzej Walicki, “Polish Conceptions of the *Intelligentsia* and its Calling”. In: *Words, Deeds and Values. The Intelligentsias in Russia and Poland during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Lund, 2005) or Wincenty Pol (“Byłem w Litwie i w Koronie, / Byłem w tej i w owej stronie, / Byłem tu i tam; / Od Beskidów do Pomorza, / Z Litwy aż do Zaporozża / Całą Polskę znam”. – quoted from Hrytsak 2006, p. 114).

Chapter 3. Imagining Ukraine: Ukrainian national project in 1860s.

Osnova as Ukrainian “National Geographic” (1861-2)

“....then all the peoples, pointing to that place on the map,
where Ukraine will be delineated, will say: behold,
the stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone”
(from *The Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian people* by Mykola Kostomarov).

In the second half of the nineteenth century the overall situation in the Western Borderlands of the Romanov Empire started to change. The first transformations happened in the 1860s, when the former members of the Cyril-Methodian Brotherhood were amnestied and allowed to settle in the capital, St. Petersburg, which offered vast possibilities to carry out their activities. As a result it immediately became a centre of Ukrainian activity. Kostomarov described that situation, when

the beneficent influence of the spring (even though inconstant and interrupted by severe frosts), the reign of Aleksandr II has also awakened Little Russia. Suddenly, some very fine works in the Ukrainian language appeared. The [prospect of the] liberation of the peasants has given us hope for our poor, subjugated people, deprived of everything they have fought for with determination and self-sacrifice all their lives. We are grateful to Emperor Alexander II, and we ask only that the liberation of the peasants be not in name only, but that they enjoy before the law the same rights the nobility enjoy. Any other type of freedom is incomprehensible for Ukraine, which clings to her old convictions¹⁰².

But, after such a peaceful start he continued with more radical notes:

We desire that the government not only would not hinder us, Ukrainians, in the development of our language, but also will show some support for it. It should issue a directive that in schools, which, as it has already announced, are to be created for the people, subjects are to be taught in the native language, in the language understood by

¹⁰² Kostomarov, Mykola. *A Letter to the Editor of Kolokol*. In: Lindheim 1996, 144.

the people and not in the official Great Russian language. Otherwise, the Ukrainian people would only learn words, without developing their own concepts¹⁰³.

Kostomarov finished the article with a persistent call: “Let neither the Great Russians, nor the Poles call their own the territory, inhabited by our people!”¹⁰⁴.

These appeal about “the territory, inhabited by our people” nicely reflect the atmosphere which existed among Ukrainophiles: post-Cyril-Methodian phase for Ukrainians was not marked by severe repressions on the government side. As a result, the process of the creation of Ukrainian identity started continued in the Romanov Empire, first of all, as a result of appearance in 1861 on the initiative of Kulish the Ukrainian-Russian language journal *Osnova* [The Basis]. As Alexei Miller writes, “at the centre of *Osnova*’s attention was the task of defining the Little Russian or Ukrainian identity, with an accent on the idea, typical for such nationalist discourse, of the independent status of the Ukrainian language, on the interpretation of history, and on the problems of the national character”¹⁰⁵. The appearance of the special journal was significant, because in 1820-30s the elite went out of their salons, started to read and made literature a crucial element of its leisure¹⁰⁶. Therefore to spread any ideas among them one had to be published.

In the context of the question of the construction of Ukrainian national space, in spite of a naive epigraph after Vladimir Monomakh “I want good to you brothers and to all the Rus’ land”, it was exactly from the pages of *Osnova* that this issue was started to be dealt with and first claims about Ukrainian national territory were heard / read from.

¹⁰³ Mykola Kostomarov. *A Letter to the Editor of Kolokol*, p. 144.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 145.

¹⁰⁵ Alexei Miller. *The Ukrainian question: the Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century*. Budapest, 2003, p. 77-78.

¹⁰⁶ As one of the contemporaries stated, “in Lomonosov’s time reading was an intensive activity. Under Catherine the Great it became a luxury of the educated. In Karamzin’s time it was an obligatory attribute of enlightenment, and during Zhukovsky’s and Pushkin’s the necessity of society” – quoted from Koznarsky 2001, p. 16.

Although its first number appeared on January 12, 1861, the idea of founding the journal was carried out by Kulish as early as 1844; moreover, geography had to become one of its main topics¹⁰⁷. From 1858 he constantly addressed the Ministry of education asking for permission to publish a periodical¹⁰⁸. After Kulish was forbidden to do it, the same permission was asked for by Vasyl' Bilozerskii, who in his letter to the chief Petersburg censor Delianov wrote that the "Southern areas of the Empire belongs to the least investigated and the most interesting. Neither external nature, nor internal everyday life or the history of Southern-Rus' population are worked out in a decent manner, they also not completely known"¹⁰⁹. He was allowed to start publishing a journal.

"Physical geography" (in a sense of Karl Ritter's *Erdkunde*) was chosen as a separate item of the journal's program. The editors defined their main aim as "a thorough and unprejudiced investigation of Southern-Rus' country, understanding its needs, achievement of a public good and also a critical view on ourselves in the past and nowadays"¹¹⁰. Defining their audience, they wrote that

an area, which *Osnova* will investigate, is predominantly inhabited with the Southern-Russian people. Although in Bessarabia, Crimea, and territories of the Don Cossack the predominant population is not a Southern Rus' one, we do include these provinces into our investigation, not just because they do not have their own periodicals yet, but also because they are in a direct industrial and commercial junction with another lands of Southern Rus'¹¹¹.

¹⁰⁷ He mentioned it in his letters to M. Iuzefovych (September 10, 1844) and I. Sreznevskii (December 10, 1845 and November 8, 1846) – Kulish, Panteleimon. *Lysty* [Letters]. Vol. 1: 1841-1850. Kyiv, 2005, pp. 41, 61 and 124. He also wrote on it to G. Galagan – *Kievskaia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 9 (1899), p. 349. In his letter to Iuzefovych (September 10, 1844) Kulish declared that "... to give ourselves a chance to study our past and to know ourselves, we need to start such a publication that would embrace by its volumes everything, where the Little Russians' life revealed itself. ... Immediately after the chronicles ... in the next volumes we have to publish: 2) collection of Little Russian laws and its history; 3) geography of Little Russia in ancient and contemporary times; 4) description of the ancient churches ...". At the end of the letter Kulish adds that "in the next year I personally will go to Little Russia and gather materials for geography...". – Kulish 2005, pp. 41-42.

¹⁰⁸ Mykhailo Bernshtein, *Zhurnal Osnova i ukraïn's'kyi literaturnyi process kincia 50-h – 60-h rokiv 19 st.* [Journal *Osnova* and Ukrainian literary process at the end of the 1850s – 1860s]. Kyiv, 1959, p. 13. There Kulish referred to Kiev, Odessa and Kharkov as to the centres of Little Russia or Southern Rus'.

¹⁰⁹ Bernshtein 1959, p. 17.

¹¹⁰ *Osnova*, 1 (1861), p. 7.

¹¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 1.

One year later, in the first issue of 1862, Bilozersky broadened the borders: speaking of the editors' new aims for a new year, with a noticeable pleasure admitted that "the particular attention of the intelligent people is turning now to revived Rus' people (*narodnost'*) of Galicia, where it was so crushed before that the Germans and Poles have already started to assert in print that there is no *Rus'* in there at all"; he promised "to present in the forthcoming year a modern Southern-Rus' chronicle, including news from the Ruthenian Galicia and from the South in general"¹¹². Correspondingly to the program of *Osnova* it had a section "News" (*visti*), where during all its existence appeared news from Poltava, Chernigov, Kiev, Kherson, Podolia, Katerynoslav, Tavria and Kharkov gubernias¹¹³.

But the first issue of 1861 started with Kostomarov's "Thoughts on the federative origins of the Ancient Rus"¹¹⁴, in particular emphasizing the existence of Southern Rus' people [*narodnost'*], although dividing it into the separate parts; as a historian he did after the pattern of the Tale of Bygone years: Ukrainian-*polianian*, Polishchuk-Drevlianian, Tyverian, Volhynian, Dregovian, Croatian and Podolian. One of the decisive statements he made here was that

the destiny of Southern Rus' branches has always been indissoluble, even till the last subordination of Galych to Poland, and Volhynia, Podolia and Rus' to Lithuania. Both these states quarrelled for the control over the whole Southern Rus', being aware of its people's integrity. Finally, in the sixteenth century, Southern Rus', due to its ethnographic peculiarities, again came into union with Poland as a single body, different from the White Russia and *Kryvychian* country. Its parts, Ukraine (i. e. Rus' together with Podolia), Polissia, Volhynia, and Red Rus', have always shown a common gravitation and understanding of their internal relationship and indivisibility. Thus Rus' of

¹¹² *Osnova*, 1 (1862), pp. 3-4. Kostomarov later promoted this idea to write on Galicia by the fact that during the inter-princes quarrels of the first half of the twelfth century Galycian branch joined Southern Rus'; "until they did not want to obey to Kiev, Red Rus'ians joined Suzdal'. But when in the Suzdal land there appeared some impulses to conquer all the Southern Rus', including the Red one, Galych acted hand in hand with Kiev and Volhynia. When something touched the interest of the whole Southern Rus'ian land – Galych immediately sent its help". – Nikolai Kostomarov. "Cherty iuzhnorusskoi istorii". In: *Osnova*, 7 (1862), p. 6-7.

¹¹³ E.g. *Osnova*, 1, 3, 4, and 7 (1862).

¹¹⁴ *Osnova*, 1 (1861), pp. 121-158.

Polians, the same as Polissia, and Volhynia, and Podolia, and Red Rus', all the parts of the Southern-Rus' lands and Southern Rus' people, with all their peculiarities, is worth to be considered as one Southern-Rus'ian land, where all its parts are tied much more firmly, than people of *Viatychi*, Riasan' and Suzdal of the Great Russia¹¹⁵.

Another crucial article to appear already in the first issue was "Places and local names of Ruthenians in our times", was written by Mykhailo Levchenko¹¹⁶. As the author put in the footnote,

the article I suggest here is, so to say, the first of the genre. One can find too little on the indicated subject in our press, thus I, *volens-nolens*, had to write it on the basis of my own observations; I had to ask more or less experienced people. The only aim I was pursuing was to stimulate the appearance of other articles like this, in such a way that we could reach a careful processing of data, which in its turn could be sybserviant for the production of a peoples ethnographic (*narodopisnoi*) map of Ruthenians¹¹⁷.

Further on the author as meticulously as possible described the whole habitat of the "Southern Rus', Little Rus', or rather Ruthenians". According to Levchenko, the continuous area of their living in Russia is "Poltava, Kharkov, Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia gubernias, together with the Lands of the Black Sea Cossacks"¹¹⁸. But the main author's achievement in my opinion is that in his description he stepped over the state border and acquainted the readers with their "brothers" in the Habsburg Empire¹¹⁹. Moreover, he mentioned that all

¹¹⁵ *Osnova*, 1 (1861), p. 135.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 263-266. This article will be referred to by Pavlo Chubynskii when pointing out the sources of his Expedition at the end of the 1860s – *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii v Zapadno-Russkii krai, snariazhennoi Imperatorskim Russkim geograficheskim obshchestvom*. Vol.7. Saint Petersburg, 1872, p. 454.

¹¹⁷ *Osnova*, 1 (1861), p. 263.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid*. "Besides, Ruthenians occupy places in Chernigov guberniia, to the south from Desna, in Kursk guerniia to the south from Seim and the whole Sudzhan' district; to the west from Don in Voronezh guberniia; in Katerinoslav and Kherson they constitute the majority of the population; Azov Cossacks in Azov gradonachal'stvo; in Tavria gubernia to the north of Perekop; in Bessarabia they inhabit the Khotyn district; in Lublin gubernia of the Kingdom of Poland they constitute the two thirds of the whole population (all belong to the Union church). In Grodno gubernia they live in the Pinsk district (Pinchuks)". – *Ibid*.

¹¹⁹ "Ruthenians compose the majority of population in Galicia to the east of Sian River; in Hungary they are a continuous population in the Marmaros, Berech, Ugoch and Ungvar komitats, and constitute the majority in Sukmar, Sabolch, and Zenlyns'k together with Sharyns'k komitats. In Bukovyna Ruthenian tribe

Ruthenians constitute a single family, in spite of their different names: *Hetmantsi* in Tchernigov gubernia, or exactly in its southern part – those living in the northern part are *Lytvyns*; Steppe people in Poltava and Katerinoslav gubernia; Ukrainians of Kiev gubernia, which is called Ukraine; *Pol'shchaky* of Podolia, which in vernacular is called Poland (here he makes a footnote, pointing out that in the New Russia people also often use Poland for Volhynia and Kiev gubernia); *Polishchuks* from Polissia; *Patlachi* from Bessarabia and Bukovyna (whose name derives from their customary long hair); *Pinchuks* from the Pinsk district of the Grodno gubernia; Southern Rus' people of the Lublin gubernia, who preserved their ancient name Ruthenians. Those, who live in Galicia, are also known as "Ruthenians or *Rusniaks*", and those Ruthenians, who live in the Carpathians, are *Gutsuls*¹²⁰. Hungarian Ruthenians are called *lyshaky* in the mountains and *lymaky* in the valleys, due to the frequency of the usage of particles "lysh" and "lym" in their language; *boiky* are the people of the southern-eastern Galicia¹²¹. Levchenko finishes with admitting that this travel account was made because of the personal will and due to the personal observations, on the basis of men's and women's clothes (especially hats) and the type of buildings as his main markers¹²².

In May, July and November-December of 1861 *Osnova* continued its geographical tendency with a whole series of articles under the name of "A short geographical description of the country inhabited by the Southern-Russian (Ukrainian or Little Russian) people"¹²³. Its author again thoroughly described the habitat of Ukrainians, devoted considerable

constitute the third of population. Little Russians also live in some places on Volga and in Siberia, behind the Baikal, in Turkey, in so called Dobrudzha. These are the last descendants of the Zaporozhians, who escaped to Turkey during the Katherin II's reign, and of Ruthenian peasants, who call themselves as Butkols. – *Osnova*, 1 (1861), p. 264. The same statements of their Russian brothers were made in Galicia already since the activity of the Ruthenian triad and the 1848 revolution in L'viv.

¹²⁰ Ibid, p. 264.

¹²¹ Ibid, p. 265.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ "Kratkoe geograficheskoe obozrenie kraia, naselennogo iuzhnorusskim (ukrainskim ili malorossiiskim) narodom". In: *Osnova*, 5 (1861), pp. 39-58; 7 (1861), pp. 120-138; 11-12 (1861), pp. 12-25.

number of pages for describing its mountains and plains, rivers and valleys, soils and forests, minerals and . It is notable that the editors tried to involve their readers into this process: at the end of the May article there was a footnote, stating: “the names of the areas in this article, in most of its part, are not popular (*narodnye*). We would be grateful for informing *Osnova* about local names of these place; we expect it from those people, living around the places, being named”¹²⁴. In 1862 Kulish, as one of the editors, even suggested to establish a scholarship in order to promote travelling inside of the country they described in the journal¹²⁵.

Besides these pronounced claims to acquire a territory, such ideas appeared afterwards as smaller articles almost in the every issue of *Osnova*. For instance, in April 1861 the editors arranged an announcement about the beginning of *Slovo* publishing in Lviv, and also assigned a special section of the journal to the “Bibliography of the question on improvement the everyday life of landlords’ peasants in the Southernrussian area from 1857-60”, which among other contained a list of the books on peasants’ everyday life in Galicia, New Russia, and Crimea¹²⁶. In the next issue *Osnova* informed that “when the bitter news of Shevchenko’s death reached Ukraine and Galician Rus’ everyone immediately saw it was a public misfortune, a national loss. Lviv’s youth was in mourning (*mournful cocades*, as they wrote, on their Cossack hats). In Kiev, Kharkov, Chernigov and Poltava requiems were served...”¹²⁷. Together with the article author suggested to establish some Shevchenko scholarships at Kiev, Kharkov and Odessa universities¹²⁸.

¹²⁴ *Osnova*, 5 (1861), p. 58.

¹²⁵ *Osnova*, 4 (1862), p. 94.

¹²⁶ *Osnova*, 4 (1861), p. 81-84.

¹²⁷ “Znachenie Shevchenka dlia Ukrainy. Provody ego tela v Ukrainu iz Peterburga”. In: *Osnova*, 6 (1861), p. 13.

¹²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 14.

Important aspect of creating one's identity, as is often pointed out by those scholars dealing with cognitive maps, is that they actually present a false image of reality creating an image of "the Other", which could be useful for self-affirmation. As Iver Neumann formulates it, collective identities are constituted not only by the imaginative material, which they are composed of, but also by what is left outside – by what they implicitly are compared to. They also have external components and are clarified with the whole layers of the 'Others'. Hence, there are no non-exclusive collective identities, because they always exist due to their separation between the people with the help of particular markers¹²⁹.

These ideas sound very interesting in the case of *Osnova* – as early as in its second issue it entered into such the process of creating the "Other", at first – a Polish one. Among different things these discussions included an interest in national space, which were held, absolutely reasonably, in the spirit of the Romanov Empire's imperial politics in the Western provinces.

As soon as (in the last issue of *Sovremennik*) we managed to write a retraction of Mr. Padalitsa's article, we found issue of the newspaper 'Czas' and of 'Revue Contemporaine' No. 210 from the December 31 that again engage us into the polemics against antihistorical Polish views on Rus'¹³⁰.

The *Czas* article reviewed a book, "*La Russie Rouge*", which, as "the above newspaper mentioned, contains claims for the Red Rus' on the Russian part, because that is a Rus'ian and Slavonic land". This article irritated Kostomarov, who wrote a reply, because of the Polish author stipulating that "the Rus'ian people (*Rus'ki* – AK) do not know what is Rus'; in reality Rus' is not the same as Russia, but as Poland, and Russia is not a country of Slavs, but of the people, who themselves do not know what they are"¹³¹. Besides Kostomarov's,

¹²⁹ Iver Neumann. *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis, 1999.

¹³⁰ *Osnova*, 2 (1861), p. 121.

¹³¹ *Osnova*, 2 (1861), p. 121.

the same issue also included an article “An explanation came from the Head of the Kiev Commission for the Study of Ancient Documents” by Mykhailo Iusefovych, who also denied the Polish character of the “Russian region until Dnieper”¹³².

Much harsher statements were found in the renowned article “What is to be thought about it? A letter to the editor from Kiev” by Volodymyr Antonovych, who wrote in June of 1861 that Poles by offending us, “inhabitants of Ukraine”, are trying to “prove what is unproven, e.g. that the land between the Carpathians and rivers Vepr, Pripiat and Dnieper for always has been a Polish one”¹³³.

In September of 1861 Jewish journal *Zion* joined the discussions; *Osnova* had to defend from accusations of national egoism. With a pretended *naïveté* Kulish expressed his surprise and did not understand how “could they conclude (in the tenth issue of *Zion*), that the aspirations of *Osnova* are purely national; ... that “*Osnova* in no way tolerate that Little Russia was inhabited by any other people except Little Russians; ... that *Osnova* does not allow anyone remain indifferent to the peculiar fate of the Ukrainian nation; that this nation is ready to start killing or expulsion of Jews”¹³⁴.

¹³² Its author rhetorically asks whether are reasonable claims of 11 percent of the population for governing over the whole territory. – *Osnova*, 2 (1861), p. 8.

¹³³ *Osnova*, 7 (1861), p. 9. He continued these thoughts in his celebrated text “Moia spovid”. In: *Osnova*, 1 (1862), p. 83-96. The same anti-Polish tonality revealed itself in T. Ryl'skii's article “A couple of words on the nobles of the Right Bank of the Dnieper”. In: *Osnova*, 11-12 (1861), p. 90-99.

Kostomarov came back to this polemics in October 1861, when he ended his article “Pravda poliakam o Rusi (po povodu novoi statii v Revue Contemporaine)” with a call: “It is time for us, brothers Poles, to leave all your ancient rumours (pogudki), its time to become aware of an absolute absence of Polish people's rights for our's Southern-Rus'ian territory. Its time to behave yourself with us as equal, to respect our inclination for an independent development of our spiritual strength, and not to think of us as a mass of people, who, according to the author, is only to serve as a raw material for the Polish nationality ... If Poles choose this direct way for our people, instead of their twisted and erroneous paths, they will enjoy the same fruits as we do. But the way of those dreamers, who built their paperboard houses in Revue Contemporaine, is a hopeless one. We are absolutely aware of it. Let's hope that the Poles will understand it as well. Ibid, p. 112. To finish for now with this anti-polish expressions I would like with an article by S. Pogarskii, “Pro narodnu osvitu i pro zasoby dlia vydannia pidruchnikiv ukrains'koiu movoiu”, where he stops at criticizing Polish Elementarzy, which authors were still writing of a Polishness of a cities on Vistula, Sian, Niman and Dniro, which are Warsaw, Vil'no, Krakow, L'viv, Poznan', Kovno, Minsk, Zhytomyr. In: *Osnova*, 7 (1862), p. 13-18.

¹³⁴ *Osnova*, 9 (1861), pp. 134-135.

All these ideas of the first issues were synthesized by Kostomarov in one of the most important texts for the Ukrainian national project *Dve Russkie narodnosti* [Two Russian Nationalities], published in *Osnova* in March 1861¹³⁵. There the author on the basis of historical, ethnographical, psychological, and religious data determined typological and national features of the Russians and Ukrainians and also uncovered historical differences between them.

Kostomarov asserted that “the Russian nationality is not something unified; there are two of them, and, maybe, the one, who studies them thoroughly, will uncover even more. Nevertheless, they are Russian”¹³⁶. He saw their main difference, first of all, in clothes, customs and in the essence of their language. Speaking of the Southern Rus’ self-name Kostomarov pointed that, in order to differentiate themselves from the northern and eastern neighbours, they appropriated different names: Ukraine, Little Russia, Hetmanate – “all of them automatically became archaisms, because neither the first, nor the second or the third one embraced the whole spectre of the people, but meant only local and temporal events of their history. The name of ‘Southern Russian’, invented recently, is still a bookish one, and maybe will remain the same forever”. This article was the first to receive an answer from the Russian nationalist side, when Mikhail Katkov called Kostomarov’s conception “a scandalous and absurd sophism that there can be two Russian nationalities and two Russian languages, as if there could exist two French nationalities and languages!”¹³⁷.

¹³⁵ Twenty years later (1888) Antonovych expanded Kostomarov in his own “Try national’ni typy natodni”. In: Volodymyr Antonovych. *Tvory* [Works]. Vol. 1. Kyiv, 1932, pp. 196-210: to the previous two people by Kostomarov’s he simply added Poles.

¹³⁶ Kostomarov, Nikolai. “*Dve Russkie narodnosti*” [Two Russian Nationalities]. In: *Osnova* 3 (1861), p. 33.

¹³⁷ Quoted from: Miller 2003, p. 106.

Therefore, even though *Osnova* had a limited circulation (ca. 1, 400 subscribers in 1861¹³⁸), it made rather a large impact on construction of Ukrainian national space. Describing the nation through the set of concrete ethnolinguistic allegedly objective features (language, customs, traditions, anthropology, very often while comparing and opposing to Poles, Jews and the Great Russians), authors of *Osnova* for the first time in Ukrainian history accomplished an outline of the territory, which should have belonged to their nation. It is interesting that after the *Osnova* bankruptcy Kulish seriously thought of publishing a journal which could be more influential due to its reformatting from the “essentially Ukrainian journal” as the previous was, to the “journal for Ukrainians or Southern Russians”, which could become “necessary for all southern readers”, which in its turn “would give us, as a separate nation, a literary autonomy without dependence on language. In other words, with the help of such a journal we could reconcile the majority of the Ukrainian intellectual (*mysliachykh*) people”¹³⁹.

By its articles *Osnova* evoked the response from the Russian side. As Alexei Miller puts it, it was in 1862-63, when the conflict between Ukrainians and Russians was for the first time “comprehended in nationalistic categories not by the narrow circle of the members of Cyril-Methodius Society or high state officials as in 1848, but by broader segments of the educated public”¹⁴⁰. Its immediate result was Valuev’s circular of July 18, 1863. Ukrainian movement could resume its activity only at the end of the 1860s, when the government softened its policy towards Poles and Ukrainians.

¹³⁸ Viktor Dudko, “Audytoria zhurnal Osnova: kil’kisnyy vymir (1861-1862)” [Audience of the Journal *Osnova*: quantitative survey (1861-1862)]. In: *Kyivska starovyna* [Kyivan Antiquity], 6 (2001), p. 79. Journal was closed because of lack of money for subsequent publishing.

¹³⁹ Ievhen Nakhlik. “Natsia – literatura – derzhavnist” [Nation – Literature – State]. In: *Panteleimon Kulish i ukrainske natsionalne vidrodzhennia* [Panteleimon Kulish and Ukrainian national revival]. Kharkov, 1995, p. 72-73.

¹⁴⁰ Miller 2003, p. 109.

Chapter 4. Mapping Ukraine in the 1870s. Ethnographical-Statistical Expedition into the Southern-Western Provinces (1869-70) and the role South-Western Department of Russian Geographical Society (1874-76) in Ukrainian national space creation

Department, bearing a sign of the scientific establishment, was, in essence, a general headquarters of a political ukrainofilism. (S. Shchegolev, 1914)

To understand the “spatial” unfolding of the Ukrainian national project in the second half of the century, one needs to examine the general attitude of the Romanov Empire towards its own space. One of the main differences compared to previous years was absolutely new politics, when from the mid-nineteenth century the Russian government started to pay intensive attention to its territorial policy.

Ukrainian territory in itself presented the case of being understudied and undersurveyed. As Larry Wolff mentions, even in the second half of the eighteenth century the most popular reference for travellers in the Southern provinces of the Empire remained seventeenth century maps of Ukraine made by the French engineer Guillaume de Beauplan (first time published in 1651)¹⁴¹. Initial official administrative mapping projects started here with Dmitrii Bibikov, the Kiev general-governor (1837-52), who in order to prove the “Russianness” of his territories began mass investigations of the region. As a result of the activity of a permanent “Commission for the statistical and natural-historical description of the Kiev educational district”, established by Bibikov, in 1852 a “Statistical description of

¹⁴¹ Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: the Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, 1994, pp. 147-148.

Kiev guberniia” was published¹⁴². Another outcome of this activity was an *Ethnographical Map of European Russia* by Petr Keppen (1793-1864), printed in 1851. Here its author united Little Russians (Ukrainians), White Russians (Belarusians) and Great Russians into one single group and marked them all with one colour. Moreover, in his depiction of Poles, Keppen limited their habitat to small islands in the north-western part of what is nowadays Poland, marking the bigger part of Poland as inhabited by Russians. Still, as Walter Sperling puts it, in a comparative perspective even with the large number of various expeditions, descriptions and explorations in the middle of the nineteenth century, “descriptions of central Russia did not reach that quality as historical, geographical, cartographical, statistical and literary accounts (state administrative and socially-popular) of the German states at the end of the eighteenth century”¹⁴³. It is curious that approximately at the same time, in the context of the “war for the Right Bank Polish explorers and scientists began their own investigations, and in the first half of the nineteenth century organized “the whole series of philological and archaeologically-cultural expeditions, hand in hand with numerous ethnographical investigations”¹⁴⁴.

The situation in terms of geographical description of the Empire’s western provinces changed only after the 1860s. The main catalyst in Russian cartography was the Polish January uprising of 1863, which made the issue of “knowing who lived where” crucial, adding the national strokes into the picture. As a response to it, IRGO commissioned from another German, Rodrich Erkert, an *Ethnographical Atlas of the Western Russian Gubernias and Neighbouring Areas* (Erkert 1863). There he meticulously marked the areas

¹⁴² Ivan Funduklei. *Statisticheskoe opisanie Kievskoi gubernii* [Statistical description of Kiev gubernia]. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg, 1852.

¹⁴³ Walter Sperling. “Building a Railway, Creating Imperial Space: ‘Locality’, ‘Region’, ‘Russia’, ‘Empire’ as Political Arguments in Post-Reform Russia”. In: *Ab Imperio*, 2 (2006).

¹⁴⁴ Oksana Ostapchuk. “Izmenenie gosudarstvennykh granits kak faktor formirovaniia iazykovoi situatsii na Pravoberezhnoi Ukraine v kontse 18 – pervoi polovine 19 veka” [Change of imperial borders as a factor in the formation of the language situation in the Right Bank Ukraine at the end of the 18 – beginning of the 19 centuries]. In: Leonid Gorizontov, ed. *Regiony i granitsy Ukrainy v istoricheskoi perspective* [Regions and Borders of Ukraine in Historical Perspective]. Moscow, 2005, p. 80.

of all the ethnic groups who lived in the region together with the separate maps of dominating people: Russians (meaning Little Russians and White Russians), Poles, Jews and Germans. In contrast to Keppen's map, Erkert defined Poles on the basis of their religion and "gave" them a much larger area than his predecessor.

Approximately at the same time, around 1862, IRGO started to prepare an ethnographical-statistical expedition into the Western provinces. The expedition's aims were to investigate the people, i.e. their "tribal differences which are expressed in languages, tempers, customs and also a relative quantity of the people, their main ethnographical boundaries"¹⁴⁵. Expedition participants also had to explore the population's division according to the religion and everyday economic activity. The area of the research was determined as nine gubernias, divided into three groups: White Russian (Vitebsk, Mogilev and Minsk gubernias), Lithuanian (Vilno, Kovno and Grodno) and Ukrainian (Kiev, Volhynia and Podolia)¹⁴⁶.

The Polish uprising of 1863 delayed the expedition. It was only in 1866, when the IRGO received permission from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to start it. The organisation of ethnographical and statistical explorations in the "Ukrainian" area was commissioned to Pavlo Chubynskii, already known to the Society after his participation in the investigation of the grain trade in the Northern-Dvina basin and his highly praised essay on folk's legal customs in Little Russia¹⁴⁷. On the other hand, he was known to Ukrainians after his Ukrainian variant of the *Marseillaise*, which among other things raised the question of a national space: in it Ukraine stretched "from the Sian to the Don rivers". Under the personal engagement of Chubynskii the expeditions' borders were broadened and now were not

¹⁴⁵ *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii v Zapadno-Russkii krai, snariazhennoi Imperatorskim Russkim geograficheskim obshchestvom*. Saint Petersburg, 1872, vol. 1, p. III.

¹⁴⁶ *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii...* Vol. 1, p. IV.

¹⁴⁷ Semenov 1896, p. 388.

limited only to the South Western gubernias, but also included the southern parts of the Grodno and Minsk gubernias, the western parts of Lublin and Sedlec gubernias, and also a northern-eastern part of Bessarabia, i.e. those areas, inhabited with Little Russians, where they stumbled on the White Russians, Poles and Moldavians¹⁴⁸.

The expedition started in the spring of 1869. In three voyages from May 1869 till 1870 Chubynskii personally travelled through the territories, “which border on the Pripiat river in the north, the river Vepr in the west, the Austrian border and the river Prut in south-west, New Russia in the south, the Dnieper in the south-east, including here Kiev, Volhynia, Podolia gubernias, partially the Minsk, Grodno, Lublin, Sedlec and Poltava gubernias, and also Bessarabia”¹⁴⁹, having written down near 4,000 songs, baptising, wedding and funeral customs, near 300 tales, 1,000 desisions from the *volost* courts books, data on salaries, the most prevalent activities, harvests, commerce, production of tobacco, silk and wine.

Chubynskii’s “tireless activity”, which was all the time praised in St. Petersburg, developed into a seven volume *Trudy Ekspeditsii* [Works of the Expedition]. As he later explained, there was nothing similar to his complex investigation of Ukrainian people to constitute at least some idea of their habitat – before there were simply no materials available on the Cholm Rus’, *Pidliashshia*, Sedlec and Grodno gubernias, Pinsk and Mozyr districts of Minsk at all, and also very few on Volhynia and Podillia¹⁵⁰. Despite his plans to transform this expedition into one which would embrace the whole Ukraine did not come

¹⁴⁸ *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii...* Vol. 1, p. XI. Fedir Vovk later recollected this summer of 1869 and preparation of the expedition: “P. P. (Chubynskii – AK) spoke a lot of his plans to use actively his right to ask for support from the local authorities. But first of all, he was stipulating the necessity to use the expedition as extensively as possible, in the interests of the whole Ukraine, and not just its three gubernias of the so called Southern-Western region – a term which according to the program replaced the phrase “Ukrainian gubernias” which was used in the initial plan of the expedition – Fedor Volkov. “P. P. Chubinskii, Otryvki iz lichnykh vospominanii”. In: *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*, 1 (1914), p. 45.

¹⁴⁹ *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii...* Vol. 1, p. XIII.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p. XII.

true¹⁵¹, in spite of the fact that the major part of the publication was devoted to ethnography, with six volumes on legends, riddles, proverbs, sorcery, fairy tales, folk calendar, and folk songs, this publication was of utmost importance from the nationalist point of view. Its seventh volume devoted to the description of Jews, Poles and Little Russians ended with the map of “Southern Rus’ vernaculars and dialects” (these conscious limitation with “vernaculars and dialects”, not “language” was very important not to provoke suspicion of the authorities, therefore in the end Chubynskii received a prestigious Uvarov’s prize of the Petersburg Academy of Sciences).

In his map, Chubynskii for the first time in the Russian Ukraine depicted the territory inhabited by the people who spoke the different variants of the Ukrainian language and also kept to Ukrainian customs. Surely, if created earlier this map would have no political message (the same as the Hungarian elites’ attitude towards Magyar language and its transformation into a political tool¹⁵²). Moreover, not all those people from the map while being Ukrainian-speaking considered themselves as Ukrainians. But according to the nineteenth-century Herderian definition of a nation, each nation possesses its particular language that binds the souls of the members of the nation and allows their communion.

¹⁵¹ In “Govirky, pidgovirky i govory Pivdennoi Rosii v zviazku iz govirkamy Galychyny”, which started with Katkov’s epigraph (“Many lingual families are still left little known or even not known at all”) he stated that “although the area of vernaculars (*govoriv*) that belong to our investigation, is limited to the territories of Kiev, Volhynia, Podolia, southern part of Minsk, southern-western corner of Grodno, southern belt of Sedlets, and eastern part of Lublin gubernias, together with the northern part of the Khotyn district of Bessarabia, the only description of the essential influences and features of vernaculars from this area requires constant references to the areas outside of our research, which they are organically connected to as constitutive parts of one single Southern-Russian language. Thus, not to make constant repetitions and to give to our description a systematic character, we decided not to limit ourselves with indicated scope, but to examine the whole branch of the Southern-Russian language firstly, and then to start describing its various displays – *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii...* Vol. 7, p. 453.

As Volkov confirmed later, “P. P. managed to include to his research *Kholmzhynu*, *pinchukiv*, etc, because even if they were not listed in the program, they still did not come out of there. But as for Chernigiv, Poltava, Kharkiv and southern gubernias, they were out of the Southern-Western region in such an extent that P. P. felt very uncomfortable to go there. And also the overall sum of money, 3,000 rubles, was too little even for the Right Bank Ukraine, thus he had to spend some of his money as well. Left Bank Ukraine is present in the “Works” very accidentally, as some marriages, a bit too much of songs and too little on buildings, clothes etc, with no mentioning of Ukrainian clothes at all – Volkov 1914, p. 58.

¹⁵² White 2000, pp. 67-68.

Rather than being a mere instrument of communication that can be mastered, language was considered to be the embodiment of a collective experience of a nation¹⁵³. Ukrainian intellectuals were fond of German romantics, excessively adding whole passages from Herder into their writings (the most famous example would be the famous Gogol). Verses like Ernst Arndt's "*Des Teutschen Vaterland*", where the author employs language as the most appropriate criterion for defining German territories, served as examples for them¹⁵⁴. Therefore, the entity sketched by Chubynskii in his map was a Ukrainian *Lebensraum*; expectations and hopes of Ukrainian nationalists were now reinforced visually¹⁵⁵. Restating Mark Monmonier, from this moment on, should anyone doubt the existence of Ukrainian nation, nationalists could merely point to the map. From now on "not only is the nation on paper, it is on map, so it must have been real"¹⁵⁶.

In 1872 this Ukrainian nationalist activity continued in the framework of the Southern-Western Department of IRGO in Kiev. As in *Osnova* case, plans to establish such a department appeared at the end of 1840s. In his letter to Kostomarov (March 28, 1847) Amvrosii Metlynskii wrote:

.....

We gather money to assist in publishing those works, which have Southern Rus' as their subject through its language and matter, which are to contribute to learning our own, native and counteract the spread of a foreign, unusual to the spirit and soil of our people; also something on people, inseparably connected to Orthodoxy and Autocracy, following the example of Geographical Society etc (as you understand we have to leave

¹⁵³ Motyl 2000, Vol. 2, p. 282.

¹⁵⁴ "Was ist des Teutschen Vaterland? / So nenne endlich mir das Land! / So weit die deutsche Zunge klingt / Und Gott im Himmel Lieder singt, / Das soll es sein! / Das, wackrer Teutscher, nenne dein!" – quoted from: Hrytsak 2006, pp. 109-110.

¹⁵⁵ This map was indeed used in future. For example it was a basis for Hryhorii Velychko's "Map describing the Ukrainian-Rus' people" of 1896 p. – Ivan Rovenchak. "Faktory ta dzhherela vydannia G. Velychkom 'Narodoopysnoi karty ukraiins'ko-rus'kogo narodu' in 1896" [Factors and sources of Velychko's 1896 map of Ukrainian people]. In: *Kartografiia ta istoriia Ukrainy* [Cartography and history of Ukraine]. L'viv-New York, 2000, pp. 109-118.

¹⁵⁶ Mark Monmonier. *How to Lie with Maps*. Chicago, 1992, p. 88.

something to think about to our readers and keep also to some official norms, not just national)¹⁵⁷.

This institution was founded much later and only owing to the lobbying of the Kiev imperial general-governor, Alexander Dondukov-Korsakov, who personally wrote letters to the Crown Prince from the Romanov family, whom at the time was a honourable head of the IRGO, asking for help in this case¹⁵⁸. An important point here is that in spite of the fact that the official frames of the Department's activity were pretty narrow and limited only to five gubernias, the sphere of its investigations was again far wider. As in the case with the ethnographical expedition, the Department's activity resulted in its two-volume "Proceedings" [*Zapiski*] (the third volume was already in print but suppressed by the authorities).

Still, it does not seem reasonable to assert that one would find there much attention paid to description of the spatial limits of the nation. In the geographical section of the first volume there are articles on Kiev's climate, on the plants of the Southern-Western region, or on the grain trade of the Little Russian and the northern gubernias¹⁵⁹. What is interesting from the point of view of national space construction that, first of all, on September 23, 1873 the Department's members elected a representative from Bukovyna, Iurii Fedkovych, as its member¹⁶⁰. Secondly, the most part of the "Proceedings" second volume was occupied by the Bukovynian folk songs, collected by Hryhorii Kupchanko; these songs were selected and published in the way "which meant that only Ruthenians live there"¹⁶¹. Besides, during the archaeological congress, organized by the Department in Kiev in August

¹⁵⁷ *Kyrylo-Mefodiivs'ke tovarystvo*. Vol. 1, pp. 288-289.

¹⁵⁸ Semenov 1896, vol. 2, p. 487. Although the work by Fedir Savchenko – Zaborona Ukrainstva 1876 roku [Prohibition of Ukrainians in 1876]. Kyiv-Kharkiv, 1930 – remains an unmatched source for the history of the Department, here I will try not to repeat it.

¹⁵⁹ *Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnogo Otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva*. 1 (1873), pp. 199-233.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, pp. 36-37

¹⁶¹ *Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnogo Otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva*, 2 (1874). Mykhailo Dragomanov, *Avstro-Ruski spogady*, Lviv, 1889, p. 73.

1874 there were some representatives from Galicia and Bukovyna present, and one of them, Iakiv Holovatsky, even read a paper devoted mainly to geographical description of the Austrian Ukrainians¹⁶². Also it is worth mentioning here a one-day census of the Kiev population, organized by the Department in 1874, which was important as an attempt “to fill in a created formal topography of a map”¹⁶³. This Kiev department was liquidated in 1876, in the fourth year of its existence, being considered as a source of Ukrainian separatism.

That is exactly why in 1878 in his “*Perednie slovo do Hromady*” [Foreword to *Hromada*] Dragomanov could be absolutely certain when claiming that “the Ukrainian land is the one where the same peasants (*muzhyky*) live, as in the former Cossack Ukraine on the Dnieper, which is from the ancient times the best one known from all of ours ukraines”, afterwards meticulously outlining its borders in his text¹⁶⁴.

¹⁶² Dragomanov 1889, p. 268. See a funny story of Ukrainian-Polish encounter during the congress, described by Dragomanov, especially his answer to the Polish manifestation of “Poland, from the sea to the sea”, expressed by the delegate from Poznan, count Dzialynskiy, with a request towards Poles to limit themselves and their appetite with Poland in its ethnographical borders – Ibid, pp. 274-278.

¹⁶³ Anderson 1991, p. 215.

¹⁶⁴ Mykhailo Dragomanov. “*Perednie slovo do Hromady*” [Foreword to *Hromada*]. In: Mykhailo Dragomanov, *Vybrane* [Selected Writings]. Kyiv, 1991, pp. 276-277: “So, these muzhyks live in the borders which our reader is capable of marking by himself using the places we are going to list further. Let him start from the west a little bit to the south from Bilostok, in Grodno gubernia, in the Russian empire, and a little bit to the east from Sedlets in the Kingdom of Poland, thus marking the border through Krasnostav, Ianiv, Kreshiv in the same Kingdom, and then in the Monarchy (v Tsisarshyni) through Iaroslav to the west of Dubenko and Sianok, moving from there almost to Staryi Sandech, and from there on across the Beskyd mountains (Carpathians) almost until Priashev in Hungary, and from there to Uzhgorod, Mukachevo, Hust, Segit and Chornogorka in the corner, where the state (kasenni) borders of Galicia and Bukovyna come together to the Hungarian, and from there on to Kirlibaba on the border of Hungary, Bukovyna and Sedmygoroddia (Transilvania).

Here the southern border of our’s Ukraine starts. It moves from Kirlibaby to Chernivtsi, the capital of Bukovyna, and from there again comes back to the Russian Empire, moving to the south of Khotyn in Bessarabia, then through Soroky with a good step up to Beltsi in Bessarabia, and then along Dniester, stepping back a bit to the west till the Dnieper estuary and to the sea, to Bilgorod (Akerman), and then to the west above the sea until the Dunai beginnings with sa long narrow stripe from Akerman into the middle of Bessarabia, and to the south from Akerman to Perekop by the sea, and by Arabat spit under Feodosia and Kerch, then across the strait to Taman’, and from there to Novorossiisk by the Kuban Cossacks’ southern border.

Ukraine’s eastern border spins to the east and to the west near Novocherkassk in the Don Cossacks territory, Slovianoserbsk in Katerynoslavzhyna, and then farther to the east, close to Boguchary and Pavlovsk in Voronezh guberniia.

Our Northern border goes behind Pavlovske, through Korotoian’ in Kursk guberniia, to the middle in between the Staryy Oskol and Oboian’, moving from there to Korocha, around Sudzha, beyond Novgorod-Sivers’kyi and gorodnia in Chernigivzhyna, to Loev on Dnieper in Mohyliv guberniia, then by Dnieper to

Personally Dragomanov stands as a key figure in the “spatial” development of Ukrainian movement for a number of other reasons. Being called by friends from Kiev as *Mykhail Galycky* [Mykhail from Galicia] for his constant preoccupation with Galicia, he was the first person to get in touch with a large number of Ukrainians outside of the Romanov Empire, what happened during his trip to Europe in 1871-73. Dragomanov summarised his impressions on the first meeting with Galicians which occurred in Vienna in 1871: “During our further talks it turned out that our Ukraine in itself ... is for them *terra incognita*. Its history, geography, customs, and even Ukrainian literature were unknown for them, not even speaking of books on Ukraine written in Russian; thus they knew neither Gogol, nor Kostomarov. In response to our surprise they only answered that it is not easy to get such literature, but when even possible – it is not needed, for it is everything from Moscow. ... After these talks we decided first of all to try providing *Sich* with a library, which was to be done by my friends, who were coming back to Russia”¹⁶⁵. Back in Kiev during the short period of Ukrainian nationalists’ editing the *Kievskii Telegraf* newspaper Dragomanov personally insisted that “*Kievskii Telegraf* turned into a critical newspaper of public and literary life in Galicia, so that neither before it, nor after it nobody in Ukraine wrote so frequently and so much on Galicia as in *Kievskii Telegraf* in the beginning of the 1875”¹⁶⁶.

In 1875-76 Dragomanov also visited Hungarian Rus’ and again expressed his astonishment of the little knowledge of Ukraine among the Ruthenians of Transcarpathia; it

the beginnings of Pripjat to Pinsk in Minsk guberniia, and then through Pruzhany in Grodno guberniia to Bilostok”.

¹⁶⁵ Dragomanov 1889, pp. 62-65. Dragomanov’s views were not the only one spreaded among Ukrainophiles. E.g. in 1871 Zhytecky was insisting on the impossibility of enlightening of Galicians - see Ibid, pp. 296-297. During his story of Ukrainians in Vienna Dragomanov mentions one more interesting example of mapping nation’s idea – Frantyszek Duchinski’s theory: “Duchinskii’s theory was figuratively drawn on one wall of the Rappersville museum. There was a geographical map of Eastern Europe, with a line drawn on the meridian of, say, Kaluga. To its west it has written: ‘*race arienne, constitution individualiste et libérale*’; eastern half was divided along the parallel of, say, Orel, to the north of which there were words: ‘*race finnique (finnoise), constitution communiste*’ and to the south ‘*race turque, or (tatare) constitution despotique*’. The western half also has *Polianes* on the Wistula, *Polianes* on the Dnieper; *Pologne Russie* on this half and *Muscovie* on the eastern” – Ibid, p. 94.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 333-334

seemed to him that the Transcarpathian Rus' "was separated from Galicia with a Chinese wall ... I gave myself a Hannibal oath: to make something for a Hungarian Rus'... I can state that something started to be done after my efforts, but an awkward compatriot ruined all my plans. And I couldn't find anyone to be ready to start such work, anyone willing even to visit Hungarian Rus'" ¹⁶⁷.

Last but not least I would like to mention when speaking of Ukrainian nationalists of the 1870s and Dragomanov in particular is that geography was used not only to persuade their compatriots, but also to bring Ukrainian issue to the wider, European audience. That is why, for instance, Dragomanov, himself being on very bad terms with geography as his gymnasium students recalled afterwards ¹⁶⁸, wrote the larger part of the chapter on European Russia in Elise Reclus's fundamental world geography. It is symbolical and important that here he absolutely in the spirit of his Ukrainophile generation wrote: "The terms Little Russia, Ukrania, Ruthenia, have never had any definite limits, constantly shifting with the vicissitudes of history, and even with the administrative divisions. None of these geographical names correspond exactly with the regions inhabited by the Little-Russian race..." ¹⁶⁹.

¹⁶⁷ Dragomanov 1889, pp. 420-429, 386, 430-431. Later Dragomanov metaphorically went much further, comparing Ukraine and its separation from Galicia with Australia's separation from Europe.

¹⁶⁸ Oleksandr Rusov was Dragomanov's student in 1850s and wrote later that their teacher "knew names of towns and rivers much worse than his students" – *Mykhailo Dragomanov: dokumenty i materialy* [Mykhailo Dragomanov: Documents and Materials]. Lviv, 2001, pp. 444-445.

¹⁶⁹ Reclus, Élisée. *The Earth and Its Inhabitants. Europe*. Vol. 5. New York, 1890, pp. 289-290. Dragomanov's map "Historical Displacements of Ukrania" followed the story on page 289.

Conclusions

A Ukrainian in Hungary might easily grasp the specificity of dealing with the topic of national space. Seeing maps of a Great Hungary, which are sold freely during the national holidays in Budapest, or keeping an eye on recent Ukrainian-Russian controversies concerning Crimea reminds of Hans-Georg Gadamer's *Wirkungsgeschichte* (history of effect)¹⁷⁰. The story which in Ukrainian case has started in the mid-nineteenth century is still being written in past perfect clause.

This thesis has begun from the assertion that until the 1860s intellectuals of Russian Ukraine did not have any constant vision of their national space. I tried to show that until the second half of the nineteenth century the image of Ukraine / Little Russia was not a stable one, limited with clearly defined borders. Moreover, there existed several different and competing ideas of "Ukraine" with Ukrainian nationalistic as only one of them. One could easily find options of a Holy Rus', a "Cossack" Little Russia, Russia, or the former *Rzeczpospolita* on the shelf filled with the intellectual output of the nineteenth century. Till the 1860s-1870s even those acting as Ukrainian nationalists could choose from the Russian Ukraine of two Dnieper banks, Eastern Ukraine around Kharkiv, the three gubernias of the former Cossack state, or to add some territories from outside of the Romanov Empire. In the mid-nineteenth century not many people would agree that all these areas have a common history and are inhabited by the same people. Thus such modest factors of one's education, salary, place of birth, or personal travel experience could become determinant for giving preference to one of the projects. Having very little attention paid to geography in the Russian educational system, these people, who studied in schools, gymnasiums and

¹⁷⁰ Gadamer, Hans Georg. *Truth and Method*. London, 1993, pp. 298-304.

universities, did not get any idea of a separate region from their lessons; moreover, “Ukrainian” gubernias were constantly united with other, Great Russian and White Russian.

Even physical contacts between the Ukrainians of Romanov and the Habsburg part until 1870s did not have a frequent character. Among those people who visited Galicia, one can name only Olexander Konysky, or Panteleimon Kulish; the boom started later, only after Mykhailo Dragomanov’s visits in 1871-73, with the latter’s personal responsibility for intensifying these contacts. In general there were also no people in Ukraine in those times like the Polish scholar Joachim Lelewel, who would carry out a systematic work collecting cartographic images of Ukraine, having a futurist, and, perhaps, unconscious, logic, foreseeing that the idea of Ukraine deserved to be preserved in a material way, and later to spread it among a wider receptive public, although in those times it existed only as a memorialized commodity.

Only the emergence of a public space allowed to start discussions on which concept of Ukraine to give preference to. Its participants engaged very actively into the creation of Ukrainian national space, for it provided them with different means to express their views and opinions, starting for the first time in *Osnova* magazine in the beginning of the 1860s. Finally the notion of Ukrainian national space was formed only in the 1870s, when even its first cartographic image appeared. Now they faced the task how to spread it to a wider audience, which was started to be done by Dragomanov with the help of his European friends-anarchists.

The topic which I raised can also be investigated from the perspective of the history of science. Since the modern scientific development started geography was not merely a scientific activity. Maps were used as instruments of statecraft; they either stressed the unity of the vast territory by presenting it as a coherent geographical bloc, or emphasized its

various parts inhabited by different people. Due to the spread of nationalism in the nineteenth century and the slow nationalization of the Empire, maps at first were used to underline the homogenous population of the country (e.g. the first ethnographic map of Russia 1851). Even after the Polish uprising of 1863, when changes started to occur, geography was employed to show the unity of Great, Little and White Russian people, and the government's general attitude to the mapping of the Empire was still defined by its desire to map the territory in order to combat nationalist movements. Meanwhile, the same strategy was employed by Ukrainian nationalists, who used their cartographic image of their territory to present their claims and demands in an intelligible and clear way.

Such investigation of mental maps creation is only the first step in their deconstruction. It has to be followed by the study of concrete complex practices, with the help of which separate parts were joined together into a single whole. These are the conducting of censuses, travels, construction of various transportation systems with railroads as the most important, organisation of urban development and of various commemorative events while practicing sacred geography – creation of symbolical landscapes, which connect a nation with the help of the holy national places, monuments, churches, museums, holidays etc, which establish a network of places of national memory; to put it simply, how nationalism marks its own space and tries to replace Kokoshka's depiction of its territory into the Modigliani's. As Mykhailo Dragomanov noticed it many years ago,

we have to admit that the things which at first glance do not have anything in common with nationality and even are not born from the nation's own desire, as railways, for instance, which Austria and Russia are building now from the pure strategic reasons, are very important for they give the people of our nation a chance to know each other better. And before it, for example, Bantysh, the author of "The History of Little Russia", was not sure, whether the same Little Russians live in Hungary; I met lots of educated people, who were surprised to know that in Volhynia live the same people as in Poltava; Stets'kyi, the author of Polish books on Volhynia, was very serious in persuading my sister that the Volhynian embroidery pattern can't be the same as in Poltava and so on. Now the roads from

the Left Bank to the Right, and then to Galicia and Hungary made much more than books to get Ukrainians together¹⁷¹.

In this period of time, the idea of national space ceased to be just a mental map and a scheme of identifications, but is purposefully turned by actors into an instrument of political influence in order to attain internal standardization and elimination of differences, hand in hand with reinforcing external differences. At the moment my research chronologically and in its tasks was more limited and did not touch upon this issue.

¹⁷¹ Mykhailo Dragomanov. *Lysty na Naddnyprians'ku Ukrainu* [Letters to the Dnipro Ukraine]. Kolomyia, 1894, p. 27.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Antonovych, Volodymyr. *Tvory* [Works]. Vol. 1. Kyiv, 1932.

Arseniev, Konstantin. *Kratkaia vseobzhaia geografiia* [A Short Universal Geography].
Saint Petersburg, 1827.

Beloha, Porfirii. *Uchebnik geografii Rossiiskoi imperii* [A Textbook for Geography of the
Russian Empire]. Saint Petersburg, 1864.

Bulgarin, Fadei. *Rossiia v istoricheskom, statisticheskom, geograficheskom i literaturnom
otnosheniakh. Ruchnaia kniga dlia vsekh soslovii* [Russia in Historical, Statistical,
Geographical and Literary Terms. A Handbook for All Estates]. Saint Petersburg.,
1837.

“Dopolnenie ‘Razgovora Velikorossii s Malorossiei’” [An Addition to A Talk Between
Great Russia and Little Russia]. In: *Kievskaia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 7 (1882).

Dragomanov, Mykhailo. *Avstro-Ruski spogady* [Austro-Hungarian Memoirs], Lviv, 1889.

Dragomanov, Mykhailo. *Lysty na Naddnyprians’ku Ukraïnu* [Letters to the Dnipro
Ukraine]. Kolomyia, 1894.

Dragomanov, Mykhailo. “Perednie slovo do Hromady” [Foreword to Hromada]. In:
Mykhailo Dragomanov, *Vybrane* [Selected Writings]. Kyiv, 1991.

Erkert, Rodrich, *Etnograficheskii atlas zakhodno-rossiiskikh gubernii i sosednykh oblastei*
[Ethnographical atlas of the Western Russian gubernias and neighbouring areas]. Saint
Petersburg, 1863.

Funduklei, Ivan. *Statisticheskoe opisanie Kievskoi gubernii* [Statistical description of Kiev
gubernia]. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg, 1852.

Geograficheskii leksikon Rossiiskogo gosudarstva ili slovar' [Geographical Lexicon of the Russian State or A Dictionary]. Moscow, 1773.

“Istoricheskoe izvestie na kakom osnovanii Malaia Rossiia byla pod respublikoiu Pol'skoiu, i na kakikh dogovorakh otalas' Rossiiskim Gdriam...” [A Historical Information on what Grounds Little Russia was under the Polish republic and According to which Agreements she gave up to the Russian Sovereigns]. In: *Ukraiins'kyi arkeografichnyi zbirnyk VUAN* [Ukrainian Archeographic Collection of VUAN], 1 (1928).

Istoriia Rusiv [History of the Rus']. Kyiv, 1991.

Keppen, Petr. *Etnograficheskaia karta Evropeiskoi Rossii* [Ethnographical map of European Russia]. Saint Petersburg, 1851.

Kievlianin [Kievan Citizen]. Book 2 (Kiev, 1841); Book 3 (Moscow, 1850).

Kulish, Panteleimon. *Lysty* [The Letters]. Vol. 1: 1841-1850. Kyiv, 2005.

Kulish, Panteleimon. *Khmelnychchyna* [Khmelnyskyi's Uprising]. Saint Petersburg., 1861.

Kulish, Panteleimon. *Ukrainskie narodnye predaniia* [Ukrainian Folk Legends]. Moscow, 1847.

Kulish, Panteleimon. *Zapiski o iuznoi Rusi* [Notes on Southern Rus']. Kiev, 1994.

Kuznetsov, Iakov. *Uchebnyi atlas Rossiiskoi imperii* [School atlas of the Russian Empire]. Saint Petersburg, 1866.

Kyrylo-Mefodiivs'ke tovarystvo [The Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius]. Volumes 1-3. Kyiv, 1990.

Lindheim, Ralph and George Luckyj, eds. *Towards an intellectual history of Ukraine: an anthology of Ukrainian thought from 1710 to 1945*. Toronto, 1996.

- Markevych, Nikolai. *Istoriia Malorossii* [History of Little Russia]. Volumes 1-2. Moscow, 1842.
- Markevych, Nikolai. *Obychai, pover'ia, kuhnia i napitki malorossiian* [Little Russian customs, beliefs, cuisine and drinks]. Kiev, 1991.
- Metlinskii, Amvrosii. *Iuzhnyi Russkii sbornik* [Southern Russian Collection]. Khar'kov, 1848.
- Metlinskii, Amvrosii. *Narodnye iuzhnorusskie pesni* [Southern Russian Folk Songs]. Kiev, 1854.
- Mykhailo Dragomanov: dokumenty i materialy* [Mykhailo Dragomanov: Documents and Materials]. Lviv, 2001
- Obodovskii, Arsenii, *Vseobzhei geografii uchebnaia kniga* [A Textbook of the World Geography]. Saint Petersburg., 1852.
- Osnova* [The Basis], 1-12 (1861), 1-10 (1862).
- “Razgovor Velikorossii s Malorossiei” [A Talk Between Great Russia and Little Russia]. In: *Kievskaia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 2 (1882).
- “Rech’ o ‘popravlenii sostoianiiia’ Malorossii” [A Speech on the Improvement of the Condition of Little Russia]. In: *Kievskaia starina* [Kievan Antiquity], 10 (1882).
- Reclus, Élisée. *The Earth and its Inhabitants. Europe*. Vol. 5. New York, 1890.
- Semenov, Petr. *Geograficheskoi-statisticheskii slovar’ Rossiiskoi Imperii* [Geographical-Statistical Dictionary of the Russian Empire]. Vol. 3, Saint Petersburg, 1866; Vol. 5, Saint Petersburg, 1885.
- Semenov, Petr. *Istoriia poluvekovoi deiatelnosti Imperatorskogo Russkogo geograficheskogo obzhestva, 1845-1895*. [History of half of the century’s activity of the IRGO]. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg, 1896.
- Shevchenko, Taras. *Kobzar* [The Minstrel]. Kyiv, 1974.

- Slovyk movy Shevchenka* [A Dictionary of Shevchenko's Language]. Vol. 1-2. Kyiv, 1964.
- Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*. T. 10. Warszawa, 1889; T. 12. Warszawa, 1892.
- Tsertelev, Nikolai. *Opyt sobraniia starinnykh malorossiiskikh pesnei* [An attempt at collecting ancient Little Russian songs]. Saint Petersburg, 1819.
- Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii v Zapadno-Russkii krai, snariazhennoi Imperatorskim Russkim geograficheskim obshchestvom* [Works of ethnographical-statistical expedition into the Western-Russian region, organised by the Imperial Russian Geographical Society]. Volumes 1, 7. Saint Petersburg, 1872.
- Ukrainski pisni vydani Mykhailom Maksymovychem* [Ukrainian songs published by Mykhailo Maksymovych]. Kyiv, 1962.
- Volkov, Fedor. "P. P. Chubinskii, Otryvki iz lichnykh vospominanii" [P. P. Chubinskii. Extracts from personal recollections]. In: *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*, 1 (1914).
- "Zamechaniia do Maloi Rossii prinadlezhashchie" [Observations on Little Russia]. In: *CHOIDR*, 1 (1848).
- Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnogo Otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva* [Proceedings of the Western-Russian Department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society]. 1 (1873), 2 (1874).
- Shchekatov, Afanasii. *Slovar' geograficheskii Rossiiskogo gosudarstva* [Geographical Dictionary of the Russian State]. Moscow, 1808.

Secondary sources

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London-New York, 1991.
- Applebaum, Anne. *Between East and West: across the borderlands of Europe*. New York, 1994.

- Bagrow, Leo. "Ivan Kirilov, Compiler of the First Russian Atlas, 1689-1737". In: *Imago Mundi*, 2 (1937).
- Bernshtein, Mykhailo. *Zhurnal Osnova i ukraïisn'kyi literaturnyi process kincia 50-h – 60-h rokiv 19 st.* [Journal *Osnova* and Ukrainian literary process at the end of the 1850s – 1860s]. Kyiv, 1959.
- Black, Jeremy. *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past*. New Haven, 1997.
- Calhoun, Craig. *Nationalism*. Buckingham, 1997.
- Casey, Edward. *The fate of place: a philosophical history*. Berkeley, 1998.
- Cubitt, Geoffrey, ed. *Imagining Nations*. Manchester, 1998.
- Deutsch, Karl. *Nationalism and Social Communication: an Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge, 1953.
- Dolbilov, Mikhail and Alexei Miller, eds. *Zapadnye okrainy Rossiiskoi imperii* [Western Borderlands of the Russian Empire]. Moscow, 2006.
- Dudko, Viktor, "Audytoria zhurnalu Osnova: kil'kisnyy vymir (1861-1862)" [Audience of the Journal *Osnova*: quantitative survey (1861-1862)]. In: *Kyivska starovyna* [Kyivan Antiquity], 6 (2001).
- Eley, Geoff. "Is All the World a Text?". In: Terrence McDonald, ed. *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor, 1996.
- Esakov, V. *Ocherki geografii v Rossii, 18 – nachalo 20 veka* [Sketches on geography in Russia, 18th – beginning of the 20th centuries]. Moscow, 1990.
- Fedoruk, Oles'. "Do kharakterystyky vzaemyn P. Kulisha ta A. Metlynskogo (dva lysty Metlynskogo do Kulisha)" [Characterising Relationship of Kulish and Metlynskyy. Two letters of Metlynskyy to Kulish]. In: *Panteleimon Kulish. Materialy ta doslidzhennia* [Panteleimon Kulish. Materials and Explorations]. L'viv-New York, 2000.

- Gadamer, Hans Georg. *Truth and Method*. London, 1993.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford, 1983.
- Grabowycz, Gryhorii, “Do pytanniia pro krytychne samousvidomlennia v ukrains’kii dumci 19 st.: Shevchenko, Kulish, Dragomanov” [On the question of the Critical Self-Consciousness in the Ukrainian thought at the end of the nineteenth century: Shevchenko, Kulish, Dragomanov]. In: *Suchasnist* [Current Situation], 12 (1996).
- Hooson, David, ed. *Geography and National Identity*. Cambridge, 1994.
- Hrytsak, Iaroslav. *Prorok u svoii vitchchyni: Franko ta ioho spilnota (1856-1886)* [A prophet in his motherland: Franko and his community (1856-1886)] Kyiv, 2006.
- Jones, Peter. “Walter, F. Les figures paysagères de la nation: Territoire et paysage en Europe, 16-e–20-e siècle. Paris: Editions EHESS, 2004”. In: *Journal of Modern History*, 2 (2006).
- Kain, Roger and Catherine Smith. *English Maps: a History*. Toronto, 1999.
- Kanevich, Stefan. *Lelewel*. Moscow, 1970.
- Kasianov, Georgiy. “Natsional’ne vidrozhennia”: termin, ideologemy, naukovy interpretacii [National revival: a term, ideology, scientific interpretations]. Kyiv, 2006 (Manuscript).
- Kharkivs’ka shkola romantykiv* [The Kharkiv school of romantics]. Vol. 3. Kharkiv, 1930.
- Kivelson, Valerie. *Cartographies of Tsardom: the Land and its Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Russia*. Ithaca, 2006.
- Knight, Nathaniel, “Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society”. In: Jane Burbank and David Ransel, eds. *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*. Bloomington, 1998.

- Kohut, Zenon. "Rozvytok malorosiis'koi svidomosti" [Development of a Little Russian Consciousness]. In: Zenon Kohut, *Korinniia identychnosti*. [Roots of Identity], Kyiv, 2004.
- Kohut, Zenon. *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s-1830s*. Cambridge, 1988.
- Kosachesvkaia, Evdokiia. *N. A. Markevych (1804-1860)*. Leningrad, 1987.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. "Prostir ta istoriia" [Space and history]. In: *Chasovi plasty. Doslidzhennia z teorii istorii* [Time layers. Explorations in the theory of history]. Kyiv, 2006.
- Koznarsky, Taras. *Kharkiv Literary Almanacs of the 1830s: The Shaping of Ukrainian Cultural Identity*. Cambridge, MA, 2001.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford, 1991.
- Lloyd, Robert. "Understanding and Learning Maps". In: Kitchen, Rob, and Scott Freundschuh, eds. *Cognitive Mapping*. London and New York, 2003.
- Loskutova, Marina. "Where Does Motherland Begin? Teaching Geography in Russian Pre-Revolutionary School and Regional Identity in the Late 19th - Early 20th Century". In: *Ab Imperio*, 3 (2003).
- Luckyj, George. *Between Gogol' and Sevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Europe 1798-1847*. München, 1971.
- Luckyj, George. *Young Ukraine: the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, 1845-1847*. Ottawa, 1991.
- Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, Ivan. "Struktura Ukraïns'koi istorii v 19 stolitti" [A Structure of Ukrainian History in the 19 century]. In: *Istorychni ese* [Historical Essays]. Kyiv, 1994.

- Malaniuk, Ievhen. “Malorosiistvo” [Little Russianism]. In: *Knyha sposterezhen’* [Book of observations]. Kyiv, 1995.
- Miller, Alexei. *The Ukrainian Question: the Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century*. Budapest, 2003.
- Monmonier, Mark. *How to Lie with Maps*. Chicago, 1992.
- Motyl, Alexander, ed. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. Vol. 1. San Diego, 2000.
- Nakhlik, Ievhen. “Natsia – literatura – derzhavnist” [Nation – Literature – State]. In: *Panteleimon Kulish i ukrainske natsionalne vidrodzhennia* [Panteleimon Kulish and Ukrainian national revival]. Kharkov, 1995.
- Neumann, Iver. *Uses of the Other: “The East” in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis, 1999.
- O’Keefe, John and Lynn Nadel. *Hippocampus as a Cognitive Map*. Oxford, 1978.
- Ostapchuk, Oksana. “Izmenenie gosudarstvennykh granits kak faktor formirovaniia iazykovoi situatsii na Pravoberezhnoi Ukraine v kontse 18 – pervoi polovine 19 veka” [Change of imperial borders as a factor in the formation of the language situation in the Right Bank Ukraine at the end of the 18 – beginning of the 19 centuries]. In: Leonid Gorizontov, ed. *Regiony i granitsy Ukrainy v istoricheskoi perspective* [Regions and Borders of Ukraine in Historical Perspective]. Moscow, 2005.
- Petronis, Vytautas. *Constructing Lithuania: Ethnic Mapping in Tsarist Russia, ca. 1800-1914*. Stockholm, 2007.
- Plokhyy, Serhii. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Cambridge, 2006.
- Plokhyy, Serhii. “Ukraine or Little Russia? Revisiting an Early Nineteenth-Century Debate”. In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. 3-4 (2006).

- Popova, Irina. *Nationalizing spatial practices: Hungarians and the Habsburg Empire, 1700-1848*. Budapest, 1999.
- Rovenchak, Ivan. “*Faktory ta dzherela vydanniia G. Velychkom ‘Narodoopysnoi karty ukraiins’ko-rus’kogo narodu’ in 1896* [Factors and sources of Velychko’s 1896 map of Ukrainian people]. In: *Kartografiia ta istoriia Ukrainy* [Cartography and history of Ukraine]. L’viv-New York, 2000.
- Savchenko, Fedir. *Zaborona Ukrainstva 1876 roku* [Prohibition of Ukrainians in 1876]. Kyiv-Kharkiv, 1930.
- Seegel, Steven. *Blueprinting Modernity: Nation-State Cartography and Intellectual Ordering in Russia’s European Empire, Ukraine, and Former Poland-Lithuania, 1795-1917*. Providence, 2006.
- Steven Seegel, “Cartography and the Collected Nation in Joahim Lelewel’s Geographical Imagination: a Revised Approach to Intelligentsia”. In: *Words, Deeds and Values. The Intelligentsias in Russia and Poland during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Lund, 2005.
- Shaw, Denis. “Geographical practice and its significance in Peter the Great’s Russia”. In: *Journal of Historical Geography*, 2 (1996).
- Shchegolev, Sergei. *Sovremennoe Ukrainstvo. Ego proiskhozhdenie, rost i zadachi* [Contemporary Ukrainian movement. Its origins, growth and objectives]. Kiev, 1914.
- Smith, Anthony. *National Identity*. Reno, 1991.
- Sperling, Walter. “Building a Railway, Creating Imperial Space: ‘Locality’, ‘Region’, ‘Russia’, ‘Empire’ as Political Arguments in Post-Reform Russia”. In: *Ab Imperio*, 2 (2006).
- Sukhova, Natalia. *Karl Ritter i geograficheskaia nauka v Rossii* [Karl Ritter and geographical science in Russia]. Leningrad, 1990.

- Sunderland, Willard. "Imperial Space: Territorial Thought and Practice in the Eighteenth Century". In: Burbank, Jane, von Hagen, Mark, and Anatolii Remnev, eds. *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700-1930*. Bloomington, 2007.
- Szporluk, Roman. "Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State". In: *Daedalus*, 3 (1997).
- Tolman, Edward. "Cognitive Maps in Rats and Men". In: *Psychological Review*, 50 (1948).
- Tolochko, Oleksii. "Kyievo-Rus'ka spadshchyna v istorychnii dumci Ukraïny pochatku 19 stolittia" [Kyivan Rus' Legacy in Ukrainian Historical Thought at the Beginning of the 19 Century]. In: *Ukraïna i Rosiia v istorychnii retrospektyvi* [Ukraine and Russia in historical retrospective]. Vol. 1. Kyiv, 2004.
- Trencsényi, Balázs, and Michal Kopeček, eds. *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)*. Budapest, 2006.
- Vann, James. "Mapping under the Austrian Habsburgs". In: David Buisseret, ed. *Monarchs, Ministers, and Maps: the Emergence of Cartography as a Tool of Government in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago, 1992.
- Vesin, Leonid. *Istoricheskii obzor uchebnikov obshchei i russkoi geografii, izdannykh so vremen Petra Velikogo i po 1876 god (1710-1876)* [A Historical review of the textbooks of the world and Russian geography, published from the times of the Peter the Great till the 1876 (1710-1876)]. St. Petersburg, 1876.
- Walicki, Andrzej. "Polish Conceptions of the Intelligentsia and its Calling". In: *Words, Deeds and Values. The Intelligentsias in Russia and Poland during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Lund, 2005.
- White, George. *Nationalism and Territory: Constructing Group Identity in Southeastern Europe*. Lanham, 2000.

Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: the Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, 1994.

Yekelchuk, Serhii. "Creating a Sacred Place: The Ukrainofiles and Shevchenko's Tomb in Kaniv (1861 – ca. 1900)". In: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 1-2 (1995).

Zamiatin, D. *Gumanitarnaia geografiia: prostranstvo i iazyk geograficheskikh obrazov* [Humanitarian Geography: space and language of geographical images]. Saint Petersburg, 2003.