NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

VOLODYMYR ANTONOVYCH:
THE MAKING OF A UKRAINIAN POPULIST ACTIVIST AND HISTORIAN

by

BOHDAN KLID

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND

RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1992

ISBN 0-315-73211-3

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: BOHDAN W. KLID

TITLE OF THESIS: VOLODYMYR ANTONOVYCH: THE MAKING OF A UKRAINIAN POPULIST ACTIVIST AND HISTORIAN

DEGREE: PH.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1992

208, 10230-114 St.
Edmonton, AB T5K 1R9
Canada

Date: 23 APRIL 1992

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH FOR ACCEPTING, A THESIS

ENTITLED: VOLODYMYR ANTONOVYCH: THE MAKING OF A UKRAINIAN POPULIST ACTIVIST AND HISTORIAN

SUBMITTED BY: BOHDAN WOLODYMYR KLID

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

John-Paul Himka
J.-P. Himka (Supervisor)

C.M. Small

Martin Katz

D.R. Marples

H.P. Liebel-Weckowicz

Bohdan Medwidsky

Roman Serbyn

DATE: 21.04.1992

ABSTRACT

Volodymyr Antonovych (1834-1908) had a formative influence on Ukrainian populism and Ukrainian historiography in Russian-ruled Ukraine. Both as activist and historian he contributed much to the Ukrainian cultural revival of the second half of the 19th century, thus helping prepare the foundations for the emergence of modern Ukrainian political parties around the turn of the century. Yet, Antonovych was not an ethnic Ukrainian, but was born into the Polish gentry of Right-Bank Ukraine. The social, economic and national interests and goals of the gentry were opposed to those of the vast majority of that land--the Ukrainian peasantry--whose emerging spokesmen were the newly-forming Ukrainian intelligentsia.

This dissertation examines the process of the transformation of Antonovych from a Polish gentleman into a Ukrainian populist intellectual, and his contributions to the formation of a Ukrainian populist ideology. The background, context and preconditions of this change, including the phenomenon of Polish Ukrainophilism, are discussed in the first two chapters. Antonovych's role as a leader of a radical Polish Ukrainophile group--the khlopomany (peasant lovers)--at Kiev university is also examined. In Chapter Three Antonovych's break with Polish society is discussed in the context of preparations for the Polish uprising of 1863-64, which forced Antonovych and the khlopomany to choose

between loyalty to Poland or to Ukraine. Antonovych's manifesto, "My Confession," in which he outlined his reasons for choosing Ukraine, can be viewed as a classical exposition of Ukrainian populist thought. Chapter Four concerns Antonovych's role in the formation of the Kiev Hromada (Commune), the most important organization of Ukrainian populists in Russian-ruled Ukraine. Shortly after its formation, the Kiev Hromada published a manifesto, "Reply from Kiev," co-authored by Antonovych, which provides insight into the ideological beliefs and goals of its members. Antonovych's most significant contributions to the ideology of mainstream Ukrainian populism, however, are to be found in his historical writings, discussed in Chapter Five. Antonovych's historiographical legacy, particularly his writings on Polish-Ukrainian relations, contributed to the creation of a powerful Ukrainian populist myth of national and social liberation.

Acknowledgements

Many people gave valuable advice and helped me during my years as a Ph.D. student, particularly during the course of the writing of this dissertation. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to the late Professor Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytsky, who introduced me to the problems of Ukrainian intellectual history and to Ukrainian populism. I am indebted most of all to Professor John-Paul Himka, my supervisor, who encouraged me and offered sound advice during the writing stage. I am also thankful to the other members of the examining committee: Professors Helen Liebel-Weckowicz, Martin Katz, Carola Small, Bohdan Medwidsky, David Marples, and the outside examiner, Roman Serbyn, who first suggested I write a study on Volodymyr Antonovych. I am especially grateful to my wife, Halyna, who not only provided moral support and encouragement, but also helped in the reading of manuscript material. Others who offered help, information, comments or advice were: Dr. Marko Antonovych, Dr. Patricia Kennedy-Grimsted, Dr. Bohdan Krawchenko, Dr. Frank Sysyn, Dr. George Gajecky, Dr. Serhii Plokhy, Dr. Serhii Bilokin, Dr. Raisa Ivanchenko, Dr. Iaroslav Dashkevych, Ihor and Tetiana Hyrych, Myroslav Yurkevich, Roman Senkus, Oksana Procyk, Alan Rutkowski, Edward Kasinec, Myron Momryk and Dmytro Shtohryn. I also want to thank Peter Matilainen and Ken Labach for their technical assistance.

The staff at the following libraries and archives were helpful: the Central State Scientific Library in Kiev (TsNB), the Central State Historical Archive in Kiev (TsDIA-K), the Lviv Stefanyk Library, the Lenin Library in Moscow, the New York Public Library, Columbia University Library, the Library of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., and Harvard University's Widener Library.

I would like to thank the following institutions and scholarship programmes for their financial support: the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, the Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytsky Memorial Doctoral Fellowship Fund, the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. for the Andrii Syniavsky Fellowship, and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) for the Canada-USSR Academic Exchange Award for 1987-88.

Finally, I want to express my indebtedness to my mother, who, despite my setbacks and mistakes, always stood by me, and always encouraged her children to seek knowledge and learning.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AIuZR	Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii
KS	Kievskaia starina
LNV	[illegible]raturno-naukovyi vistnyk
LPP	[illegible]eraturno-publitsystychni pratsi
UZh	Ukrainskaia zhizn
UIZh	Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal
UFW	Unpublished and Forgotten Writings
ZNTSh	Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka

Introduction

In the pantheon of the Ukrainian populist movement of the second half of the 19th century and in the formation of its ideology, Volodymyr Antonovych (1834-1908) occupies a position of importance.[1] Two other figures of comparable importance are Mykola Kostomarov (1817-85) and Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841-95). Kostomarov, a predecessor and older contemporary of Antonovych, was a pioneer of the movement and contributed substantially in the formation of the ideology.[2] Drahomanov was a contemporary of Antonovych and co-operated with him, but because of his radicalism was persecuted by the Russian administration and chose to emigrate to Switzerland in 1876. He has been regarded as a founding father of Ukrainian socialism and of the first modern Ukrainian political party - the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party - which was populist.[3]

---

[1] For a definition and brief description of the Ukrainian populist movement and its ideology see my essay "Populism: Ukrainian and Russian," for a forthcoming volume of the Encyclopedia of Ukraine. The term populism is protean, as it can be used to describe movements and ideologies that differ one from the other quite substantially. See G. Ionescu and E. Gellner, eds., Populism: Its Meaning and National Characteristics, London, 1969; M. Canovan, Populism, New York-London, 1981.

[2] See D. Papazian, "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov: Russian Historian, Ukrainian Nationalist, Slavic Federalist," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966.

[3] There are two unpublished Ph.D. dissertations on the Ukrainian radical populist Mykhailo Drahomanov in English. See N. Diuk, "M.P. Drahomanov and the Evolution of Ukrainian Cultural and Political Theory," Ph.D. dissertation, Oxford University, 1986; B. Rogosin, "The Politics of M.P. Dragomanov: Ukrainian Federalism and the Question of Political Freedom in Russia," Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard, 1967. See

Yet, little is known about Antonovych or even about Ukrainian populism in the Western scholarly community. There is no published monograph in any Western language on this movement nor on its ideology;[4] neither are there any published biographies of Ukrainian populist leading figures in Western languages; even Ukrainian-language biographies are not numerous.[5]

---

also the collection of essays in I.L. Rudnytsky, ed., Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings. Annals of the Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. (Special Issue), 1952, vol. 2, no. 1. On the formation of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party and Drahomanov's role see J.-P. Himka, Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890), Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

[4] The only monographs that study some aspects of Ukrainian populism in any detail in English are J.-P. Himka's Socialism in Galicia and G. Luckyj, Young Ukraine: The Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, 1845-1847, Ottawa-Paris, 1991. Himka's work largely examines developments in Austrian Galicia, including the origins of Polish socialism there. In addition, this study does not examine in detail the entire spectrum of Ukrainian populism in Galicia, but concentrates largely on its left wing. Luckyj's brief study surveys the first Ukrainian proto-populist organization: the Cyrillo-Methodian Society. There is no monograph in Ukrainian that treats Ukrainian populism in a comprehensive fashion either. The only study that surveys this movement as well as of other revolutionary and reformist movements in Ukraine is M. Iavorsky's, Narysy z istorii revoliutsiinoi borotby na Ukraini, 2 vols., Kharkiv, 1927-28.

[5] The only biography of Antonovych is D. Doroshenko, Volodymyr Antonovych: Ioho zhyttia i naukova ta hromadska diialnist, Prague, 1942. This study, although valuable, is semi-popular and dated. In addition, Antonovych's youth and early years of political activities are treated very briefly. Since the early 1930s and until most recently, the publication of a biography on Antonovych in Ukraine was virtually impossible, where he was labelled by official historians and Communist party ideologues as a bourgeois nationalist historian. For a recent assessment of Antonovych in this vein see L.H. Melnyk, Torzhestvo istorychnoi pravdy (Krytyka burzhuaznyno-natsionalistychnykh falsyfikatsii istorii Ukrainy), Kiev, 1987, esp. pp. 37-44. Most recently

In contrast, English-language literature on Russian populism is quite plentiful. General, fairly comprehensive, studies, such as F. Venturi's sympathetic portrait,[6] or A.

Antonovych has been rehabilitated. See the short, popular article by M. Braichevsky, "Ievropeiets ridnoi istorii," Ukraina, no. 44 (October), 1989, pp. 8-9; no. 45 (November), 1989, p. 15. See also V.M. Rychka and V.A. Smolii, "V.B. Antonovych iak istoryk ukrainskoho kozatstva," UIZh, 1990, no. 9, pp. 109-15 and the more recent O.I. Kyian, "Zhyttievyi ta tvorchyi shliakh V.B. Antonovycha," UIZh, 1991, no. 2, pp. 64-76. The only biography of Antonovych in Polish is the tendentious and conservative study by F. Rawita-Gawronski, Wlodzimierz Antonowicz: Zarys jego dzialnosci spoleczno-politycznej i historycznej, Lviv, 1912. See also his Rok 1863 na Rusi: Ukraina, Wolyn, Podole, Lviv, 1903, where Antonovych is discussed as well.

Some of the more important biographies of other Ukrainian populists were written in the 1920s and 1930s. See D. Doroshenko, Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov, Leipzig, 1930. On Antonovych's life-long friend T. Rylsky, see O. Mytsiuk, Tadei R. Rylsky (1840-1902), iak khlopoman i ekonomist, Chernivtsi, 1933. Another biography by Mytsiuk is his study of the radical Ukrainian populist S. Podolynsky. See his Ukrainskyi ekonomist-hromadivets S.A.Podolinsky, Lviv, 1933. A Soviet study of Podolynsky's views is A.I. Pashchuk, Sotsiolohichni ta suspilno-politychni pohliady S.A. Podolynskoho, Lviv, 1965. A very recent biography of the populist and linguist P. Zhytetsky is V.P. Plachynda's, Pavlo Hnatovych Zhytetsky, Kiev, 1987. Several monographs have been published on the radical Ukrainian populist M. Drahomanov. The most recent is R.P. Ivanova, Mykhailo Drahomanov u suspilno-politychnomu rusi Rosii ta Ukrainy, Kiev, 1971. An earlier Soviet study is I.S. Romanchenko and D. Zaslavsky, Mykhailo Drahomanov: Zhyttia i literaturno-doslidnytska diialnist, Kiev, 1964. See also M. Hrushevsky, Z pochyniv ukrainskoho sotsiialistychnoho rukhu: Mykhailo Drahomanov i Zhenevskyi sotsiialistychnyi hurtok, Vienna, 1923. This study concentrates on Drahomanov's activities during his years of self-exile in Switzerland. In Russian, see the two biographies of D. Zaslavsky, Mikhail Petrovich Dragomanov: Kritiko-biograficheskii ocherk, Kiev, 1924; D. Zaslavsky: M.P. Dragomanov: K istorii ukrainskogo natsionalizma, Kiev, 1934. In Polish see E. Hornowa, Ocena dzilnosti Michala Dragomanowa w Historiografii ukrainskiej, rosiiskiej i polskiej, Opole, 1967.

[6] See his Roots of Revolution, Chicago-London, 1983. Reprint edition.

Ulam's semi-popular and critical monograph,[7] introduce students to the origins and development of this movement and ideology, as well as to the actors themselves, whereas A. Walicki's study[8] analyzes the ideology. There are numerous English-language biographies and studies of Russian populist activists and thinkers as well.[9]

It is not surprising that much scholarly literature exists on Russian populism. The English-language title of Venturi's classic study suggests that native origins of the Russian revolutions of 1917 lie in the populist movement and in its ideology.[10] The continuity between Russian populism

---

[7] See his In the Name of the People: Prophets and Conspirators in Pre-revolutionary Russia, New York, 1977.

[8] See his The Controversy over Capitalism, Oxford, 1969.

[9] Some of the more important monographs are M. Malia, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, Cambridge, Mass., 1961; D. Hardy, Petr Tkachev, the Critic as Jacobin, Seattle-London, 1977; P. Pomper, Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement, Chicago-London, 1972; J.H. Billington, Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism, Oxford, 1958; S.H. Baron, Plekhanov: The Father of Russian Marxism, Stanford, 1963. E.H. Carr, Michael Bakunin, London, 1937, W.F. Woehrlin, Chernyshevskii: The Man and the Journalist, Cambridge, Mass., 1971. Biographical literature in the Russian language is immense. Valuable volumes of bio-bibliographical material were already published in the 1920s and 1930s. See Deiateli revoliutsionnogo dvizheniia Rossii: Bio-bibliograficheskii slovar. Ot predshestvennikov dekabristov do padeniia tsarizma, 5 vols., Moscow, 1927-. The project was never completed, becoming a victim of Stalinist policies. The volumes on populist figures start with vol. 1, part 2; the last book published in 1934, vol. 3, part 2, covered populist figures active in the 1880s.

[10] Regarding the relationship and continuity between Russian populism and Marxism see R. Pipes, "Russian Marxism and Its Populist Background: The Late Nineteenth Century," The Russian Review, 1960, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 316-37.

and Marxism is represented well in no less a figure than G. Plekhanov, one of the chief ideologists of Russian Marxism. Although the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party has the best claim of being the direct descendant and continuator of the Russian populist tradition, even V. Lenin, who tried to distance himself from this movement and its ideology, nevertheless acknowledged the debt that he and other Russian Marxists owed to their populist predecessors.[11]

The central importance of the Russian revolutions of 1917 in world history has caused scholars to treat these events as points of departure from which to study Russian revolutionary movements and ideologies, seeking continuity in political and socio-economic thought and revolutionary traditions in order to understand the ideological and organizational roots of these cataclysmic events. The Russian revolutions of 1917, however, were not the only upheavals in the final years and immediately after the Great War, nor were they strictly Russian affairs. Furthermore, the Russian revolutions, although the most important, were only two of many East European revolutions that broke out in the wake of the collapse of the Russian, German, and Habsburg empires. One of the other revolutions was the Ukrainian Revolution, which in its early stages can be seen as being a part of the Russian revolutionary process, but which had its own dynamics and

---

[11] See his pamphlet What is to be done?, Oxford, 1963, esp. pp. 155-56.

goals, and soon grew into a separate phenomenon.

If the search for the native ideological roots of the Russian revolution leads back to Russian populism, it also holds true that the search for the native roots of the Ukrainian revolution leads to Ukrainian populism. This central tenet is shown symbolically in the connecting thread represented by M. Hrushevsky, the dean of Ukrainian historiography. Hrushevsky became a student of the faculty of history of Kiev University in 1886 where he began studying under Antonovych's direction. Hrushevsky's historical writings, especially his earlier works, were strongly populist in their interpretation of Ukrainian history.[12] Sometime before moving to Austrian Galicia in 1894, where he became professor of the chair of East European (de facto Ukrainian) history, Hrushevsky became immersed in the Ukrainian populist movement, became a member of the Kiev Hromada (Commune or Society), the most important clandestine organization of the Ukrainian populist intelligentsia, where Antonovych had great influence. When the February Revolution of 1917 in Russia broke out, Hrushevsky returned to Kiev from Moscow, where he had been exiled, and joined the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries (UPSR), which chose him as its leader. He also became the President of the Central Rada (Assembly or Council), which soon became the first legislature and

---

[12] See T. Prymak, Mykailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture, Toronto, 1987, pp. 27, 30-31.

government of an autonomous and later independent Ukrainian state.

It is not fortuitous that in the person of Hrushevsky there was a personal link between Ukrainian populists represented by intellectuals like Antonovych, who can be seen as representatives of the classical, or mature, period of the Ukrainian populist movement, and the much younger activists of the neo-populist political party, the UPSRs. Antonovych and his compatriots were, in turn, linked with their predecessors who founded the Cyrillo-Methodian Society in 1846, the first Ukrainian proto-populist organization. One of the key figures in this society was M. Kostomarov, who was also one of its major ideologues. His writings of the late 1850s and early 1860s also served as a guide and signpost for the younger generation of Ukrainian populists associated with Antonovych, who became active at that time.[13]

The Cyrillo-Methodians were arrested in 1847, in the early stages of the development of their organization and ideology, before they were ready to begin proselytizing to wider circles, especially to the popular masses. The development of a Ukrainian populist ideology and movement were thus halted for about a decade. Nevertheless, despite this hiatus, continuity in the Ukrainian populist movement of at

---

[13] The best study on the Cyrillo-Methodians still remains that of the Soviet scholar P.A. Zaionchkovsky, Kirillo-Mefodievskoe obshchestvo (1846-1847), Moscow, 1959. See also G. Luckyj, Young Ukraine.

least several decades is evident.[14]

With the death of Nicholas I, who tried to prevent political and social change from taking place in Russia by exerting greater authoritarian control over all of society, and the accession of Alexander II to the throne, a relaxation of state control over cultural and, one can argue, political activities was inaugurated. In these more liberal conditions, ideas and movements that had been controlled, halted or driven underground under Nicholas began to come to the surface or become reborn.

The formation of several hromady of Ukrainian populist intellectuals and students in the late 1850s and early 1860s must be seen in this context. These activities signified the coalescence of the classical Ukrainian populist movement; in the same period several important classical expositions of its ideology were written. Antonovych occupies a position of importance in these processes in this period of ferment and change, becoming involved in both the movement and in the formation of its ideology.

This dissertation is in part a biography of Antonovych's early life. However, the biographical data serves largely as background and provides a context for the primary focus of this study, which is an examination of the formation of a Ukrainian populist of Polish culture and the exposition of

---

[14] See I.L. Rudnytsky, "Trends in Ukrainian Political Thought," in his Essays in Modern Ukrainian History, Edmonton, 1987, pp. 96-98.

populist views in his writings, including his historical works. Antonovych's early populist activities are also examined, especially his role in the formation of the Kiev Hromada.

A parallel between Russian and Ukrainian populism has been alluded to above. Some of the underlying ideas that made up the ideologies of both were similar, or common to both.[15] However, in the case of the formation of the Ukrainian movement and ideology, the influence and reaction to Polish ideas and to the Polish national movement was of paramount importance as well.[16] This is not surprising, as much of Ukraine had been under Polish rule for centuries and was a land in which Polish culture made a significant impact.

Ukrainian populism can also be called Ukrainian national populism. Mainstream Ukrainian populists always regarded national liberation as well as the social emancipation of the peasantry as the two main pillars of their ideological

---

[15] For example, the idealization of the peasantry was common to both, including peasant communal institutions, as was the idea that the nobility had an obligation to serve and to aid the peasantry, which was a way to pay back the debt that the nobility felt they owed to the peasantry for centuries of exploitation.

[16] The historian Peter Brock has concluded that populism, as an ideology, was first developed among Polish emigres in the 1830s, decades before the Russian variant. He also mentioned the influence that Polish political thought had on Herzen, thus implying its impact on the formation of Russian populist ideology as a whole. Brock, however, does not develop this idea. See his Polish Revolutionary Populism: a study in agrarian socialist thought from the 1830s to the 1850s, Toronto-Buffalo, 1977, esp. pp. 3-4.

beliefs. One of the catalysts that triggered the development of the national component of the ideology was the example of the Polish national liberation movement, especially of the two uprisings against Russian rule of 1830-31 and 1863-64, as well as the impact of Polish literature and political thought.

The influence of Polish political thinking on the formation and development of the ideology of the Ukrainian populist intelligentsia was evident as early as in the formation of the views of the Cyrillo-Methodians, especially in the programmatic Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People, which was reminiscent of the the Polish poet A. Mickiewicz's romantic tract.[17] Polish political thought and the political activities of Polish patriots influenced Ukrainians in two ways. On the one hand, the Poles provided an example worthy of emulation of a nation struggling for independence from Russian rule. On the other hand, Polish pretensions to Galicia and Right-Bank Ukrainian lands called forth a reaction, which also stimulated the growth of Ukrainian national consciousness.

In the person of Antonovych, in his personal national metamorphosis, in his early activities, and especially in his historical writings, this inimical and complementary

---

[17] A. Mickiewicz, Ksiegi Narodu Polskiego i pielgrzymystwa polskiego. First published in Paris, 1832. Polish influences on Ukrainian political thought are discussed in S. Kozak, Ukrainscy Spiskowcy i Mesjanisci Bractwo Cyryla i Metodego, Warsaw, 1991. See also D. Doroshenko, Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov; V. Shchurat, "Osnovy Shevchenkovykh zviazkiv z poliakamy," ZNTSh, vols. 119-20, pp. 217-347.

connection of the Ukrainian and Polish movements is strikingly illustrated. Antonovych was born a member of the Polish impoverished nobility in Right-Bank Ukraine at a time when Polish culture and the Polish gentry were dominant there. He was raised by his strict, strongly patriotic mother and became active in Polish patriotic circles at Kiev university. Yet Antonovych rejected his Polish nationality as a young man to become a leading figure in the Ukrainian populist movement and contributed to the formulation of its ideology in both his publicistic and historical writings, many of which were strongly anti-Polish.

As mentioned, this dissertation examines the formation of a Ukrainian populist intellectual of Polish cultural background. Right-Bank Ukraine was annexed by the Russian Empire in the late 18th century following the last partition of Poland. The Polish gentry was the dominant economic and social group there into the second half of the 19th century. Yet, retaining a Polish identity in Right-Bank Ukraine, where the majority of the population was Ukrainian, and where official government policy was aimed at destroying the Poles' dominant cultural position, as well as a weakening of their socio-economic status, seemed to foreshadow eventual assimilation into the dominant imperial Russian culture, or into the lower Ukrainian peasant culture. There was a third alternative, however, which was to become a member of the emerging Ukrainian elite in Right-Bank Ukraine. This was the

path chosen by Antonovych and a few of his Polish compatriots.

The dissertation examines this process in the person of Antonovych. In the first chapter the background and preconditions for the possibility of this change are discussed and set forth. In chapters two and three the metamorphosis itself is shown against the background of Polish student movements at Kiev university, where Polish Ukrainophilism, or local patriotism, was a significant tendency. Preparations for the Polish uprising of 1863 proved to be the catalyst that forced Antonovych and his close compatriots to break with their Polish comrades and go over to the Ukrainian side. Antonovych's participation in the formation of the Kiev Hromada, which culminated in a symbolic merger of Left- and Right-Bank students, a group of the latter being led by Antonovych, was also stimulated by the activation of the Polish movement.

Finally, Antonovych's contributions to the formation of a Ukrainian populist ideology are shown through examining his writings. Some of these were polemical, journalistic essays. However, the bulk of Antonovych's populist beliefs were expressed and developed in his historical writings, many of which were anti-Polish. In these works, Antonovych not only contributed to develping a populist ideology, but also to a Ukrainian populist historiography, which remained the dominant trend among Ukrainian historians throughout the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries.

CHAPTER ONE

Background and Early Years

In his unfinished memoirs, first published in 1908 shortly after his death, Volodymyr Antonovych described in some detail his family background.[1] His grandfather, on his father's side, was a Hungarian, Matyas Dzsidai[2], who had a university education and worked as a tutor in the employ of a Hungarian count. He was a Hungarian patriot of liberal views, who became involved in a revolutionary conspiracy around the end of the 18th century to establish an independent Hungarian republic. The conspiracy was uncovered, several of its leaders were arrested and executed, while Matyas fled to Austrian Galicia, where he found employment as a forester.

---

[1] In LNV, books 7-9, 1908. Reprinted as "Memuary," in V. Antonovych, Tvory, vol. 1 (only volume published), Kiev, 1932, pp. 3-61. Further references will be to "Memuary." Antonovych's memoirs remained unfinished, covering the period into the early 1860s. The first part of the memoirs concerns Antonovych's family background. Antonovych attached great importance to geneology and cultural anthropology, which was brought forth, at least in part, by his study of anthropology. This caused him to believe strongly in the large weight of inheritance in the life and activities of every individual. Antonovych did not believe that inheritance pre-determined an individual's life. One's education and upbringing as well as personal initiative played an important role, albeit not nearly as important as inheritance. See Antonovych's discussion of his beliefs in "Memuary," pp. 3-4.

[2] This is probably the Hungarian form of his name. In his memoirs, Antonovych uses Matiash Dzhydai. In Polish this would be Maciej Dzidaj.

Here, he married a local Ukrainian peasant woman. The couple had a son, Janos,[3] who was Volodymyr's father.[4]

Janos also received a university education, completing a degree at the Faculty of Philosophy at Lviv University, probably in 1826 or 1827. Shortly thereafter, along with two other companions, he decided to go to Greece to help the insurgents in their fight for independence from the Turks. As they had little money, the three had to work for about a year to save enough for the trip; on their way to Greece, while in the Kiev region, they learned that the war had ended and that Greece had won its independence. Because there were relatively few university-educated men in Right-Bank Ukraine,[5] the three untested romantic revolutionaries were soon besieged

---

[3] In Ukrainian: Ivan, which is the form Antonovych uses; in Polish: Janusz; the Hungarian form is Janos.

[4] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 4-5. One Polish historian did not believe that Janos was the father, and claimed that Antonovych made this up to discredit his mother. See F. Rawita Gawronski, Wlodzimierz Antonowicz, pp. 9-17. It would seem, though, that Antonovych would have no reason to lie about this, unless he wished to deliberately minimize his Polish ethnic background and emphasize instead his ethnic Hungarian and Ukrainian roots. This is also what Rawita-Gawronski hints at. But this is highly unlikely as well.

[5] Right-Bank Ukraine refers to former predominantly ethnic Ukrainian lands of the late 18th-century Polish Commonwealth that encompased the palatinates of Bratslav, Kiev, Podillia and Volhynia. In the Russian Empire of the 19th century these lands were referred to as iugo-zapadnyi krai or Iugo-Zapadnaia Rossiia (south-west lands or South-West Russia). They more or less encompassed the gubernias (provinces) of Kiev, Podillia and Volhynia. F. Rawita Gawronski denied that educated men were in short supply in Right-Bank Ukraine. See his Wlodzimierz Antonowicz, p. 16, n. 1.

by local members of the Polish szlachta (nobility) to remain and work as tutors for their children. Thus, Janos remained in Right-Bank Ukraine, finding employment with various noblemen. In 1832, he was a tutor for the nobleman Markowski, whose manor was in the village of Iahubets, in the Uman region. It was here that he met Volodymyr's mother, Monika, who also worked for the same lord as a tutor.[6]

Like Janos, Monika was also of mixed ethnic background. Her mother, Karolina, was the child of a long-standing illicit relationship between prince Lubomirski[7] from the town of Pavoloch, county of Skvyra, and a local Ukrainian peasant woman, who also bore him two sons. Karolina was married off at an early age to an elderly nobleman, originally from central Poland, Hipolit Gorski - a disagreeable character, who drank heavily and died in a drinking-related accident. In addition to Monika the Gorskis had two sons, Kajetan and Jozef. The destitute young widow, Karolina, was helped by her two brothers, who managed to find an apprenticeship for the two boys as lawyers' aides. Monika was taken into the household of the Podoski family, wealthy landowners, where her father had served.[8]

---

[6] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 5-6.

[7] Antonovych was not sure of of his given name, but thought it was Kasper. Ibid., p. 6.

[8] Ibid., pp. 7-8. Gorski, who lost his lands for supporting the insurrection led by Tadeusz Kosciuszko in 1794, earned his living largely by working for more wealthy landowners.

Monika was twelve years old when she went to live with the Podoski family, a stay that lasted for about seven or eight years, after which she left to earn her own keep. The Podoskis were well-off landowners, whereas Monika was from the impoverished, landless stratum, and an orphan at that. At the Podoskis she received an education, learning French, as well as a little history, geography and mathematics. It was here, Antonovych claims, that his mother's beliefs and views on life were largely formed: respect for the way of life of the szlachta, a craving for material comforts, and contempt towards the lower estates, such as the peasantry and Jews.[9]

After leaving the Podoski estate, Monika hired herself out as a governess in various landowners' homes. At one of these she met Bonifacy Antonowicz, also a petty nobleman and tutor, and they soon married. Bonifacy was of Lithuanian heritage from the gubernia of Vilnius. Their marriage did not last, as their characters were strongly opposed to one another. Whereas Monika was energetic, strong-willed, and even despotic, Bonifacy was phlegmatic and passive. They [illegible]ogether for about three to four years and had two c[illegible] one of which, Ewelina, survived. After the sep[illegible]n, Monika continued working as a governess for different noblemen. About ten years after the separation she

---

[9] Ibid., p. 8.

met Janos Dzsidai, a meeting which led to the birth of Volodymyr Antonovych.[10]

According to official records, Volodymyr Antonovych was born on 6 January 1834, in the town of Makhnivka, county of Berdychiv, Kiev gubernia.[11] Shortly after he was born, it appears that Janos and Monika went their separate ways. Before doing so they agreed that Volodymyr would live with Monika until he was of school age, after which Janos would care for the boy and provide for his education.[12] When Volodymyr was three years old his mother quit teaching and moved into the home of Jozef, her unmarried brother, who was

---

[10] Ibid., p. 10.

[11] V.G. Liaskoronsky wrote that Antonovych was actually born in 1830 in the town of Chornobyl. Volodymyr was such a sickly child that his parents rushed to baptise him. As there was no Roman Catholic priest present, a Uniate priest performed the baptism. Shortly theafter, his parents moved to Makhnivka, in Berdychiv county. Here, they determined to re-baptise Volodymyr, but the local Roman Catholic priest refused to do this until 1834, which was the year given as his birth in official documents. Liaskoronsky noted that Antonovych's eldest son, Ivan, gave him this information. See his obituary, "V.B. Antonovich," Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia, 1908, New Series, Part 15, pp. 51-52, n. 1. This information may not be far-fetched. In a letter written in December 1902, Antoni Mioduszewski, a close friend of Antonovych in the 1850s, asked Volodymyr to confirm that he had indeed been baptised as a Uniate. Mioduszewski wrote that he received this information from Antonovych's elder sister, Ewalina. Antonovych replied several months later that this was not true. See M. Hrushevsky [M.H.], "Try lysty Volod. Antonovycha do Antoniia Miodushevskoho," ZNTSh, vol. 89, 1909, pp. 119-20. See also D. Doroshenko, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 4-5, who notes these same sources.

[12] K. Melnyk-Antonovych, "Dodatkovi prymitky ta vidomosti do 'Memuariv,'" in V. Antonovych, Tvory, p. 66.

an attorney in the county of Makhnivka. Antonovych's grandmother, Karolina, also lived there with her son.[13]

Within the immediate family, Volodymyr was most fond of his grandmother, whom he described as having the qualities of "ideal goodness, gentleness, and love of people." The first years of his conscious life, he recalled, were spent almost exclusively with his grandmother. "My grandmother and I were inseparable... and [we] had a great love towards one another. [She] oftentimes spoke about her recollections to me, sang songs, taught me to read and passed on her views on life, based on love and goodness."[14]

Oftentimes, Karolina would tell Volodymyr stories about her life, most often about events that occurred when she was a young girl. From them, Antonovych was able to gain a glimpse into the life of the Polish petty gentry of the late eighteenth century, many of whom worked as estate administrators and stewards for the more well-off landowners in the borderland regions of Right-Bank Ukraine.

---

[13] The reason his mother had to set aside teaching was because she wanted to find a husband for her daughter, Ewelina, and for this she deemed it necessary to devote much time to establish relations with the local nobility, arranging dances and preparing other social gatherings. See V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 11.

[14] Ibid.

Antonovych also learned for the first time something about the Ukrainian haidamaka uprisings.[15] More than once his grandmother related to him a particular episode that must have left a strong impression. Haidamakas had attacked the estate, managed to break into the manorhouse and begun to rob it. The twelve-year-old Karolina tried to stop a haidamaka from taking her favourite dress; he took pity on her and left it for her. The haidamakas did not kill anyone in the home. Antonovych wrote that his grandmother always ended this narration with the comment, "Even though he was a haidamaka, he was a good man."[16]

Whereas Antonovych respected and had a deep emotional attachment to his grandmother, his assessment of his mother's character was largely negative. In part this was due to her

---

[15] The haidamka uprisings were partly jacqueries and partly Cossack-inspired and -led movements that erupted sporadically in Polish-ruled Right-Bank Ukraine throughout much of the 18th century. The largest uprising, in 1768, is known as Koliivshchyna. There is much literature on the haidamakas. In English see W. Serczyk, The Haidamak Uprisings, Edmonton, forthcoming. See also Z. Kohut, "Myths Old and New: The Haidamak Movement and the Koliivshchyna (1768) in Recent Historiography," Harvard Ukrainian Studies, vol. 1, no. 3 (1977); W. Serczyk, Haidamacy, Cracow, 1972.

[16] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 12-13. Polish historiography and popular literature has, for the most part, portrayed the haidamaka uprisings negatively. See the introductory chaper to W. Serczyk's unpublished study The Haidamak Uprisings. This would undoubtably coincide with the assessment of the haidamakas in Polish szlachta society of the 19th century as brigands and cutthroats. Karolina's description of this particular incident to Antonovych, where she labelled a haidamaka as a "good man," therefore, was uncommon and did indeed show she was open-minded. This must have had some effect on Antonovych's awakening consciousness, as he went into some detail on this incident in his memoirs.

authoritarian attitude towards him; slappings, beatings, and other humiliating punishments, at times bordering on cruelty were common.[17] Antonovych wrote that as a young boy he feared his mother. The tone of her voice was sharp and she had a "despotic" character. She frightened Antonovych to such a degree that he "tried to hide, or run from the house as soon as she arrived there..."[18] In a letter to the historian Michal Rolle, the poet Leonard Sowinski, who knew Antonovych as an adolescent and later became his friend, basically confirmed Antonovych's assessment of his mother. She was "intelligent and and well-read," he wrote, but combined a passionate attachment to her son with "maternal despotism."[19]

In assessing Antonovych's memoirs, it is clear that he regarded this type of authoritarianism and cruelty in the family as fairly typical of the Right-Bank Polish szlachta.[20] Antonovych gave another example of how he felt his mother's views fit into those that were prevalent among the szlachta,

---

[17] Antonovych mentioned some of the rather cruel punishments. One time he forgot to wipe his lips clean following a meal. His mother not only scolded and cursed him, but took a dirty rag used to wipe floors and forcibly wiped his lips and face with it. Antonovych's face broke out in a rash; he became infected and was ill for about a month following this incident. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[18] V. Antonovych, "Memuary,", p. 13.

[19] See Sowinski's letter of 13 May 1867 to M. Rolle (Antoni J.) in M. Rolle, In illo tempore, Brody, 1914, p. 265.

[20] One should recall here Antonovych's assessment that his mother's character was formed, in large part, during her stay with the Podoski family. See above.

and reflected their character. In the summer of 1840, Monika forced her daughter to marry Stefan Wasniewski, a petty nobleman who was a lawyer by profession. According to Antonovych, Wasniewski was a partisan of the equality of the szlachta, yet, at the same time, displayed an obsequious attitude towards wealthy landowners. He was cruel and exploitative towards the peasants and greedy for profit, without regard for the methods used to obtain it. In his family life, Antonovych noted, Wasniewski was a despot.[21] Since she forced this marriage upon her daughter, one can conclude that Monika probably approved of Wasniewski's character traits, or at the very least found them to be not offensive enough to deny him her daughter in marriage.

After Ewelina was married, his mother returned to teaching, working for the landowner Cybulski, who lived in the town of Horyshkivka, near Tulchyn, in the region of Vinnytsia. It was here that Antonovych, at the age of six, began his schooling. For three years he and two of Cybulski's daughters were taught by his mother. Besides Polish grammar, Polish history, a general outline of geography and catechism, he learned French, which, Antonovych wrote, was extremely beneficial, for it gave him direct access to a rich Western literature, thus broadening his knowledge.[22]

---

[21] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 23.

[22] Ibid., p. 25.

Antonovych's mother, quite typically of the szlachta, was a "hot-blooded Polish patriot," and she tried to instill this patriotism in Volodymyr. One way was through the history lessons, which, he recalled, were centered on the history of the Polish state and devoid of criticism of Poland's past. In general, he noted, criticism of Polish society or accepted practices among the szlachta was frowned upon, and critical individuals were reproached as "bad birds, who defile their own nest." One's patriotic obligation, Antonovych wrote, consisted of praising that which was one's own, ignoring its faults, and criticizing everything foreign.[23]

It would be relevant here to examine in some detail Antonovych's views on szlachta society in Right-Bank Ukraine, as outlined in his memoirs. One cannot accept, without reservations, the views expressed here as being identical with conclusions he had reached as a young boy and adolescent. As will be seen, his comments, observations and opinions on szlachta society were almost exclusively negative in his memoirs. These observations and conclusions give us an insight into his character formation while still a young boy. The strong, negative opinions, formed at an early age, can be seen as one of the foundations upon which his ideological beliefs developed when he became a young adult.

Although the szlachta formed a single estate, it was not a homogenous social group, being divided into several strata,

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

according to wealth. Within it were spectacularly wealthy magnates, a small group, who owned thousands of serfs and vast tracts of land, including numerous towns and villages, as well as impoverished petty noblemen, a large group, most of whom did not own serfs and many of whom did not even own land.[24] In theory all members of the szlachta were equal, although in practice the wealthier strata looked down upon the less wealthy and impoverished layers.

At the head of szlachta society were the large landowners or magnates. According to Antonovych, about 9/10 of the land in Right-Bank Ukraine held by the nobility belonged to the magnates.[25] Because of their great wealth, they held, practically speaking, unlimited powers, being able to corrupt the local administration. In total there were very few magnate families and most of them lived in Warsaw, St.

---

[24] The French historian Beauvois estimated that 90% of the legally recognized szlachta in 1850 did not own any serfs. See D. Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie 1831-1863: Szlachta Polska na Wolyniu Podolu i Kijowszczyzne, Paris, 1987, p. 192.

[25] Antonovych does not indicate a source for his figure, nor does he give a date or time period, although it can be assumed that the period referred to was around the time of his childhood. In his study of the szlachta in Right-Bank Ukraine, Beauvois did not give any figures for landownership, but, in regard to the ownership of serfs, he wrote that about two hundred families out of a total of about 17,500 legal noble families in Right-Bank Ukraine owned over 1,000 serfs each. This figure comes to about 1/8 of the total number of inhabitants of Right-Bank Ukraine. D. Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie, pp. 182-83, 192, 266-68.

Petersburg or abroad. On the whole, their influence on szlachta society was weak.[26]

The most influential stratum in Right-Bank szlachta society were the landowners of middle rank, who, on average, held about two to three villages, and could vote in the elections to the assemblies of the nobility, limited to those who had more than 100 souls. Below them were the impoverished szlachta, petty landowners, who did not have the necessary land and number of serfs needed to participate in the noble assemblies.[27] At a still lower level were nobles who worked in the liberal professions: doctors, lawyers and pharmacists, who were not accepted in landowners' society. At the bottom of the szlachta's social ladder were the serving nobility, who were landless. These noblemen earned their living by hiring themselves out to the magnates and middle level landowners: in the adminstration of estates, for example, as stewards or bookkeepers; or in the household, as governors, governesses and tutors.[28]

---

[26] V. Antonovych, "Memuary, pp. 35-36.

[27] The Polish contemporary writer, J.I. Kraszewski, in his novel Dwa swiaty, Cracow, 1967 (reprint edition), described a typical member of this stratum, who owned three adult male serfs, about 30 morgs of farmland for sowing crops, as well as some forest and pastureland. Cited in D. Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie, p. 192. Kraszewski himself, although not a magnate, belonged to the wealthier sector of the middle stratum, Ibid., pp. 192-93, n. 24.

[28] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 36-37. It should be noted that following the 1830-31 insurrection, the Russian government mounted a campaign to deprive the landless Polish szlachta of noble status. By the early 1850s, 340,000 had

Antonovych wrote that when he moved to the Cybulski's he first became acquainted with Polish landowners of middle rank. It was not a society of intellectuals, he noted, although each landowner would speak with great authority and confidence. They looked down on people of the liberal professions, even going as far as to shun contacts with them. Although theoretically equal, the wealthier, middle-level landowners looked down on the impoverished and landless members of their estate. His mother, as a member of the lower, serving szlachta, treated the wealthier and more aristocratic szlachta with great piety; yet, on the other hand, she expected that that the wealthier treat the landless, serving szlachta without respect. In short, Antonovych wrote, the more well-off landowners tried to maintain themselves as a separate caste and referred to a member of the impoverished szlachta as szuja (rogue or scum).[29]

According to Antonovych, the szlachta believed that they were an estate established by God and nature; members of other estates could not even be considered to be equal to a member of the szlachta. Therefore, contacts between members of different estates were discouraged. In everyday life, these "caste principles," as Antonovych called them, revealed themselves in various ways. For instance, Volodymyr was

---

been so deprived. D. Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie, Chapter Two, esp. p. 137.

[29] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 25, 28.

forbidden by his mother to befriend servants and village children. Words and phrases, or behaviour, not sanctioned were discouraged, not by the admonishment that they were in and of themselves bad, but by saying that only peasants or Jews behaved or spoke in this or that particular manner.[30]

Antonovych noted that the arbitrary power of the szlachta over the peasantry was virtually unlimited. Although the szlachta were deprived of many of their political freedoms after Poland lost its independence, their power over the peasantry was strengthened and they gained economically. In comparing the treatment of peasants by Russian dvoriane (noblemen) and the Polish szlachta, Antonovych felt that a difference existed in personal relations between lord and serf. He wrote that, "Nowhere, perhaps, did the lords treat the peasants with such scorn and disrespect to the individual dignity of man as in the South-Western lands." A member of the szlachta could not bring himself to admit that peasants were people. Peasants who were unfortunate enough to be personal servants were subject to constant curses and often to physical beatings.[31]

Antonovych claimed that because the Polish szlachta set thenselves apart from the other social groups, they were

---

[30] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 28.

[31] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 32-33. However, in his memoirs, Antonovych's friend, Borys Poznansky, wrote that serfdom was worse in Left-Bank Ukraine and central Russia than in Right-Bank Ukraine. See his "Vospominaniia," Uzh, 1913, no. 1, p. 33.

alienated from them, did not know them and thus relations between Poles and other groups in society were often inimical. This was particularly true in relations between the szlachta and the peasantry. The landowner, who lived on his estate for many years, believed that the peasants were his enemies and that the only thing they wanted was to work less and drink. Accordingly, he believed that their destiny was to remain serfs. The majority of the lords did not even want to consider the possibility of education for the peasantry.[32]

According to Antonovych, the only estate that resisted the Polish nobility to some degree were the Orthodox priests. Most did not challenge the authority of the landowner, but there were those who defended the peasantry. In these cases the szlachta were often able to bribe the consistory authorities to have the troublemaker lose his position.[33]

---

[32] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 38 See also Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie, p. 77, who wrote that Poles had long neglected the issue of elementary education of the peasantry.

[33] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 39. Perhaps Antonovych's rosy assessment of the role of the Orthodox clergy is based on his own experience with an enlightened young priest who helped Antonovych in the late 1850s in his work in the field of popular education. See O. Levytsky, "Storinka z zhyttia Volodymyra Antonovycha," LNV, 1913, vol. 62, book 4, pp. 19-27. Despite this claim by Antonovych, it seems that the role of the clergy in the countryside was largely negative. See Kyianyn's report in Meta, 1863, no. 1, cited in K. Studynsky, "Epizody borotby za ukrainstvo v 1863 r.," in Iubileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademyka Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevskoho, vol. 2, Kiev, 1928, pp. 512-13, who wrote that the Kiev metropolitan sabotaged the establishment and work of elementary schols in the countryside and was aided in this by the priests. See also the report by Ukrainets, "Z Ukrainy," Meta, 1863, no. 2. Reprinted in ibid. See esp. p. 516, where the author gives a damning indictment of the corruption and

On the whole, Antonovych wrote, the cultural level of the szlachta in Right-Bank Ukraine was very low. In the Right-Bank region there were only a few people, perhaps, who had completed a master's degree from the 1840s to 1860s. In general, members of the szlachta rarely finished secondary schooling, and the sons of the wealthy landowners, even if they did complete their gymnasium schooling, generally did not go on to the universities. Rather, Antonovych noted, children of the petty, impoverished and serving szlachta were more likely to go. The szlachta as a whole did not read much, or not at all. People from the liberal professions were much better read, but had little influence on society's development.[34]

The low level of culture had its impact on the ideology of szlachta, which Antonovych characterized as built upon the triad: Catholic fanaticism (in religion); chauvinistic Polish patriotism tinged with messianism and a persecution complex; (in social relations) "the szlachta principle," that is, the notion that the szlachta, through the grace of God and nature,

---

servility of the clergy and accuses them of sabotaging popular-educational work in the countryside.

[34] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 33, 35. Beauvois confirmed that the more educated among the szlachta came from the impoverished sector, and that the more wealthy sector looked down on their more educated, but poorer peers. See his Polacy na Ukrainie, pp. 197-200. See also T. Bobrowski, Pamietnik mojego zycia, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1979, pp. 300-02.

were born to rule.[35] Other philosophies, including democratic ideas, were not even considered worthy of study. Antonovych claimed that the Jesuit order tried to strengthen and maintain this ideology among the szlachta and that, in general, this group had an enormous influence within szlachta society.[36]

Part of Antonovych's education consisted of his mother's attempts to instill in him the beliefs, outlooks and mannerisms of the szlachta, most of which have been mentioned. In his own case, Antonovych wrote that his early upbringing did result in implanting one negative characteristic that caused many problems and which he had to fight to control throughout his life: that was the urge to show himself as better than others, as someone unique. He recalled that this led him to "self-praising lies" that, when revealed, caused

---

[35] There is a strong coincidence between the ideology of the szlachta, as relayed by Antonovych, and the conservative official ideology of Nicholas I, which was based on the triad: Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationality.

[36] The Jesuit order had been banned by the pope in the late 18th century. It was reinstated in Russian Poland following the last partitions. The Russian government expelled the order in 1820. Nevertheless, the organization existed underground. Antonovych wrote that the Jesuits came from all walks of life. One of their aims was to bring order to the disorganized szlachta society. To do so, they tried to gain positions in landowners' estates, either economic or pedagogical. Accordingly, there was almost no wealthy estate in Right-Bank Ukraine where a Jesuit did not have a position. The Jesuits were also organized in religious societies that were allowed to exist. See V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 37-38.

him much shame.[37] Developing a sense of honour was extremely important, especially among szlachta males, although Antonovych noted the contradictions inherent in the typical Polish nobleman's view of what this honour encompassed and how best to protect it. Some of its principles were understandable, but others had little or nothing to do with maintaining honesty, integrity or decency.[38]

As described in his memoirs, Antonovych did not find any redeeming features within Polish szlachta society. He retained these exclusively negative views on the szlachta throughout his entire life, as evidenced in his memoirs, the first part of which were written in 1897.[39]

Following three years of schooling with his mother, Volodymyr was taught for about a year by a tutor, who had been hired by the Cybulski family to teach their son, Karol. This year was devoted to preparing him for secondary school, the

---

[37] V. Antonovych," Memuary," p. 29. K. Melnyk-Antonovych wrote that this trait, if it did exist, was only with him as a young child. As an adult, he "always distinguished himself from everyone else by his modesty, restraint and politeness." Kateryna Melnyk-Antonovych, "Dodatkovi prymitky ta vidomosti do'Memuariv'," in V. Antonovych, Tvory, pp. 76-77.

[38] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 28-29.

[39] D. Doroshenko commented that although it was understandable that Antonovych judged the szlachta harshly, he noted that there were individuals and groups from the szlachta who contributed towards the revival of Ukrainian culture. Among these he mentioned poets and writers of the Ukrainian school in Polish literature and the first Polish Ukrainophiles. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 7-10. On the Ukrainian school in Polish literature, see below, esp. n. 41. On Polish Ukrainophilism, see Chapter Two.

gymnasium. He now began to study both Russian and Latin, in addition to arithmetic and geography. After these preparatory courses were completed, Volodymyr was sent to stay with Bonifacy Antonowicz for the next half year, who agreed to further help Volodymyr before classes at the gymnasium were to begin. It was here that Volodymyr came into contact with a different sort of szlachta milieu, finding himself in a more open and free environment.[40]

Bonifacy lived at the home of his former student, Otton Abramowicz. Otton was a young bachelor who liked company and led an active social life. Yet, in contrast to most young male Polish nobles of his day, who spent much of their leisure time playing cards and drinking, Otton and his friends would, oftentimes in the evenings, gather to read out loud for two to three hours; most often one of Michal Czajkowski's short stories was read. It was through Czajkowski's novels that Antonovych first learned something about Ukrainian Cossacks.[41] He recalled in his memoirs that "for the first

---

[40] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 29-30.

[41] Michal Czajkowski (Sadyk-Pasha) was the author of several romantic novels and short stories on Ukrainian Cossack themes: Powiesci Kozackie, 1837; Wernyhora, 1838; Kirdzali, 1839; Owruczanin, 1841; Ukrainki, 1841. Czajkowski is considered one of the central figures of the Ukrainian school in Polish literature, which was tied to the romantic movement. Antonovych did not hold this school in very high esteem. See his "Memuary," pp. 33-34. D. Doroshenko wrote that Antonovych was too severe in his criticism here. He points out that the literature of this school, and especially the novels of Czajkowski, influenced many Poles, some of whom, like Kost Mykhalchuk, the later philologist and friend of Antonovych, Ukrainized themselves. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, Prague,

time I saw a new world, that did not have anything in common with the szlachta order and differed from it in its unique boldness, vivacity and energy.... These images of Czajkowski implanted themselves deep into my soul and were never erased, laying the the initial foundation of Ukrainophilism."[42] Antonovych also had access to Abramowicz's library, where he read for the first time the works of Adam Mickiewicz; he especially became interested in the translations of Greek songs describing the recent struggles of the Greeks for independence from the Turks.[43]

In the summer of 1844, at the age of ten, Antonovych set off for Odessa, where his father, Janos Dzsidai, lived, and where he was now to begin his formal education in a gymnasium. Dzsidai had moved to Odessa shortly after he and Monika

---

1942, p. 11. The Ukrainian school in Polish literature and Polish romantic Cossackophile literature are discussed in G. Grabowicz, "The History and Myth of the Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1975.

Czajkowski was not only a romantic writer, but also a colourful figure active in the Polish national movement. Following the failed 1830-31 insurrection, in which he headed a Cossack unit from Volhynia, he emigrated to France. He eventually entered the service of the Ottoman sultan, changed his name to Sadyk-Pasha, and convinced Turkish authorities to allow him to organize Cossack military formations from descendants of largely Ukrainian Cossacks who lived in the Dobrudja region. His plan was to use this unit to try to spark anti-Russian rebellions among Ukrainian peasants in future conflicts of the Turkish state with Russia. See I.L. Rudnytsky, "Michal Czajkowski's Cossack Project during the Crimean War: An Analysis of Ideas," in his Essays in Modern Ukrainian History, Edmonton, 1987, pp. 173-86.

[42] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 30-31.

[43] Ibid., p. 31.

separated, where he opened a boarding house for students. For four years Antonovych attended the Richeleau, or First Odessa Gymnasium; in 1848 he transferred to the newly-opened Odessa Second Gymnasium, where he finished his last three years of secondary schooling.[44]

Janos was very helpful to him in all respects. He had married and his wife treated Antonovych almost like her own child. Volodymyr made good use of his father's excellent library at home, and Janos, who noticed the boy's passion for reading, helped him along by offering suggestions and encouragement. Antonovych's appetite for reading was so great that he also regularly visited a local bookseller, paying him one kopeck for the right to stand and read there whatever he found to be of interest.[45]

While in secondary school, Antonovych became especially interested in geography, which remained throughout his life his best-loved subject of study, but also history, and the natural sciences. In addition, he devoted considerable attention to foreign languages, learning Latin and German, as well as improving on his already basic knowledge of French, becoming fluent in all three. Although he was one of the

---

[44] V. Anonovych, "Memuary,", p. 63. K. Melnyk-Antonovych, "Dodatkovi prymitky," p. 67.

[45] K. Melnyk-Antonovych, "Dodatkovi prymitky," pp. 68-69.

gymnasium's youngest pupils, Antonovych showed himself to be an exemplary student.[46]

Antonovych's years in Odessa were crucial to the formation of his ideological views. He wrote that his father held "deep democratic convictions" and had a great deal of influence on him during this period. He recommended books for Antonovych to read. Much time was spent reading French-language works, and in his last years there he read many of the works of the French encyclopaedists and philosophers of the eighteenth century "under the influence of whom," Antonovych wrote, "my views were formed."[47] Volodymyr also gave much credit to the "humane" teachers who taught him at the Odessa Second Gymnasium.[48]

In addition to the study of the French Enlightenment authors, it is likely that Antonovych was introduced to French social theories of the first half of the 19th century as well while in Odessa. One also has to bear in mind that the revolutions of 1848-49 must have had repercussions in Odessa,

---

[46] Ibid.

[47] Antonovych specifically mentioned that he had read works by Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau. See his "Memuary," p. 40.

[48] In a letter written as a reply to an invitation issued to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Second Odessa Gymansium, he wrote that his three years as a student there "was an unforgettable period of my life - those were years when the moral make-up of a man is formed, and in this regard I am much indebted to the second gymnasium..." This letter was printed as "Dodatok do 'Memuariv'," in V. Antonovych, Tvory, pp. 62-65.

which Antonovych described as "a lively and European-enlightened city..."[49]

Although it can be stated that Antonovych left Odessa a convinced democrat, he had not as yet arrived at his Ukrainian populist convictions. In his memoirs he wrote that while in Odessa he did not become acquainted with any scholarly or literary works on Ukrainian topics except for A. Skalkovsky's works on the Zaporozhian Sich and the haidamakas.[50] Yet, as Antonovych noted, immediately after he left the gymnasium and returned to the Right Bank, he felt out of place in szlachta society, now considering their ideas strange and "archaic."[51] Having become imbued with new democratic and humanitarian ideas from his readings and from his father in Odessa, Antonovych now began to seriously consider "how to apply the general principles of theoretical democracy onto our own soil. It turned out that the democratic element in the land was the

---

[49] V. Antonovych, "Dodatok do "Memuariv', in his Tvory, p. 63. Odessa was a dynamic port city in the 19th century that was quite cosmopolitan and progressive. See P. Herlihy, Odessa: A History 1794-1914, Cambridge, Mass., 1986, esp. pp. 128-30; 143-44. Foreign influences were so prevalent and the atmosphere so liberal in Odessa that Nicholas I referred to the city as "a nest of conspirators." Cited in Ibid., p. 130.

[50] A. Skalkovsky, Istoriia Novoi Sechi ili poslednego Kosha Zaporozhskogo, izvlechena iz sobstvennogo zaporozhskogo arkhiva A. Skalkovskim, Odessa, 1841; Naezdy gaidamakov na Zapadnuiu Ukrainu v XVIII st. 1733-1768 gg., Odessa, 1845.

[51] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 40.

peasantry. Here... the question of nationality came to the fore."[52]

Although forbidden to maintain contact with the lower estates, it appears that Antonovych had already begun to explore and become acquainted with the world of the Ukrainian peasantry before he entered university. Sowinski, who met Antonovych when the latter was sixteen years old, wrote that Volodymyr "often sought the company of peasants and their children and was quite successful in gaining their favour."[53] Antonovych would continue on this road of learning about the Ukrainian peasantry during his university years.

During his early years, Volodymyr Antonovych received what can be described as a fairly typical upbringing in an impoverished Polish Right-Bank szlachta family. His mother, who was responsible for his upbringing in these early years, was a Polish patriot, whose expectations and outlook on life were common to much of the szlachta. Perhaps, most importantly for the development of Volodymyr, she had an authoritarian personality and was unduly strict towards him. Antonovych resented this and her attempts to mold him into a her vision of a young member of the szlachta. He was a

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] From Sowinski's letter of 13 May 1867 to Rolle in M. Rolle, In illo tempore, p. 266.

sensitive and precocious young boy who dutifully endured much abuse from his mother, but he also did rebel.[54]

It is clear from all this that he identified szlachta society with his mother. From early childhood he began to resent his mother, her values and the type of society she represented and stood for. Her attempts to instill these values in him led to mild forms of rebellion. In contrast to his mother, whom he feared and obviously began to reject as a child, he became close to his grandmother, attracted by her humaneness and gentleness.

When he went to live for several months with Bonifacy Antonowicz at Otton Abramowicz's, he encountered a different szlachta culture and society. Abramowicz and his friends, Antonovych noted, were influenced by a literary and cultural movement among the Right-Bank Polish szlachta, known as

---

[54] Antonovych related one such incident to his second wife, Kateryna Melnyk-Antonovych. During the years his mother tutored him, Volodymyr was given many written assignments, which he treated seriously. Often, when he took the completed assignments to his mother she would, instead of praising him for his efforts, would stress the mistakes he made, usually by remarking in a strict and ironic tone that in the next assignment he should make even more mistakes than in the work just completed. During his last year of instruction at home Volodymyr finally decided to follow his mother's instructions--literally--and so he brought her an assignment deliberately riddled with mistakes! See K. Melnyk-Antonovych, "Dodatkovi prymitky," p. 76. Sowinski remarked that when he first met Antonovych one summer, when the latter was home for holidays from Odessa, he was struck by the fact that Antonovych was unduly quiet and introspective. This behaviour was, in his view, a form of protest against his mother and her expectations of him. This form of protest extended even to neglect of his outward appearance. His mother was fanatical about outward appearance. See Sowinski's letter of 13 May 1867 to Rolle, in M. Rolle In illo tempore, p. 266.

balagulszczyna.[55] Their dress was not fashionable, but rather styled close to what Cossacks would wear. Here, he encountered a more open atmosphere and became exposed to intellectual stimulation in the form of listening to the romantic Polish Cossackophile writings of Michal Czajkowski read in the circle of Abramowicz's friends, which first steered him in the direction of Ukrainophilism. This was a romantic alternative to his mother's world.

At Abramowicz's, Antonovych was first exposed to a group of szlachta that had Ukrainophile sympathies. It should be noted that many members of the Right-Bank szlachta were of Ukrainian ethnic background, who had become Polonized over the past few centuries.[56] Accordingly, the Right-Bank szlachta was a separate type from the szlachta of the core, ethnic Polish lands. Beginning in the 19th century, some members of this szlachta began to exhibit a form of local Ukrainophile

---

[55] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 30. There is some literature on this interesting, but not definitively studied literary and cultural movement. In part, it was a form of grotesque protest against conventional Polish szlachta society and its values. It was tied to the romantic movement and also was a part of the history of Polish Ukrainophilism among the szlachta. Balaguli became associated with extreme forms of social behaviour, including moral debauchery. See V. Hnatiuk, "Iarmarkove ukrainofilstvo v zhytti ta literaturi (balahulshchyna)," in Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademyka Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevskoho, vol. 2, pp. 272-289. See also K. Mykhalchuk, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, no. 5-6, pp. 18-20, who points out the serious side of this movement and the strong Ukrainophile tendencies within it.

[56] This point is raised by D. Doroshenko. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 7-8. See also V. Lypynsky, Szlachta na Ukrainie, Cracow, 1909, pp. 39-40.

patriotism and turned to study their past: folk life, Ukrainian language and songs, that is, the land and people among whom they lived. To some degree, this was a local manifestation of the romantic movement, that played such a crucial role in the rebirth of the Slavic nations. Some of the Polonized petty gentry on the Right Bank, who became poets, writers, historians and ethnographers, made significant contributions to literature and to scholarship. At the same time, an analogous process was taking place among some members of the Russified or semi-Russified petty nobility, many of whom were descendants of Ukrainian Cossack officers in Left-Bank Ukraine. [57]

In the Right Bank, this process gave birth to the Ukrainian school in Polish literature.[58] Despite Antonovych's generally negative characterization of this school and of its influence in Polish society, it did have an influence, as Antonovych himself admits, on his own development, in sparking his first interest in Ukraine, in

---

[57] See D. Doroshenko, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 7-9.

[58] As mentioned already, one of the most prominent members of this school was Michal Czajkowski (1808-1886). Adam Czarnocki (Zorian Dolenga-Chodakowski) was a pioneer of Ukrainian ethnography. Some writers did not limit themselves to writing on Ukrainian topics in Polish but began to use the Ukrainian language in their works. Among these were Tymko Padura (1801-1872), Spiridon Ostashewski (1795-1875) and Anton Szaszkiewicz, known as the king of the balaguli. Despite the display of local patriotism, they were all patriots of the idea of resurrecting historical Poland. Some participated in the 1830-31 uprising and emigrated. See D. Doroshenko, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 9-10. See also G. Grabowicz, "The History and Myth of the Cossack Ukraine."

Cossacks and in the past. K. Mykhalchuk, a life-long friend of Antonovych's from his days as a university student, also was influenced by the literature of the Ukrainian school.[59]

Following this first exposure to Ukrainophilism, Antonovych moved to Odessa, a fairly open and cosmopolitan city, where, due in large degree to encouragement from his father, who was a freethinker and a humane man, he learned a great deal about 18th- and early 19th-century French philosophy, as well as social and political thought. He also was fortunate to have had enlightened teachers there.

When he returned to his mother in the summer of 1850, shortly before going to Kiev university, he recognized the backwardness of the old szlachta society and its ideology and felt alienated from it. His ideals were now based on those of progressive French thought, although he was not as yet sure how to implement these where he lived. It appears clear that he had by now concluded that he would have to reject the szlachta ideals and way of life. However, he had still not developed fully a new identity of his own and, related to this, he had still not found a milieu or society to replace the one he rejected. At Kiev university, Volodymyr's search for an identity would be completed, and, at the same time, he would find a society with which he could identify.

---

[59] V. Miiakovsky, "Z molodykh lit K. Mykhalchuka," Ukraina, 1924, book 4, p. 100.

CHAPTER TWO

Student Activism and Polish Ukrainophilism at Kiev University

In the fall of 1850 Antonovych moved to Kiev and enrolled in the faculty of medicine at Kiev university.[1] While still a medical student in the early 1850s, he apparently went to Paris where he studied anthropology. This, of course, brought him to the source of contemporary radical French political theories of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon.[2] Evidently, Antonovych completed his medical studies in 1855, left Kiev, and moved to live with his sister, Ewelina, for several months in the town of Chornobyl (Chernobyl), where he worked as a

---

[1] Apparently, Antonovych enrolled in the faculty of medicine because his mother demanded it. Sowinski, who knew Antonovych's mother well, wrote that she did not take Volodymyr's wishes into account, but guided by monetary considerations, "ordered" her son to study medicine. Antonovych obeyed "without the least bit of resistance..." From Sowinski's letter to Rolle of 13 May 1867, in M. Rolle, In illo tempore, p. 266.

[2] Antonovych did not mention that he had studied in Paris in his memoirs. This information has been taken from O. Mytsiuk, Ukrainski khlopomany, Chernivtsi, 1933, pp. 9-10. Mytsiuk had corresponded with Antonovych's son, Dmytro, and it is assumed that this is the source he relied on in making this assertion. D. Bahalii, a student of Antonovych, also wrote that Volodymyr had studied anthropology in Paris. See his "Perednie slovo," in D. Bahalii, ed., Materiialy dlia biohrafii V.B. Antonovycha, Kiev, 1929, pp. 7-8. Apparently, Antonovych was fond of Proudhon's theories. M. Drahomanov, a close collaborator and friend of Antonovych, who had a falling out with him in the mid-1880s, wrote in a letter to O. Konysky in 1888 that Antonovych was "a former Proudhonist." See M. Vozniak, "Drahomanov u vidnovlenii 'Pravdi,'" Za sto lit, 1930, book 6, p. 312. See also O. Mytsiuk's Ukrainski khlopomany, p. 10.

medical doctor in order to pay off his debts.[3] That same year his mother died. In the late summer of 1856, Antonovych was back again at Kiev university - this time in the historical-philological faculty.[4]

Soon after arriving in Kiev Antonovych attempted to become more acquainted with Ukrainian literature and history. This proved to be difficult. Antonovych did not have contacts within the small, nationally conscious Ukrainian community. The Ukrainophile Cyrillo-Methodian Society had been suppressed and disbanded, its leading members arrested and exiled just

---

[3] V. Antonovych's letter of January 1898 to the Odessa Second Gymnasium, reprinted in Tvory, pp. 62-64. In written testimony of 11 February 1861 to the Investigating Committee of the Kiev Governor-General's Office, established to deal with accusations against him that he had been urging peasants to slaughter their lords and had organized a communist secret society, Antonovych wrote that he had studied at the faculty of medicine of Kiev University to 1855, "after which, feeling an irrepressible aversion to medicine, I left the University..." TsDIA-K, F. 442, od. zb. 132, pp. 259-259 ob. D. Doroshenko wrote that Antonovych was graduated in 1854, a year earlier than normal, because of the Crimean War. He noted that Antonovych's knowledge of medicine, notably histology, were of help to him in his later archeological work. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 13.

[4] L. Sowinski wrote in his letter to M. Rolle that the death of Antonovych's mother freed him from his obligations towards her, which meant that he was now able to devote himself completely to social studies. See M. Rolle, In illo tempore, Brody, 1914, p. 266. In his testimony to the Kiev Governor-General's committee investigating his activities, Antonovych wrote that he returned to Kiev in March 1856, and in August was registered in the historical-philological faculty of the University. TsDIA-K, Fond 442, op. 810, od. zb. 132, p. 159 ob.

three years earlier.[5] Ukrainophile activities were suspect. In addition, because of the 1848 revolutions, the regime of Nicholas I, already reactionary, became even more so, increasing police surveillance and censorship and arresting those who advocated liberal or radical ideas. Nevertheless, sometimes with difficulty, Antonovych was able to find and read important works available on Ukrainian history, folklore and literature.[6]

In his fourth year of medical studies Antonovych finally met two individuals he considered conscious Ukrainians. One of them, F. Panchenko, first told Antonovych about the Cyrillo-Methodian Society and gave him the Chyhyryn edition of Shevchenko's Kobzar.[7] W. Lasocki, who was a medical student

---

[5] The Cyrillo-Methodian Society was a secret Ukrainophile and Slavophile organization that advocated both the social liberation of the peasants and the national liberation of Ukraine, which would become an independent state within a Slavic federation. On the Society see P.A. Zaionchkovsky, Kirillo-Mefodievskoe obshchestvo.

[6] Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 60. Antonovych mentioned that he was unable to find, for some time, any works of the poet Shevchenko. He was able to locate, after much searching, Istoriia Rusov. He read the works of D. Bantysh-Kamensky, M. Markevych and O. Rigelman, as well as the Cossack chronicles of Hrabianka and Velychko, the three volumes of Kievlianin published by M. Maksymovych, and some of the volumes of Molodyk, published in Kharkiv. He also read the collections of folk songs compiled by Maksymovych, I. Sreznevsky and A. Metlynsky. On the above-mentioned works, historians and ethnographers, see D. Doroshenko, A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography, New York, 1957.

[7] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 61 On Panchenko, see K. Melnyk-Antonovych, "Dodatkovi prymitky," pp. 88-90. Ukrainophile groups did exist at Kiev university in the early 1850s. Melnyk-Antonovych provides some information on the existence of a Left-Bank Ukrainian group at Kiev university in

in the early to mid 1850s, wrote that while Antonovych was a medical student, he not only studied the natural sciences as needed, but dedicated himself to studying social questions and especially relations between Poles and Ukrainians.[8]

It seems that already at this time he became involved in at least one student literary-political circle. L. Sowinski wrote that he ran across Antonovych at a meeting of a student circle in 1854, where "the most rabid pamphlets and demagogic lampoons" were read. The "bard" of the group wrote poems "in the spirit of Marat," whereas Antonovych represented the "critico-philosophical force" of the circle. Sowinski concluded that the group was characterized by cynicism and hatred of the upper classes and saw in this circle the origins of the khlopoman (peasant lover) movement, which Antonovych was to lead.[9] Already that summer the group, according to Sowinski, "similar to the apostles," made excursions into the countryside in the regions of Polissia and Volhynia, to mix with the lower classes, but limited their activities to

---

the early 1850s that Antonovych, apparently, was not aware of. Ibid., pp. 90-91. One Ukrainophile group at Kiev university in the early 1850s, gathered around the later well-known Chernihiv Ukrainophile S. Nis, was known as "Nis' company" (kurin Nosa). See S. Rusova, "Shevchenko i ukrainskoe obshchestvo 60-kh godov," UZh, 1913, no. 2, p. 51.

[8] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia z mojego zycia, vol. 1, W kraju, Cracow, 1933, pp. 228-29.

[9] On the khlopomany, see below.

drinking with the peasants and the tenant szlachta and only "muttering" about the rights of the lower classes.[10]

Although student circles and groups existed at Kiev university in the first half of the 1850s, because of the restrictions imposed by Nicholas' regime, membership in these circles was small and activities circumscribed. The beginnings of open and more massive participation in organized student activities did not take place until the fall of 1856. This activation was tied to the general liberalization that occurred with the death of Nicholas I and the accession of Alexander II to the throne, who ended the Crimean War and relaxed restrictions on the activities of society.[11] Alexander also made it clear that he intended to abolish serfdom, which opened the door to debate on this as well as other burning issues of the day that had not been allowed under Nicholas. The revival of student life at Kiev

---

[10] From Sowinski's letter to Rolle, in M. Rolle In illo tempore, p. 267. Apparently, Sowinski wanted to portray Antonovych as a radical. This view should be counterbalanced by the fact that Sowinski broke with Antonovych before the Polish insurrection of 1863-64. In two letters of Antonovych to his friend, Antoni Mioduszewski, in 1856, Antonovych reveals himself as a very mature and sober young man. In these letters he wrote that the road of life that lay ahead would not be that of laurels but of hard work, like that of a bee that makes honey for others, that the only reward one could expect after a lifetime of hard work was to be judged favourably by one's own conscience. These thoughts are hardly those one would expect from an extremist. See his letters of 25 May and 18 August 1856, in M. Hrushevsky [M.H.], "Try lysty Volod. Antonovycha do Antoniia Miodushevskoho," ZNTSh, 1909, vol. 89, pp. 116-19.

[11] The word society is used to denote the educated part of Russian society.

university was in part tied to the freer conditions and the activation of society that was occurring, especially in the larger cities, throughout the Russian Empire. But there was at least one other important factor that created a unique situation at Kiev university, and this was the existence of the large Polish student body there and, tied to this, the beginnings of the revival of the Polish national movement.[12]

The Polish student movement that emerged and developed at Kiev university in the second half of the 1850s continued the traditions of radical conspiratorial activities there, especially those of the second half of the 1830s.[13] Following the failure of the 1830-31 insurrection, in which Poles from Right-Bank Ukraine participated, many patriotic Poles emigrated to western European countries, where they broke up into two camps: an aristocratic-conservative wing and a more democratic one. The latter camp recognized that the peasantry had to be brought into the struggle for Polish

---

[12] For a general survey of organized Polish student life at Kiev university, see Jan Tabis, Polacy na Uniwersytecie Kijowskim 1834-1863, Cracow, 1974. The Polish student body at Kiev university from the late 1830s to 1863 constituted, more or less, between 50% and 60% (on average 52.61%) of the total student body. See Table 1, ibid., p. 34. Following the failed insurrection of 1863-64, the percentage of Poles at the university dropped dramatically. See Roman Serbyn, "Les étudiants de l'Université de Kiev d'après les registres académiques, 1858-1863," Studia Ucrainica 2, Ottawa, 1984, pp. 197-212, esp. p. 203.

[13] A tradition of Polish conspiratorial organizations and of armed resistance to Russian rule existed in all of the former territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that had come under Russian rule in the late 18th century.

statehood: they advocated its social liberation and integration into the Polish nation, which had been the preserve of the nobility. One of the leaders of the more radical wing of the democratic camp was the historian Joachim Lelewel, who contributed substantially towards the revision of the traditionally conservative szlachta views on the problems of the Polish national liberation in his writings.

This radical camp was able to gain considerable support among Kiev university students. Lelewel was not only an historian and ideological leader, but also a conspirator, who maintained ties with Poles living under Russian rule. As a leading member of Young Poland he maintained ties with Szymon Konarski, who, from 1835 to 1838, was active in establishing and uniting already-existing conspiratorial groups of patriotic Poles in the the former eastern provinces of the old Commonwealth (Lithuania, Belarus'and Right-Bank Ukraine) into the organization Stowarszenie Ludu Polskiego (Society of the Polish People). Konarski's views on the role of the nobility and on peasant emancipation were radical for his time and it was because of this that resistance was strong among Polish noblemen in Right-Bank Ukraine to his leadership and program. He was able to gain a considerable following among students at Kiev university. When the conspiracy was uncovered, the

authorities became so alarmed that they closed the university down in January 1839 for several months.[14]

A turning point in the organizational life of Polish students at Kiev university occurred on 12 October 1856, during a gathering to celebrate the medical student F. Nowicki's birthday. Nowicki gave a speech here concerning the demoralization of students that had a galvanizing effect upon those gathered.[15] The next day the students met again, and Nowicki gave another speech on the same topic, which sparked the birth of a movement whose followers were called purysci (purists or puritans). Among those present at the first meetings was Antonovych, a friend of Nowicki. The purists, as their name implies, spoke out against the immoderate

---

[14] The conspiracy was uncovered in 1838; Konarski was arrested and executed the year afterward. In a report to Nicholas I, Governor-General Bibikov suggested that before the university be re-opened Polish professors should be transferred to Russian provinces, while Russian professors be brought in their place. He also suggested that more Russian students be admitted to the university. Some of these suggestions were implemented when the university was re-opened in the fall of 1839. On the history of the society see B. Lopuszanski, Stowaryszenie Ludu Polskiego (1835-1841): Geneza i dzieje, Cracow, 1975. See also H.Ia. Serhienko, Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini pislia povstannia dekabrystiv, Kiev, 1971, esp. Chapter Three, which concerns Konarski's activities in Right-Bank Ukraine.

[15] During the period when the governor-general of Kiev was D. Bibikov (1837-55), autonomous student organizing and especially political activities at Kiev university were forbidden and strict controls over student life were in place. However, Bibikov allowed drinking and card-playing among students, even when this led to debauchery. See Kiev university professor P. Pavlov's recollections of Bibikov's speech on this topic before the faculty and students of Kiev university. Cited in F. Venturi, Roots of Revolution, Chicago, 1983 (Reprint of New York 1960 edition), pp. 220-21.

drinking, card-playing and laxity in moral and ethical behaviour [illegible] was common among Kiev university students at that time. [illegible]hough purism was a short-lived phenomenon, it led to two important consequences: the beginnings of manifestations of disdainful attitudes towards those, primarily more affluent students, who dressed fashionably and followed the manners of the szlachta, called tyflowcy[16]; more importantly, the birth of the purist group sparked the revival of student activism at the university.[17] Another event that galvanized student activity was the Brinken affair that took place in the spring of 1857. Brinken, an army colonel, slapped a Polish student and turned him over to the police for kicking his dog. Kiev university students reacted swiftly: about 400 signed a petition demanding the officer

---

[16] Tyfel was the name given to thick cloth, out of which the more wealthy students sewed their coats. See B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, p. 14.

[17] The best account of the formation of the purists by a participant is given by W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 186-87. On pp. 228-29, Lasocki commented that although Antonovych was respected for his knowledge, he did not have much influence in this group. Lasocki mistakenly wrote here that Antonovych was a medical student at the time of the formation of the purists. In his memoirs, Poznansky wrote that the movement of purism was an extreme reaction to the moral turpitude and laxity that characterized student life during the rule of Governor-General Bibikov. Purists were polite and modest in their behaviour, avoided overeating and drunkenness. They wore modest, rather drab clothing, with some going as far as dressing in grey military cloth. Poznansky noted that Antonovych wore a drab brown overcoat and dressed shabbily while a student. He wrote that this aspect of the purist movement in part influenced the decision of the khlopomany to wear peasant dress, the clothing of the common folk. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, pp. 13-14. See also J. Tabis, Polacy na Uniwersytecie, pp. 80-81.

apologize. When nothing was done by the authorities, the students took matters into their own hands and beat up the officer. Despite the gravity of this transgression, the students involved were given relatively light punishments.[18]

That same year, Nikolai Pirogov was appointed curator of the Kiev educational district. A liberal and reformer, he was well-liked by the students. Pirogov immediately promulgated reforms: he banned the flogging of students except in exceptional cases, relaxed the rules on wearing uniforms, and encouraged self-government among the students. He told the students that they themselves should be responsible for the maintenance of order on campus, and that, to facilitate this, they should establish a system of student courts. Apparently, this stimulated the formation of mass student organizations. The student body was divided up into corporations (gminy), although it seems that these organizations had been in the process of formation before Pirogov's encouragements.[19]

---

[18] See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 235-36. See also J. Tabis, Polacy na Uniwersytecie, pp. 83-87.

[19] See the memoirs of Z. Kotiuzynski in W. Wierzejski, Fragmenty z dziejow mlodziezy akademickiej u Kijowe 1834-1920, Warsaw, 1939, pp. 25-26. According to W. Wroblewski, already in 1855, various Polish patriotic circles were organized. One of the first undertakings of these groups was the formation of a library. See ibid., p. 31. M. Dubiecki wrote that the underlying idea behind the organization of the corporations was to help poor students. See his Mlodziez Polska w uniwersytecie Kijowskom przed 1863, Kiev, 1909, p. 70. The historian J. Tabis wrote that the formation of the corporations took place in two stages. In the first stage (1856-59), various circles or groups were formed based on friendships formed at gymnasiums. During this first stage these groups had the character of mutual aid or self-

The first corporations were formed on the basis of friendships formed at gymnasiums. This organizing principle was eventually scrapped and corporations were then formed according to territorial principles. By 1860 (at least) the following corporations had been organized: Congress Poland, Lithuania, Volhynia, Ukraine (province of Kiev), and Podillia. Each corporation elected a representative; together they formed a Supreme Governing Council (Zarzad), which regulated relations among the students.[20] Antonovych was chosen as representative from the Ukrainian corporation and, as such, also became a member of the Supreme Governing Council.[21] The

---

improvement organizations. In the second stage, the actual corporations were formed, that were more political and ideological in nature. See his Polacy na Uniwersytecie, p. 88. The word gmina can also mean community or commune.

[20] See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 231, who wrote, that a Belarus' corporation also existed. According to W. Wroblewski, each corporation elected a representative, his deputy, a librarian, treasurer, and leaders of groups of ten (dziesietnicy). As cited by W. Wierziejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 31. Kotiuzynski wrote that a Russian and Little Russian corporation existed. Ibid., pp. 25-26. Poznansky, wrote that the corporations had the character of mutual aid organizations that also maintained a degree of control over its members. They quickly became Polish patriotic organizations and the main source of support for the 1863 Polish insurrection. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, pp. 14-15. M. Dubiecki wrote that independent of the corporations, a bank was established to help students. A common library, and a secret bank were also established. See his Mlodziez Polska, p. 72. L. Syroczynski wrote that the organizations based on gymansium friendships, which began to be formed in 1856 were, initially, like mutual aid societies and were non-political. They elected a librarian and treasurer. In 1859-60, the provincial-based corporations were formed. See L. Syroczynski, Z przed 50 lat, Lviv, 1914, pp. 7-9.

[21] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 231.

corporations held separate meetings, but in matters that concerned all the students, meetings of the entire student body were called.[22]

Groups or circles were also formed that were independent of the corporations. The corporations as well as some of these circles began to discuss matters concerned with the Polish national movement and social questions. Social concerns were connected with the beginnings of debate over the character of the future abolition of serfdom.[23]

In addition to the corporations, the mutual aid and other more or less open groups, around 1857, a secret political organization, known as the Zwiazek Trojnicki (Union of Threes), was also formed.[24] Antonovych, apparently, was

---

[22] Memoirs of W. Wroblewski, as cited by W. Wierzejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 31.

[23] Lasocki wrote that, with time, debates over political and social questions grew ever fiercer. The most radical groups were among the best organized and for a time it appeared they would be able to convince Polish society to follow their lead. See his Wspomnienia, pp. 231-32.

[24] The name Trojnicki comes from the word three. Most probably the word three was used to denote that the organization was formed on the basis of groups of three. The organization was thus structured like a pyramid. For conspiratorial purposes each of the three founding members organized his own group of three, the members of which were not known to one another. The new recruits then organized their own groups of three, and so on. See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 232. It is possible though that the word three referred to the three provinces of Right-Bank Ukraine: Volhynia, Podillia, and Ukraine(or Kiev province). See "Zeznania Zdzislawa Janczewskiego," in S. Kieniewicz, ed., Zeznania sledcze o powstaniu stycniowym, Wroclaw, 1956, p. 17. A leading member of the 1863 provisional government, O. Awejde, also gave testimony to this effect. See T.Snytko, "Studencheskoe dvizhenie v russkikh universitetakh v nachale

among the founders and was one of the original first three in the leadership; he remained in this position, possibly as late as 1861, at which time he left.[25] The Zwiazek Trojnicki acted as a behind-the-scenes co-ordinating force encouraging the organization of the students, promoting discussions of patriotic, political and social questions, and building support for the idea of armed uprising. It eventually comprised the leading cadres for the future Polish rising in Ukraine.[26]

60-kh godov i vosstanie 1863 g.," in Vosstanie 1863 g. i russko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazy 60-kh godov, Moscow, 1960, p. 198, n. 72. L. Syroczynski wrote that the organization was founded in 1856. See his Z przed 50 lat, p. 8. Two Soviet scholars wrote that the Zwiazek Trojnicki did not exist. They admit that conspiratorial organizations at Kiev university began to be formed around 1857-58, but that Polish memoirists were simply mistaken about the name used. The conspiratorial groups, they claim, merged into one large organization that united Poles, Ukrainians and Russians called the Kiev Secret Society (Kyivske taiemne tovarystvo). See V.D. Koroliuk and H.I. Marakhov, "Vstup," in H. Marakhov et al., eds., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1856-1862 rr., Kiev, 1963, pp. xxix-xxx. Their argument is not convincing.

[25] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 232. The other two founding members were the purist F. Nowicki and W. Milowicz. Syroczynski wrote that the organization was founded by older students. See his Z przed 50 lat p. 8. Antonovych never admitted that he had belonged to any Polish conspiratorial organizations while still a student. In his memoirs he wrote that he had taken no no part in the conspiracy leading up to the insurrection. See his "Memuary," p. 54. See also the discussion above in Chapter Three.

[26] As the date for the uprising approached, every ten groups of three were to be reorganized into three groups of ten. See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 232. L. Syroczynski wrote that the organization was "patriotic and socio-political" and aimed to raise the consciousness of the students at the university through the formation of literary and scholarly dicussion circles. In 1862 the organization

The activation of student life was noticeably stimulated by the students who entered the university in [illegible]58, who were apparently much more restless and idealistic than their older counterparts. They quickly began dominating student organizations, exerting their influence. Antonovych began to turn his attention to the newcomers, and soon gained a great deal of influence among them.[27] His influence over these students became so great that "among them a large number blindly believed in him and were ready, on his sign, to throw themselves into the fire and were unconditionally so dedicated to him, that the sacrifice of their own lives and possessions did not seem like anything to them."[28] K. Mykhalchuk, who became a life-long friend of Antonovych, wrote, concerning

---

became defunct with the establishment of the Ukrainian Branch of the National Central Committee (Wydzial Centralnogo Komitetu Narodowego na Rusi), which organized the insurrection and acted as the provisional government. See his Z Przed 50 lat, p. 8.

[27] The memoirist Lasocki wrote that the youth led by Antonovych were among "the most principled and generous" of the university. See his Wspomnienia, pp. 229-30.

[28] Ibid., pp. 230-31. K. Mykhalchuk, who entered Kiev university in 1859, wrote that Antonovych made an immediate impact on him, described as follows: "His enunciation and his energetic manner of speaking, filled with amazing simplicity, clarity, logic and sincerity, so captivated me and inspired me to have deep faith and respect towards him that I gladly confessed everything that I knew and did not know, what I believed in and in what I had doubts, what uplifted me and what depressed me, what I wanted, what I aimed for, on what I pinned my hopes and in what I despaired." Mykhailchuk admitted that he immediately trusted Antonovych to such a degree that "I was ready to follow him everywhere and do everything he entrusted to me." K. Mykhalchuk, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, nos. 8-10, p. 84.

Antonovych's reputation among the students, that "the Polish students were extremely proud of him and his authority was incontestable."[29]

With the awakening of public life, student groups desired to express themselves in their own printed organs. As there were still problems with censorship and meeting printing costs, this need was in part filled by various handwritten brochures and journals. One of the first such handwritten journals to appear at Kiev university, either in late 1856 or early 1857, was Bigos, a humouristic and light satirical journal that was, for the most part, an organ of the purists. Four or five issues appeared during its approximately two years of existence.[30]

In 1858 a group, largely composed of purists, was able to finance the printing of a journal.[31] In the introductory article the leader of the purists, F. Nowicki, wrote about the split that was occurring between the younger and older

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[30] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 187, 233. Although Antonovych was a purist and close to Nowicki, I could not find any evidence that he was closely involved with Bigos or that he had written articles for it.

[31] The journal was entitled Pisma urywkowie wierszem i proza Jozefa Prospera Gromadzkiego. L. Syroczynski wrote that the journal was connected to the Zwiazek Trojnicki organization. See his Z przed 50 lat, p. 10. One should note here that F. Nowicki, a leader of the Zwiazek Trojnicki, was a purist as well, and participated in the publication of the journal. Antonovych was a purist and a leader of the Zwiazek Trojnicki. I did not find any evidence, however, that he wrote for this journal.

generations in the borderland regions. The author also complained that children of Polish lords were deliberately kept from and thus alienated from the rest of the population. He called upon the youth to organize groups throughout the land to help rebuild society on patriotic and progressive principles, which the szlachta was incapable of doing. The article generated an enthusiastic response among many students, "the sons," whereas those from the older generation, "the fathers," were quite upset over its appearance.[32]

The split referred to was in part due to differences of views over the question of liberation of the serfs. The older generation generally favoured a conservative solution, whereas the young tended to support more liberal and even radical measures. The older generation began to be called, disparagingly, by the youth, mosterdziejy or moszrodziejy.[33]

In 1858-59, two new handwritten journals appeared: Ulicznik, which was the organ of Poles from the Congress Kingdom (koronniarzy) and Publicyst, an organ of Poles from Ukraine. Both Antonovych and his close friend, Tadei Rylsky,

---

[32] W. Wierzejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, pp. 38-39; L. Syroczynski, 5 przed 50 lat, p. 10.

[33] This is a distorted form of mosciwy dobrodziej, literally gracious benefactor, a humble form of addressing landlords by peasants. See V. Miiakovsky, UFW, M. Antonovych, ed., New York, 1984, note d, p. 490. The split between the older and younger generations was based, in great part, on the issue of emancipation of the peasantry. The journal's central article, written by the later well-known Polish historian, Aleksander Jablonowski, a university friend of Antonovych, was concerned with the role of the provinces in Polish history. See V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," UFW, pp. 266-67.

were members of the editorial board of Publicyst. Publicyst, which first appeared a little later than Ulicznyk, contained Ukrainophile articles, which alarmed the koroniarzy associated with Ulicznyk. They began to attack Publicyst for its Ukrainophilism, to which the Publicyst editorial group responded, defending their position.[34]

Ukrainophilism among Polish students at Kiev university in the second half of the 1850s and early 1860s was significant and popular. In part it was a fad, but in its more serious forms it was an expression of regional or local patriotism, identification with the Ukrainian peasant population and opposition to the szlachta. In a broad historical context, this was a continuation of earlier Polish Ukrainophilism in Right-Bank Ukraine, which was in part an attempt to reconcile the traditional goals of the Polish national movement with Ukrainian conditions.[35] Now, however, the new Ukrainophilism included taking into account the social interests of the Ukrainian peasantry, indeed, counterposing

---

[34] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 233-34. In his memoirs Antonovych recalled that he was involved in producing a handwritten journal. He claimed that in the journal themes were chosen that "introduced the principles of Ukrainianism and democracy with strong criticism of szlachta life and szlachta theories." See his "Memuary," p 46. Unfortunately, Antonovych does not indicate which particular handwritten journal he had in mind here.

[35] The primary, traditional goal of the Polish movement stressed the re-establishment of political independence within the old borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Social questions, the issue of forms of government and the reconciliation of national differences within one state were, at best, secondary matters.

them to the social interests of the traditional leaders of the Polish national movement, the szlachta. In addition, Ukrainophile students began to recognize the differences between the Polish and Ukrainian nationalities as important. Some began to advocate the primary education of the Ukrainian peasantry in the Ukrainian language. The growing influence of democratic ideas and ideals of social justice led many students to view the goals of the contemporary Polish national movement in Right-Bank Ukraine in a different light than their parents.[36] And, one can argue, this led the students onto the road of a new hybrid identity, which can be called Polish-Ukrainian.

Ukrainophilism manifested itself even in the physical appearance of the students, which was in part a fad, but also symbolic. Tadeusz Komar, a particularly popular poet among Kiev university youth, wrote a poem in which he called upon the university youth to wear peasant cloaks and shun their traditional garb, the clothing of the szlachta.[37] According

---

[36] Radical populist groups that wanted to include the peasantry in the Polish struggle for independence by championing their social interests began to be formed, especially by emigres, following the failed 1831-32 insurrection. See P. Brock, Polish Revolutionary Populism, Toronto, 1977.

[37] Komar's poem, "A Song For Today," (Piosnka na dzisiaj) had a tremendous impact on the youth that entered university in the years 1857-58. To illustrate the mood, two stanzas of the poem follow:

> Wear peasant cloaks, wear peasant cloaks!
> And cast off your landowner's garb,
> Coats of arms, lace and purple robes,

to Lasocki, many university students, especially the younger ones led by Antonovych, began transforming themselves physically into Ukrainians, by wearing peasant cloaks and overcoats.[38] Another memoirist wrote that among Polish Kiev gymnasium students, students openly talked about becoming close to the Ukrainians, which manifested itself in the wearing of peasant dress.[39]

Within the editorial board of Publicyst it was common practice to read and discuss proposed articles, as well as other essays not meant for inclusion in the journal. In mid 1859, W. Odyniec, a student from Belorussia, submitted an article, entitled, "Insurrection or Revolution?" (Powstanie czy rewolucja?). In the essay, Odyniec clearly placed national concerns, that is, the struggle for the re-establishment of the Polish state, before social questions. All social groups and classes, he argued, had to unite to achieve success in the upcoming national insurrection. Social

---

Tsarist pins and privileges!

Wear it! As a sign of your rejection
Of the landowner's conceit and false pride,
As a sign of your union with the people
For progress and love!

The poem was printed in W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 240. See also V. Miiakovsky, "Z molodykh rokiv K. Mykhalchuka," Ukraina, 1924, no. 4, pp. 100-102, for a brief insight into Ukrainophile trends among gymnasium students in Zhytomyr.

[38] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 229-30, 240, 295.

[39] Excerpts from R. Oryszewski's memoirs, as cited in W. Wierzejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 27.

questions should be put aside, to be decided in due time in a free and independent Poland.[40]

The debate over this article led to the breakup of this, at least in part, Ukrainophile editorial group. Antonovych and Rylsky threatened that if the article was published they would leave the journal. Notwithstanding this, the majority of the editorial group decided to print the article, whereupon Antonovych and Rylsky carried out their threat and soon founded their own journal, entitled Plebeusz. Both of these handwritten journals folded in 1860. In total, only three issues of Plebeusz were written.[41]

The name of the new, short-lived journal, Plebeusz, certainly gives a good indication of the social orientation of Antonovych and the group that split from Publicyst. The split also had a national dimension. It represented one of the steps taken by Antonovych that ended in his abandoning the Polish camp and going over to the Ukrainian side. On the other hand, the split was also indicative of the growing influence of Polish national feelings among the students, even among Poles from Ukraine, a considerable number of whom were Ukrainophiles.

By the late 1850s then, Antonovych had become an influential student leader, especially among the Ukrainophile students. It is not clear exactly when he and those who

---

[40] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 234.

[41] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 234-35.

shared his views and associated with him, began to be called khlopomany. They crystallized into a group that was especially strong in the Ukrainian (Kiev) corporation.[42] Lasocki called Antonovych's followers khlopomany, and believed that his aim was to use this group "to dictate to their fathers the conditions of the so-called peasant question." The khlopomany, according to Lasocki, wanted the landowners to agree to the unconditional property enfranchisement of the peasantry.[43] According to another memoirist, it was in the debate over the terms of emancipation that the khlopoman group was formed.[44] Yet, Antonovych's aims were not limited to social matters. In his memoirs, he wrote that one of his objectives was to turn the Ukrainian (Kiev) corporation, where he was a leader, and where the khlopomany, his followers, were the strongest, towards Ukrainianism.[45] According to Lasocki, Antonovych was able to convince many of the younger students to follow him in a direction that was intended to turn them

---

[42] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 53. It may be possible that the entire Ukrainian corporation was known as a khlopoman organization.

[43] The greatest point of friction between the khlopomany and the szlachta was over the peasant question. Lasocki admitted that in the local district and gubernia committees of landowners established to discuss and propose terms for emancipation, the "radical view" of the khlopomany was not well represented. See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 295-96.

[44] Memoirs of W. Wroblewski, as cited in W. Wierziejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 33.

[45] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 53.

into "Ruthenian patriots."[46] Khlopomaniia was also [illegible], a more radical form of Polish Ukrainophilism.

In his memoirs, B. Poznansky, who became a life-long friend of Antonovych and entered Kiev university in 1859, compared the emergence of khlopomaniia with purism. The purist phenomenon was a reaction to the unfettered merrymaking, boisterousness and moral turpitude common among Kiev university students. More idealistic students decided to fight against it. This reaction even affected the form of dress of the purists, who strove to dress modestly and simply. In the case of the khlopomany, ideas of liberation that were being disseminated throughout the country stimulated feelings of justice and love for the common folk, and a reaction to the severity of serfdom. The khlopomany, Poznansky claimed, were among those in the front ranks of the fight for the peasants' liberation.[47]

The khlopomany were, it seems, almost all Ukrainophile Polish students or former students of Kiev university. In the context of the Russian Empire, khlopomaniia was a local variant of the populist movement that was beginning to gain adherents among the students and intelligentsia. Whereas the object of the populist movement, the peasant, was called a muzhik in most of Russia, in Right-Bank Ukraine he was called

---

[46] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p.230.

[47] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, no. 3, 1913, pp. 22-23.

a khlop. One of the consequences of khlopomaniia was that the khlopomany attempted to become close to the peasants, to study and understand them. Because the peasantry in the Right Bank was Ukrainian, this led to some of them joining this nationality. Finally, the khlopomany were attracted to the people themselves, to their good qualities, and believed that these better qualities would grow and develop after they had become free citizens.[48]

In the context of Polish history, the historian Miiakovsky wrote that the ideology of the khlopomany was tied directly to the development of democratic ideals in Polish society that had begun to develop in the late 18th century. Radical and revolutionary ideas became more widespread in the first half of the 19th century, among the impoverished and declasse szlachta and especially among the intelligentsia, which, as a group, grew in numbers and whose social weight in Polish society also became more significant in this period. Khlopomaniia was one of the later manifestation of this process.[49]

The khlopomany not only debated with their peers and with the older generation about the peasant question, but also actively attempted to become familiar with the peasants and

---

[48] Ibid. Although it is evident that the khlopoman movement can be characterized as populist, F. Venturi, in his classic study of Russian populism, Roots of Revolution, does not mention it.

[49] V. Miiakovsky, "V.B. Antonovych. Pered slidchoiu komisiieiu," UFW, p. 312.

their way of life. They concluded that it was shameful to live in a country and not know it nor its people well. They decided therefore to spend the entire holiday period, from April through August, travelling about the countryside, primarily on foot. At least three summer vacations were spent this way (probably 1858-1860). The students, dressed in peasant garb, travelled extensively through the Right-Bank provinces of Volhynia, Podillia and Kiev, as well as the southern provinces of Kherson and Katerynoslav.[50]

The memoirist Lasocki recalled one such excursion organized largely by Antonovych in 1859. Preparations for the trip went on for about half a year. Antonovych, Rylsky and three other students, dressed in Ukrainian peasant garb, left

---

[50] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 41. Antonovych recalled that the khlopomany were not harassed by the police as the revolutionary populists of the 1870s were, as they were among the first to "go to the people." In his account of the excursions, Antonovych made only positive remarks about the peasantry, noting that he was always well-treated by them. After travelling during the day the students usually inquired about lodgings in whatever village they happened to be at. Oftentimes this was done at the local tavern. Antonovych noted that nowhere did the peasants accept proferred money for lodging or supper. At times they were even offered money themselves, the peasants explaining that travellers were in great need of money. The peasants, he noted, had "a highly developed folk ethic" and "a strong sense of logic." "The people," he concluded, "appeared before us not as depicted by the szlachta, but as they really were." Ibid., pp. 41-42. The szlachta, as mentioned already, looked down on the peasants, and it was common to refer to them as beasts (bydlo). Antonovych's views of the peasantry as expressed here were quite common to populists, who idealized the peasantry. In his memoirs Lasocki wrote that these excursions into the countryside were not something new, because this had been done earlier by students in Lithuania, who travelled through the countryside in small boats. See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 297.

on two peasant carts, loaded with Ukrainian-language literature,[51] through the steppes towards the historical territories of the Zaporozhian Cossacks. The szlachta, Lasocki noted, was quite upset at this Ukrainization of its youth.[52] The Zaporozhian Sich territories and southern Ukraine were also explored by Poznansky and a friend the following summer.[53]

The khlopomany were not only interested in "going to the people" to learn their way of life and to become close to them, but also to help them. They distributed Ukrainian-language popular books and pamphlets to the peasantry and organized readings in the countryside.[54] They also assisted

---

[51] Most, if not all, of the literature mentioned was meant for popular education. In the late 1850s, many nationally conscious Ukrainian intellectuals became involved in laying the groundwork for an effort to fight illiteracy in the countryside and encourage reading. As there was virtually no Ukrainian-language material, the first step involved preparing primers, grammars, collections of poems, religious tales and short stories meant for the peasantry. One of the more successful early attempts at a primer was P. Kulish's Hramatyka, published in 1857. See G. Luckyj's biography of the former Cyrillo-Methodian, P. Kulish, Panteleimon Kulish, New York, 1983, esp. p. 116. Antonovych was involved in plans, along with "a small group," probably khlopomany, to prepare material for publication of popular educational books in Ukrainian. See his letter of 14 February 1859 to the Orthodox priest I. Nemyrovsky in O. Levytsky, "Storinka z zhyttia Volodymyra Antonovych," LNV, 1913, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 20-21.

[52] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 297-98.

[53] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 4, p. 23.

[54] See V. Miiakovsky, "B.S. Poznansky (Narodnyk 60-kh rokiv," Ukraina, 1926, book 1, p. 80.

the peasantry in their social struggles. Poznansky noted that when rumours of peasant unrest in Bohuslav, Kaniv county, reached Kiev (probably in the fall of 1860), the khlopomany sent him, under a false passport, to investigate and render assistance to the peasants. Although these rumours were groundless, the incident nevertheless showed that the khlopomany were ready to actively intervene to assist peasants in their struggles with the landowners.[55]

The szlachta was becoming more and more alarmed by the activities of the khlopomany. Rumours soon became widespread among them that the purpose of the excursions into the countryside was to instigate the peasantry to rise up and slaughter the lords. Antonovych claimed that the khlopomany were being carefully watched during their excursions, especially by the Jesuits. In addition, his activities at the university among the students were also being monitored.[56] Antonovych wrote that he first learned about the complaints

---

[55] Poznasky stressed that the assistance to be offered to the peasantry was legal. He also pointed out the differences between the "going to the people" movement with which he was associated, which limited itself to legal activities, and that of the revolutionary populists of the 1870s. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 4, pp. 24, 30. In the spring of 1861 Poznansky left Kiev university and settled in the village of Dudary, near Kaniv, taking on the position of steward on the estate of the widow Gabel, whose sons were khlopomany. He at once became a legal advisor to the peasants; soon afterword, he was arrested and questioned by the authorities after local landowners complained that he was inciting the peasantry against them. See V. Miiakovsky, "B.S. Poznansky," pp. 80-82.

[56] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 41, 45.

from the curator Pirogov, to whom he had come to seek a teaching position in the early spring of 1860, immediately after completing his candidate's degree in history. Pirogov told him that the Polish nobility had showered him with complaints about Antonovych and his activities and cautioned him to be careful.[57]

In May 1860, two months after Pirogov's warning, the nobility of Kiev gubernia gathered to elect county and gubernia marshals and their administrations.[58] Taking advantage of this, they decided to question Antonovych on his activities. He received a summons from the marshal of Berdychiv county to attend a specially-called meeting to answer charges. Before attending, Antonovych prepared a text containing an outline of his principles, copies of which were distributed. This document served as a basis for his defence.[59]

---

[57] Ibid., p. 46.

[58] On the history, significance and role of the Polish nobility's organs of self-government in Right-Bank Ukraine between the two anti-Russian insurrections see D. Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie, pp. 141-79.

[59] This statement of Antonovych's is, apparently, not extant. In his memoirs, Antonovych called this meeting a "trial by noblemen" (dvoriansky sud). See his "Memuary," p. 46. Lasocki, on the other hand, described the meeting as an attempt to reach an understanding between the "fathers," as landowners, and their "sons." Lasocki wrote that leading representatives from three camps were called to the meeting. Among the "fathers" was R. Rylski, the father of Tadei, one of Antonovych's closest friends. In addition to Antonovych, M. Dubiecki represented the "sons." An intermediate group of recent university graduates, who tried to mediate, included L. Sowinski and Lasocki. See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 293.

At the Berdychiv meeting the three main charges brought against Antonovych were: propagandizing atheism, anti-patriotism, and hatred of the szlachta, which included the accusation of distributing literature to the peasantry calling upon them to slaughter their lords. As evidence, the szlachta cited Antonovych's statement of principles itself and the distribution of P. Kulish's grammer among the peasantry.[60]

Antonovych defended himself by pointing out that in his statement of principles he had advocated freedom of conscience, religious equality and toleration, which could not be equated with propagating atheism. Regarding the second accusation, he pointed out that every nationality should have its freedom, be recognized and respected. Because the majority of the population in Right-Bank Ukraine was Ukrainian, it should be recogized as the most important one. One of the noblemen present retorted that this meant, in reality, that the Poles then would have to be slaughtered. To this Antonovych replied that two or more nationalities could live and prosper in one country together if they showed mutual respect towards one another and helped one another in their development. As an example, he pointed to contemporary

---

[60] One of the illustrations in Kulish's primer showed a tree split open by lightning; under the tree lay a dead man. Anonovych's accusers claimed that the dead man symbolized the szlachta. It was forbidden to distribute Kulish's primer in Right-Bank Ukraine, whereas in Left-Bank Ukraine it was allowed. See V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 47, n. 1.

relations between Swedes and Finns in the Duchy of Finland.[61] The charge that the excursions into the country were undertaken for fomenting social revolution was also dismissed by Antonovych. He explained the trips were made to get to know the peasantry and collect ethnographic material.[62]

The meeting did not resolve anything. Antonovych recalled that Tadeusz Bobrowski, a well-respected Polish nobleman, cut short the proceedings and gave a speech in which he basically defended Antonovych and his followers.[63] In his memoirs Bobrowski did not specifically mention this incident, but did write that the szlachta considered Antonovych to be a "demagogue and a dangerous man". He noted though that Antonovych's criticisms were of an academic nature and never heard Antonovych make inflammatory declarations. On the peasant question, he wrote that Antonovych held moderate views.[64]

This meeting represented a significant point in Antonovych's life. To prepare himself for it, he drafted a statement of principles which probably was his first attempt to formulate openly a defence of the Ukrainian nation against Polish claims of hegemony in Right-Bank Ukraine. His pointing

---

[61] Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[62] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 297.

[63] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 49-50.

[64] T. Bobrowski, Pamietnik mojego zycia, vol. 2, Warsaw, 1979 (Reprint edition), p. 238.

to relations between Swedes and Finns in Russian Finland as an ideal towards which Poles and Ukrainians should strive for showed clearly he believed that Poles in Right Bank Ukraine, who constituted the traditional economic, political and social elite, should work for the benefit of the majority of the population, the Ukrainian people. This ideal was not acceptable to the szlachta and, on his part, Antonovych was not prepared to bend to their will.

Although this unpleasant meeting was now behind him, Antonovych was immediately warned after the conclusion of the meeting that if he did not recant his views he would next have trouble with the Russian adminstration.[65] Already in July 1860, the Makariv county police officer (zemskii ispravnik) reported to the Kiev governor-general that Tadei Rylsky, Antonovych's close friend, had been "spreading pernicious ideas and thoughts among the common folk." In the report, Tadei, his brother Iosyp, as well as others were mentioned as belonging to a group headed by Antonovych.[66] In a report of the Kiev county police officer, who had been investigating Kiev university students, dated 5 November 1860, Antonovych was named as a leader of a "society of communists". This society, the report read, was spreading communist ideas among the common folk in order that they would support a future

---

[65] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 50.

[66] The report is cited at length in V. Miiakovsky, "V.B. Antonovych. Pered slidchoiu komisiieiu," pp. 313-14.

insurrection to reconstitute the Polish state.[67] The Kiev governor-general, Vasilchikov, suspected that these reports were exaggerated, for they came from the Polish szlachta. Nevertheless, he ordered his own official, Rukker, to keep Antonovych under "extremely close, but secret and constant surveillance."[68] Rukker's report confirmed that the accusations against Antonovych were overblown.[69]

In another report, the Berdychiv county police officer wrote to the Kiev governor-general that Antonovych often visited his sister, Ewelina Wasniewska, who lived in the village of Sopyn, Berdychiv county. In December 1860, shortly after Antonovych had returned to Kiev following a two-week visit there, the Berdychiv police officer visited her home. He was able to gain her confidence, whereupon she spoke to him quite freely about details of Antonovych's life. In her conversation with the officer she spoke favourably of T. Shevchenko, A. Herzen, and P. Pavlov, a liberal professor of Russian history, who had taught until recently at Kiev university, and showed him portraits of them. Ewelina also showed him a photograph of Antonovych and several khlopomany

---

[67] Ibid., p. 315.

[68] Cited in Ibid., p. 316.

[69] Rukker's report is cited at length in ibid., pp. 317-18.

dressed in Ukrainian peasant costumes, as well as a portrait of the Polish revolutionary S. Konarski in chains.[70]

The new information was enough to convince Vasilchikov to launch more comprehensive investigations. By mid January 1861, both the Rylsky residence as well as that of Antonovych's sister were searched and materials were seized. Within two weeks Antonovych was called to the Kiev governor-general's office, where a special commission had been established to investigate the activities of himself and the Rylsky brothers.[71]

The investigation concentrated on two major accusations: the first consisted of his activities among students at the

---

[70] The report is cited extensively in ibid., pp. 317-18. Other photographs and drawings found in a search of the premises, which illustrate Antonovych's sympathies well, were of the Polish historian Lelewel, the Polish general Jozef Bem, who fought in both the 1830-31 insurrection, as well as in the ranks of the Hungarian insurgents in 1848-49, and the Ukrainian Cossack hetman, Bohdan Khmelnytsky. From the written testimony of Antonovych to the committee investigating his activities. In TsDIA-K, Fond 442, opys 810, od. zb. 132, pp. 262, 263.

[71] Vasilchikov, the governor-general, ordered the investigating commission to analyze the contents of the seized materials and to question Antonovych on 27 January 1861. See his report to the commission in TsDIA-K, Fond 442, opys 810, od. zb. 132, p. 246 ob. The file name of this case was entitled, "Concerning the formation of a communist society" (Delo ob ustroistve kommunisticheskago soobshchestva). See also V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 51. Although the charge that Antonovych was a leading member of a communist society was exaggerated, as it was based primarily on overinflated complaints of the szlachta, this did not mean that radical ideas were not popular among Polish students. One of the more popular poets of the late 1850s at Kiev university was T. Komar, who wrote a poem "The Feast of Madmen" (Uczcie szalencow), which can be described as a communistic poem. Printed in W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 251-57.

university; the second concerned propaganda in the countryside. The investigators, Antonovych noted, attempted to prove the existence of a secret society. In his testimony to the commission, Antonovych did not deny the existence of various circles, nor the organization of literary evenings where topics on historical and social themes were discussed but denied that these circles could be considered clandestine political organizations. Regarding the question of inciting the peasantry, Antonovych replied that the only aim of the excursions into the country was to acquaint the participants with the daily life of the people, to conduct ethnographic studies, and to determine what remained of the common folk's historical memory.[72] Antonovych denied accusations that he had incited peasants to rebel against their lords or that he had propagandized communism, of which he said he knew little.[73]

---

[72] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 51-52. In his written report to the investigating commission, Antonovych called the trips into the countryside "excursions for ethnographic purposes." In this testimony Antonovych indicated his whereabouts during the summer holidays beginning with the summer of 1851. He admitted that during the spring and summer holidays in 1859, he and Tadei Rylsky travelled through Kiev, Kherson and Katerynoslav gubernias. Other such excursions were not mentioned. From his written report to the investigating commission. In TsDIA-K, Fond 442, op. 810, od. zb. 132, pp. 259 ob.-260 ob.

[73] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 52. In his written testimony to the commission, Antonovych wrote a scathing attack against the szlachta. He charged them with spreading unsubstantiated rumours about him that led to this formal investigation and challenged his szlachta accusers to "bring forward at least one fact on which they base their views, to show at least one village, at least one peasant, to whom I

Antonovych had two additional meetings with the commission,[74] but no charges were laid against him, nor were administrative measures, such as exile, taken against him.[75] Regarding the Rylsky brothers, the investigating commission concluded that no hard evidence was found that they had engaged in pernicious or unlawful activities either.[76] Nevertheless, because of their hot temper, the commission decided to exile them to Kazan. The exile of the two brothers was not carried out, but all three were put under close police

---

preached, even in some roundabout way, about some kind of social uprising..." See his written testimony of 13 February 1861. In TsDIA-K, Fond 442, opys 810, od. zb. 132, esp. p. 267.

[74] These last two meetings probably took place on 13 and 14 February 1861. On these two days Antonovych gave further written, and possibly oral, testimony to questions posed to him by the commission. See TsDIA, fond 442, opys 810, od. zb. 132, pp. 267 ob., 270 ob.

[75] Antonovych may have been saved from exile by the chairman of the investigationg committee, Marko Andriievsky, who was the head of the secret division of the chancellery of the Kiev governor-general's office. Drahomanov claims that Andriievsky defended Antonovych from the other members of the committee. See M. Drahomanov, "Do istorii ukrainskoi khlopomanii v 1860-ti rr.," Zhytie i slovo, 1895, book 3, p. 347. In his memoirs, Antonovych described Andriievsky as a "Mature, calm and objective" man, attributes he did not give the other members of the committee. See his "Memuary," p. 51.

[76] Nevertheless, the committee recommended that they be exiled to Kazan, where they could complete their university education. See V. Miiakovsky, "V.B. Anonovych. Pered slidchoiu komisiieiu," p. 321.

supervision.[77] Antonovych remained under strict police supervision for at least two years afterwards.[78]

The investigation of Antonovych by the Russian authorities certainly confirmed, once again, to Anonovych, that compromise with the szlachta was out of the question. Moreover, they had used the authorities in an attempt to intimidate and silence him. It was certainly possible that he could have been exiled. The steps taken by the szlachta showed they regarded him as a particularly dangerous individual. He was a leader of a significant group of Polish students that opposed the domination of the szlachta in society and defended the social interests of the peasantry. Perhaps more importantly, he had been advocating, with some success, the Ukrainization of these young people, which meant that they could be lost to the Polish national cause. This issue became more acute as the direction of Polish national movement headed towards armed insurrection.

Antonovych had advocated emancipation of the peasantry with land. However, it appears he never advocated radical or revolutionary measures, and kept within the limits of the law in his advocacy of peasant rights. This was recognized by T.

---

[77] Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 52-53. Their father, a wealthy landowner, intervened and the decision was never carried out. See V. Miiakovsky, "V.B. Antonovych. Pered slidchoiu komisiieiu," p. 320-21.

[78] Antonovych wrote in his memoirs that for a period of two years following this investigation, he was questioned by the authorities on twelve different matters. See his "Memuary," pp. 54-58.

Bobrowski, who characterized Antonovych's views on the peasant question as moderate. The investigating commission did not find him to be a dangerous radical on this question either.

On the question of nationality, it is clear that Antonovych had, by 1859 or 1860 at the latest, evolved in his views to the point where, in cases where he had to choose between the Ukrainian and Polish nationality, he chose the former. In May 1860 he openly confronted the szlachta by declaring that the Ukrainian nationality was more important in Right-Bank Ukraine than Polish.

CHAPTER THREE

The Break With Polish Society and the 1863 Insurrection

Throughout 1860 Volodymyr Antonovych was probably arriving at the conclusion that he should openly and fully adopt the Ukrainian nationality as his own. At the same time, he was also being pushed out of Polish society by the szlachta.[1] However, into the latter months of 1860 at least, the activities of Antonovych were still conducted exclusively, or almost exclusively, within the Polish student milieu. Antonovych continued to follow a policy that aimed to Ukrainize the Kiev Ukrainian corporation, where his influence was the greatest.[2] But this idea had to be abandoned. In addition to the szlachta's pressure, more importantly, by 1860, Polish society was beginning to seriously organize for the Polish uprising, which led to important consequences. Antonovych noted in his memoirs that his Ukrainian cultural work could no longer find support among the majority within the corporation, and there was also the

---

[1] V. Miiakovsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych," UFW, p. 327.

[2] K. Mykhalchuk wrote that a separate "conspiratorial" group of "Ukrainian patriots" existed, who were also members of the Ukrainian corporation. This group was especially influential in the corporation. See K. Mykhalchuk, "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," in G. Luckyj, ed., Sami pro sebe, New York, 1989, p. 220.

danger that he and his closest followers could become entangled in the preparations for the insurrection.[3]

Although Antonovych did not elaborate on this in his memoirs, the revitalization of the Polish national movement and especially the beginnings of serious preparations for the uprising inspired many Polish students, even Ukrainophile Poles, to make a strong commitment to work for the resurrection of the Polish state. This had to lead, sooner or later, to disagreements between Ukrainophile Poles and other Polish students, and cause splits within the ranks of the Ukrainophiles as well. A commitment to work for the re-establishment of the Polish state in its historical boundaries meant that Ukrainophile sympathies and interests, as well as social concerns, would necessarily have to be subordinated to this, the primary aim of the Polish national movement. Some khlopomany tried to reconcile these two loyalties, and assented to the demands of the Polish national movement; others did not. Antonovych belonged to the latter group.

---

[3] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 53. The best general study of the 1863 insurrection is S. Kieniewicz, Powstanie Styczniowe, Warsaw, 1972. A definitive study of the 1863 insurrection in Right-Bank Ukraine still needs to be written. The only monograph on this topic is by the Soviet historian H. Marakhov, Polskoe vosstanie 1863 g. na Pravoberezhnoi Ukraine, Kiev, 1967. This study, although useful, follows typical Soviet interpretations and emphases, which limit its value. See also the altogether too brief and sloppily written work by W. Luciw, Ukrainians and the Polish Revolt of 1863 (A Contribution to the History of Polish-Ukrainian Relations), New Haven, Conn., 1961.

Antonovych began to have fundamental disagreements with some Polish students, even among the khlopomany and other collaborators and friends already in the late 1850s. Perhaps the first manifestation of this was the rift that occurred in the editorial board of Publicyst concerning the debate over inclusion of an article calling for the subordination of all interests to that of re-establishing Polish independence.[4] This showed the growing influence of Polish national concerns, even within Ukrainophile circles under Antonovych's influence. Because Antonovych and Rylsky were not able to prevent the inclusion of the article, this event has to be seen as a political defeat for Antonovych and of his strategy of Ukrainizing the Ukrainian corporation. Antonovych and Rylsky both left the editorial group to found their own journal, Plebeusz, after this defeat. This decision marked one of the first steps taken by Antonovych that clearly led to a serious and, as events turned out, complete break with Polish society.

There were at least two other disputes with fellow Polish students that indicated a serious split was developing. Polish students, including khlopomany, were involved in establishing secret primary and even secondary schools in Right-Bank Ukraine.[5] A debate erupted among the khlopomany

---

[4] See Chapter Two.

[5] Antonovych wrote briefly about his involvement in a secret secondary school. Soon after he and his closest friends came under police surveillance (at the turn of 1860-61), it was decided to close the school and get the young lads accepted into state-run gymnasiums in Kiev. Before this plan

over which alphabet should be used by Ukrainian students. Antonovych was in favour of an alphabet based on Cyrillic, while it seems that most of his friends wanted a Latin-based alphabet.[6] The second incident concerned a projected address to the Tsar to have the language of instruction at Kiev University changed to Polish. When Antonovych learned of this he suggested that the petition should be changed to ask for the establishment of Ukrainian and Polish chairs of language and literature. The Poles had already received, in principle, permission for the Polish chair from the Tsar, and therefore

---

was completely implemented, the apartment where the teaching was conducted was searched. Antonovych was questioned about this matter by the authorities, but not enough evidence was found to warrant arrest or exile. See his "Memuary," pp. 56-58. Khlopomany were also involved in primary education. In Kiev they established a primary school where the language of instruction was Ukrainian and where the school committee compiled a Ukrainian primer as well as several other texts in Ukrainian. See P. Swiecicki's account in Siolo, vol. 2, Lviv, 1866, pp. 161-62, as cited in V. Lypynsky, Szlachta na Ukrainie, 1909, pp. 66-67. For a general treatment of Polish involvement in establishing secret schools and promoting primary education in Right-Bank Ukraine see H.I. Marakhov, Polskoe vosstanie 1863 g., pp. 74-83. For the text of the statutes of the organization to promote popular education among the people (primarily of Polish background), the Towarzystwo Naukowiej Pomocy Ludowi Polskiemu Wolynia, Podola i Ukrainy (Society for Educational Assistance to the Polish People of Volhynia, Podillia and Ukraine) see H.I. Marakhov et al., eds., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1856-1862 rr., pp. 88-92.

[6] See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 324. See also M. Drahomanov, "Evrei i poliaki v iugo-zapadnom kraie," in his Politicheskiia sochineniia, I.M. Grevs and B.A. Kistiakovskii, eds., vol. 1, Tsentr i Okrainy, Moscow, 1908, pp. 240-41. There was no standardized Ukrainian alphabet at this time.

rejected Antonovych's amendment.[7] Antonovych then threatened to organize a counter-petition, to which the Polish students reacted by withdrawing theirs.[8]

Part of the reason for the rise in Polish national feelings among Kiev university students was the influence exerted upon the student body by Poles from the Congress Kingdom (koroniarzy). According to the memoirist Poznansky, in 1859-60, a noticeable number of young Poles from the Congress Kingdom moved to Kiev gubernia; some entered Kiev university, while others found employment on estates and in various enterprises in the region. The increase in the number of koroniarzy was not only a result of the lack of higher educational institutions in or near the Congress Kingdom,[9] but also because leaders of the Polish national movement in Warsaw, most notably the Agricultural Society headed by A. Zamoyski, sent a number of young people to Ukraine to help prepare the insurrection there.[10]

---

[7] According to Lasocki, in the spring of 1860, the Polish szlachta of Kiev gubernia had petitioned the Tsar to fund a chair of Polish language and literature at Kiev university and change the language of instruction from Russian to Polish in the gymnasiums of Bila Tserkva and Kiev. The Tsar, apparently, approved of the changes in principle. W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 293.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Following the failed 1830-31 uprising against Russian rule, both Warsaw University and Vilnius University, where Poles from the Congress Kingdom had traditionally gone to receive a higher education, were closed.

[10] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, pp. 19, 25-26.

The Kiev university student body immediately felt the presence of the increased number of koroniarzy. The corporations became more politicized, more involved in Polish patriotic activities and better organized in 1859-60. The koroniarzy also worked towards strengthening the authority and reputation of the corporations, among the students as well as in Polish society as a whole. When important matters came up, the koroniarzy insisted on calling general meetings of all of the corporations to pass judgement.[11]

Poznansky noted that the koroniarzy were generally culturally superior and better educated than their counterparts from Lithuania and Ukraine. Yet, many also retained the mannerisms and wore the fine clothing of gentlemen, which the Kiev university purists had rejected. Antagonism existed among the three groups, in part because of cultural differences between students from the Congress Kingdom (the center) and Ukraine and Lithuania (the two provinces). Poznansky wrote that Poles from Lithuania and Ukraine did not like the koroniarzy and did not meet with them. Koroniarzy were boastful and conceited, whereas

---

[11] See Ibid., UZh, 1913, no. 3, pp. 15-16. See also V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," UFW, p. 267-68. The calling of general meetings was used by the koroniarzy to impose discipline on members of other corporations as well as over the other corporations themselves. According to one account, the entire Lithuanian corporation broke off relations with the rest of the Polish student body after a decision by the Lithuanian corporation was overturned at a general meeting. See W. Wroblewski's memoirs in W. Wierzejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 33.

Ukrainian Poles got along well with the Lithuanian Poles, whom Poznansky characterized as straightforward.[12]

The three groups were united in their hatred of Moscow's domination and in their desire to reconstruct historical Poland. Nevertheless, there were political differences. Poznansky considered that the best of the Poles from the provinces were democrat-populists as well as Polish patriots, whereas the koroniarzy were only political patriots. Their attitude towards native Lithuanians and Ukrainians, he noted, was similar to the attitude of Europeans to African natives. They were not overly concerned about relations between landowners and their serfs, which were a major issue to the khlopomany. Their political line was that all Poles should unite to free historical Poland. To the nobility they promised that their prestige would be higher in an independent Poland, whereas to the democrats they promised social justice, civil liberties and parliamentary institutions.[13]

The influence of the koroniarzy within the student body contributed to the split that was beginning to grow within the ranks of the khlopomany. This came to the surface shortly following the trial of a student, Tytus Dalkiewicz, who had khlopoman sympathies. The trial showed the strength of the

---

[12] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, pp. 20-21; no. 3, p. 15.

[13] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 3, pp. 15-16.

koroniarzy within the student ranks as well as their politics.

Dalkiewicz was tried by a meeting of the whole Polish student body upon the insistence of the koroniarzy following his return to the university in the fall of 1860. That summer Dalkiewicz had wandered about the countryside in Belarus', largely in Mahilou county, where he had apparently urged the peasantry to take action against abusive landlords.[14] At his trial, the koroniarzy demanded that Dalkiewicz be expelled from the Polish student body and condemned. Poznansky considered this position as extreme and politically motivated, for, in his view, the koroniarzy viewed Dalkiewicz's activities as instigation of the local populace against the Poles. The koroniarzy wanted to reassure the local landowners that such incidents would not be repeated. The khlopomany, on the other hand, saw this incident as a manifestation of relations between the peasants and their landowners. Their sympathies, of course, lay with the former.[15]

Debate on the nature of the conflict at the trial led to the question being raised of which side one should take in case of conflicts between the landowners, who were almost all

---

[14] According to Poznansky, Dalkiewicz, after hearing testimony from some peasants about the cruel treatment they had suffered at the hands of a landowner, had made a motion with his hand across his throat, that was interpreted as his sanctioning the peasantry to slit the throat of their lord. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, no. 3, p. 17.

[15] Ibid., pp. 17-19.

Poles, and the local peasantry, the Ukrainians. Poznansky recalled that he openly declared for the first time then that he would take the side of "the people," who were Ukrainian.[16] Shortly after the trial, Antonovych discussed the conflict with Poznansky, interpreting it in national terms. The koroniarzy, he claimed, did not judge Dalkiewicz's actions on their own merits, but were primarily concerned with preventing the peasants, who were of Belarus' nationality, from rising against their Polish lords.[17]

The Polish students were not able to reach a verdict at the trial of Dalkiewicz. Nevertheless, the trial itself and its immediate consequence was one of the last of the critical complex of events that led to Antonovych's total break with Polish society. Shortly after the trial Antonovych and his closest friends[18] met at Panchenko's apartment to discuss the direction of their future work. At the meeting the issue of which nation should be considered as one's own was debated. Antonovych stated that to live among the Ukrainian people, and not merge with them, not to be involved in their national interests, meant that one was "a sponger, a parasite." Repeating his conclusion, that he had openly declared at his trial before the Polish szlachta earlier that spring,

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid., pp. 19-20.

[18] According to Poznansky, in addition to himself, at least the following were present: Rylsky, Panchenko, Antonovych, W. Wasiliewski and G. Przedpelski. Ibid., p. 20.

Antonovych said that in Right-Bank Ukraine, one could not consider the Polish nationality as the most important one, as the Poles constituted a small minority of the total population He declared that nowhere else did the idea of nationalism and democracy coincide as in Ukraine. "[It was] not possible to be a democrat," he said, "to stand on [the side of] the people's interests and not be a Ukrainian patriot."[19]

Most of those present at the gathering agreed with Antonovych's conclusions. This meeting was important because it marked the first time that a group of khlopomany declared themselves to be Ukrainians and also agreed that it was no longer possible to continue Ukrainian cultural work and, at the same time, remain members of the Polish corporation; a separate Ukrainian organization therefore had to be founded.[20] But two of the khlopomany present, W. Wasilewski and G. Przedpelski, could not accept Antonovych's

---

[19] Ibid., p. 21. One should note here a parallel view expressed by M. Drahomanov, who wrote that radicalism and Ukrainophilism went hand in hand in Ukraine. See his "Avstro-ruski spomyny," in LPP, vol. 2, Kiev, 1970, p. 214.

[20] It is evident that this decision, although taken in the fall of 1860, had been in the making for some time. Mykhalchuk noted in his autobiographical essay that he had declared back in the spring of 1860, before a gathering of the conspiratorial Ukrainian group headed by Antonovych, that he believed it was "insincere" and "incorrect" to remain a member of both the Polish corporation and the secret Ukrainian group. See K. Mykhalchuk, "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," in G. Luckyj, ed., Sami pro sebe, p. 220.

conclusions,[21] and Antonovych himself noted that only fifteen in total left the Polish corporation.[22]

This meeting, therefore, also clearly marked the beginning of a definitive split between those khlopomany who now became Ukrainian, and the remainder of the group that stayed within the Polish corporation. It appears that the newly declared Ukrainians still continued to maintain ties with Polish organizations for at least a few more months, possibly longer, and did not cut personal ties with their Polish khlopoman friends either.[23] In addition, both the Ukrainian and Polish khlopomany remained united in their support of the peasantry and their liberation.[24] Nevertheless, the split was permanent.

One of the first decisions of this new Polish-Ukrainian group was to establish relations with the largely older generation of Ukrainian populists, the former Cyrillo-Methodians, grouped around the editorial board of the St.

---

[21] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 3, pp. 21-22.

[22] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," Tvory, pp. 53-54.

[23] Poznansky mentioned in his memoirs that the question of choosing nationality for him was not definitively settled until the spring of 1861. Later that spring, when he was arrested, Poznansky's Polish khlopoman friends were quick to come to his aid. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 4, pp. 30-31.

[24] Ibid., p. 26.

Petersburg journal Osnova.[25] Antonovych was delegated to represent the group and made a trip to St. Petersburg sometime in late 1860, probably December. There, he met with the chief editor, V. Bilozersky, and submitted an article to him by T. Rylsky.[26]

It appears quite likely that Antonovych did not go to St. Petersburg for the sole purpose of meeting with and establishing ties with the Ukrainophiles there. It has been well established that Antonovych was involved in the Polish conspiracies, at least in the second half of the 1850s.[27] In 1866, a book was published containing the testimony of Jozef (Jozafat) Ohryzko,[28] in which he claimed that Antonovych went to St. Petersburg and then to Moscow late in 1860 as a member of the conspiratorial Polish leadership that was preparing the uprising in Kiev. The purpose of the trip was to establish ties between the Polish revolutionary group in Kiev and

---

[25] Although Osnova was ostensibly a literary journal, it was also the political and ideological organ of the older generation of populists - the Cyrillo-Methodians. Younger populists also began contributing to it, so the journal can be said to have united two generations of Ukrainian populists. The best study of the Osnova group and its politics is M.D. Bernshtein, Zhurnal Osnova i ukrainskyi literaturnyi protses kintsia 50-60-kh rokiv XIX st., Kiev, 1959.

[26] Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 59. Rylsky's article, "S pravago berega Dnepra," was published under the pseudonymn of Maksym Chorny in the February 1861 issue of Osnova.

[27] See Chapter Two.

[28] Ohryzko was a Polish activist and writer who, in 1863, was a member of the Polish revolutionary government in St. Petersburg.

similar groups in St. Petersburg and Moscow. According to Ohryzko, in St. Petersburg Antonovych met with him and gave him the addresses of Hieronym Kieniewicz[29] in Moscow, Jozef Kraszewski[30] in Warsaw, and Tytus Dalewski.[31] Antonovych then left for Moscow to meet Dalewski himself.[32]

Antonovych denied these accusations in an article published in the newspaper Kievlianin in 1866.[33] In his

---

[29] A Polish revolutionary who was active organizing among military officers in St. Petersburg, and who helped organize, along with Russian revolutionaries of Zemlia i volia, a conspiracy to begin a revolt in Kazan in conjunction with the Polish insurrection. The conspiracy was uncovered, and although Kieniewicz escaped, he was arrested in June 1863 and executed a year later for his involvement in this affair. See F. Venturi, Roots of Revolution, pp. 303-15.

[30] Kraszewski was a well-known Polish writer who had lived in Zhytomyr for some time in the 1850s. He had encouraged Mykhalchuk's Ukrainophilism when the latter was a student at Zhytomyr gymnasium, and had suggested to Mykhalchuk that he contact Antonovych when he went to Kiev in 1859 to attend the university. See V. Miiakovsky, "Z molodykh rokiv K. Mykhalchuka," Ukraina, 1924, no. 4, pp. 98-102.

[31] Tytus Dalewski was a law student at Moscow University, where he was active in Polish conspiratorial circles. During the insurrection of 1863 he was among the leadership in Lithuania and Belarus'.

[32] The testimony of Ohryzko, as relayed by N. Gogel, a member of the Vilnius committee investigating the 1863 insurrection, was published in N.V. Gogel, Iosafat Ogryzko i peterburgskii revoliutsionnyi rzhond v dele poslednego miatezha, Vilnius, 1866. A second edition was published in 1867.

[33] Reprinted as "Poiasnennia na naklep I. Ohryska," Tvory, pp. 125-30. In his rebuttal, Antonovych denied that he had ever met Ohryzko. He also argued fairly convincingly that Ohryzko had to have known the addresses of the people supposedly given him by Antonovych beforehand. He also pointed out that it was inconsistent for him to have travelled to St. Petersburg as a Polish revolutionary on the one hand and, on the other, to have given anti-Polish material for

memoirs Antonovych denied all links to Polish conspiratorial activities and wrote that Poles, investigated for conspiracy, tried to cover up their tracks and lead the authorities astray by implicating himself and others who had broken with Polish society.[34] Yet, there is too much evidence from various sources that show Antonovych had at the very least carried out personal favours for his friends and had passed on messages from Poles in Kiev when he was in St. Petersburg.[35] The historian Miiakovsky commented that it was entirely possible

---

publication in Osnova.

[34] Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 54. Antonovych's assertions have to be treated with scepticism. The historian V. Miiakovsky concluded that Antonovych, even when he was an old man writing his memoirs, did not want to reveal certain moments of his life completely, especially on his early conspiratorial activities. See his "Volodymyr Antonovych," UFW, p. 323.

[35] See part of the testimony of Ferdinand Warawski, selectively transcribed and published, in I.S. Miller, ed., Russko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazi, vol. 1, Moscow, 1963, pp. 338-39. Reprinted in V. Miiakovsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych," UFW, pp. 330-31. Miiakovsky pointed out the remarkable similarity between the published testimonies of Ohryzko and Warawski. Warawski also testified that he received Antonovych's address from Franciszek Labudzinski of Kiev. See H.I. Marakhov et al, eds., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini, Kiev, 1963, p. 328. See also V.R. Leikina-Svirskaia and V.S. Shidlovskaia, "Polskaia voiennaia revoliutsionnaia organizatsiia v Peterburge (1858-1864 gg.)," in Russko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazi 60-kh godov i vosstanie 1863 goda, Moscow, 1962, p. 28, n. 78; K. Wierzejski, in his Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 42, wrote that Antonovych went to St. Petersburg to meet Ohryzko, then to Moscow to meet with Dalewski and Kieniewicz. In his monograph on the Polish insurrection in Right-Bank Ukraine, H. Marakhov wrote, based on archival documents, that Antonovych took a letter from Franciszek Labudzinski of Kiev to Warawski in St. Petersburg when he travelled there in the winter of 1860. See his Polskoe vosstanie, p. 49.

that Antonovych had visited Ohryzko, who at that time was not in favour of an insurrection and was not involved, therefore, in conspiratorial activities.[36] And, one should not exclude the possibility that Antonovych met with Ohryzko and others not as an emissary of the Polish underground in Kiev, but as a representative of the just emerging Ukrainian khlopomany in order to conduct negotiations and reach an understanding with Polish leaders.

It is clear from the evidence available that in the span of about a year and a half, that is from the fall of 1860 to the beginning of 1862, Antonovych's relations with most of

---

[36] Ohryzko had been editor of the St. Petersburg Polish journal Slowo, which began appearing in January 1859. The journal had the support of that part of the liberal Russian intelligentsia, such as K. Kavelin, who were sympathetic to the goals of the more moderate wing of the Polish national movement. In one of its issues it had published an article critical of the Kiev khlopomany. The journal, though moderate, was closed by the authorities and Ohryzko then began work editing the collection of Polish laws, Volumina legum. It is quite possible then that in late 1860 Ohryzko had still not thrown in his lot with the revolutionaries. Therefore, V. Miiakovsky's conclusion that Antonovych could have visited Ohryzko, but not as an emissary of the Polish underground is possible. See his "Volodymyr Antonovych," UFW, pp. 327-29. Oskar Awejde, a member of the Polish Central National Committee and of the insurrectionary government, testified before the committee investigating the Polish insurrection, that the Poles in Ukraine were divided into three parties: the Whites, the Reds and the Ruthenians. The Ruthenian party, led by Antonovych, stayed clear of revolutionary activities and desired only to work for the promotion of the Ukrainian nationality and language. See I. Miller, ed., Pokazaniia i zapiski o polskom vosstanii 1863 goda Oskara Aveide, Moscow, 1961, p. 133. This testimony coincides with that given by Zdzislaw Janczewski, in S. Kieniewicz, ed., Zeznania sledcze o powstaniu styczniowym, Wroclaw, 1956, p. 17. According to the testimony of Awejde and Janczewski then, it was believed by some Polish leaders that Antonovych was not involved in conspiratorial activities leading up to the insurrection.

Polish society and its leadership deteriorated to the point where it could be described as adversarial and even inimical. This was not simply a consequence of the decision made by Antonovych and the Ukrainian khlopomany to leave the Polish corporation and form their own independent group; this deterioration of relations can more properly be seen in the context of: the general rise in national feelings, especially among the Poles and the reaction to this among, first of all, Ukrainians, and also Russians; the beginnings of international conflicts and polarization of views that took place among Poles, Ukrainians and Russians, especially between the first two nationalities in this same time period. The deterioration of relations among the nationalities can be illustrated by outlining some confrontations that took place at Kiev university in 1861 among the students.[37]

It appears that most Polish, Ukrainian and Russian students at Kiev university co-operated or belonged to the same circles and groups until 1859. Evidently, divisions of groups by nationality did not really begin to take place in earnest until that year, although this is not entirely clear.[38] It is clear, however, that 1861 was a critical year

---

[37] Although Antonovych completed his candidate's degree in 1860, he maintained close ties with students at the university, as did many other recent graduates.

[38] One can conclude that the organization in earnest of the Poles around 1859-60, when the corporations were reorganized according to territorial principles, triggered a response among the Ukrainians and Russians to form groups independent of the Polish-controlled associations.

in which relations between Poles and Ukrainians deteriorated sharply.

In late February 1861 Russian soldiers killed several demonstrators in Warsaw, which raised national feelings among Polish students in Kiev. In March 1861 a Polish student was arrested and temporarily expelled from the university for not taking off his cap during the reading of the Emancipation edict. A general meeting was called at which Polish students presented a petition condemning the police actions and demanding guarantees that similar actions by the police would not be repeated. They asked for support from the other students. According to one memoirist, at this meeting, Oleksander Stoianov and Drahomanov, delegates of the Ukrainian and Russian students, spoke out against supporting the

---

Drahomanov, who entered Kiev university in 1859, found that the Poles were particularly intolerant of Ukrainians, and that Ukrainians already belonged to separate Ukrainian national groups in 1859. See his "Avtobiograficheskaia zametka," in M.P. Drahomanov, LPP, vol. 1, Kiev, 1970, p. 43. N.K. Rennenkampf, who was a student at Kiev university in the late 1850s and early 1860s, wrote that the generally repressive conditions helped sustain co-operation between the Polish and other students, although there was no real mutual sympathy between them. See his memoirs "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," Russkaia starina, 1899, vol. 99, no. 7, p.36. In his memoirs, B.M. Iuzefovych, describing the situation at Kiev University around 1860, wrote that despite the existence of separate Ukrainian groups, Poles and Ukrainians generally worked together, largely because the former wanted to control the Ukrainians to further Polish national objectives. See V.M. Iuzefovych [ed.], Tridsat let tomu nazad, St. Petersburg, 1896, pp. 13-14. See also H. Marakhov, Polskoe vosstanie, p. 128, who wrote that student groups and organizations contained members of all nationalities to the end of 1859, and that divisions of groups according to nationality did not begin to take place until then.

petition, to which the Polish students responded by withdrawing their petition.[39] It appears that one of the the last times Polish and Ukrainian students appeared together was at the poet Taras Shevchenko's funeral services, which took place in Kiev in May 1861 during the transfer of the poet's body from St. Petersburg to Kaniv.[40]

In the fall of 1861, when the students returned to the university, more frequent and forceful demonstrations by the Polish students began taking place. In October a policeman who had been spying on Polish students was beaten up. A crowd of mostly Polish students then entered the university, broke some display cases and tore down the university adminstration's announcements as well as a portrait of Alexander II. A general student meeting took place the next day, on October 10, where the non-Polish students reacted to the forceful demonstrations of the Poles and now appeared as a solidly organized group opposed to the Poles, which caused the latter to leave the meeting.

---

[39] See N. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," pp. 37-39. See also J. Tabis, Polacy na Uniwersytecie, p. 109, who does not mention the petition nor the disagreement between the Poles and the Ukrainians and Russians.

[40] See W. Wierziejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 42. Near the bridge over the Dnieper River crowds halted the funeral procession; spontaneous speeches were given and poems were recited. An eyewitness to the event, M.K. Chaly, wrote that the best speeches were given by Drahomanov, Stoianov and Antonovych. See his Zhizn i proizvedeniia T.G. Shevchenko, Kiev, 1882, p. 192. Cited by M. Drahomanov in "Avstro-ruski spomyny," p. 158.

The Ukrainian and Russian students took further steps now to oppose the Poles. They composed their own address to the curator of the educational district, protesting the actions of the Polish students. The petition was apparently signed by 162 students and recent graduates, among them Stoianov, Drahomanov, and Antonovych. In the petition the students condemned the demonstrations and declared that the actions of the Poles were "foreign to the nationality of that land, [which was] definitely not Polish."[41]

One consequence of the October events was that some of the Ukrainian and Russian students, following their protests against the actions of the Polish students, decided to co-operate with the authorities against the Poles. N.Kh. Bunge, rector of the university, along with the university administration, agreed to lend support to the non-Polish students, to counter the much better organized Poles.[42]

---

[41] See N. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," pp. 39-41. The text of the petition was first published on pp. 40-41. See also B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, no. 5, p. 42.

[42] See B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, no. 5, p. 45. See also N. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," p. 40. Although Drahomanov may have signed the petition referred to by Rennenkampf, he expressed disapproval of the harsh anti-Polish stand taken by Ukrainians and disapproved of their willingness to co-operate with the authorities against the Poles. See his "Avtobigraficheskaia zametka,"in LPP, vol. 1, p. 44. See also his fine analysis of the Polish national movement as it affected Ukraine,"Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikorusskaia demokratiia," in Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii [P. Struve, ed.], vol. 1, Paris, 1905, pp. 1-268. The Soviet historian, H.I. Marakhov, accused Antonovych of collaborating with the authorities against the Poles and of signing a petition calling on the government to use force to

Although the decision to cut ties with the Polish corporation and form a separate Ukrainian group had been made in the fall of 1860, it is not known whether this meant that all ties with Polish society were to be broken. Antonovych's definitive break with Polish society and his going over completely into the Ukrainian camp took place sometime in 1861, probably by late winter or spring of that year. This should be seen in the context of certain events of late 1860 and 1861, both those that personally affected Antonovych,[43] as well as the general deterioration of relations between Ukrainians and Poles, reflected in polemical writings.[44]

---

break up the Polish demonstrations. Marakhov even makes a reference to an archival document to back up his claim. See his Polskoe vosstanie, p. 101, esp. n. 4. However, personal examination of the archival document referred to by Marakhov revealed that it was merely a report filed with the Kiev governor-general's office, which stated that Antonovych, Rylsky and about 150 others, had signed a petition addressed to the university council asking that Polish demonstrations should be suppressed by force. No petition, signed or unsigned by Antonovych, was found in this file. One, therefore, should conclude that this report is exaggerated. The petition referred to in the report is probably the same one published by Rennenkampf. There is no call for the use of force to stop Polish demonstrations in this petition. See N. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," pp. 40-41.

[43] One should recall here the trip Antonovych made to St. Petersburg in late 1860, where he met the leaders of the older Ukrainophiles. In addition, one has to take into consideration Antonovych being called before the Kiev governor general's investigating committee in February 1861.

[44] Polemics between Polish journalists and writers and their Ukrainian counterparts began to take place in earnest by 1860. From the Ukrainian side the writings of M. Kostomarov were particularly important. See esp. his article "Ukraina,"published anonymously in Kolokol, January 15, 1860, no. 61. Reprinted in M.P. Drahomanov, Sobranie politichekikh sochinenii, vol. 2, Paris, 1906, pp. 746-55. See also "O

The Polish memoirist W. Lasocki wrote that in March 1861 Antonovych was in hiding, but it became absolutely clear soon afterward that he had indeed cut his ties with the Poles completely, had gone over to the Ukrainian side, and had taken up an inimical position to the Poles.[45] Antonovych had earlier been involved in criticizing Polish society, especially the szlachta. In 1861 he continued to do this, but the difference was that he now did this from the position of the Ukrainian camp and that he stood squarely on their side against the Poles. In July 1861 he had published one of his first articles in Osnova, an anti-Polish polemical piece.[46]

The appearance of Antonovych's article in Osnova sparked a response from the Polish side by the well-known Polish journalist Zenon Fis, who wrote under the pen name of Tadeusz Padalica. Fis submitted his response to Osnova, which published it in its October issue. In his article Fis recognized that Antonovych had gone over to the Ukrainian camp

---

kozachestve. Otvet 'Vilenskomu vestniku,'" in Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova, M. Hrushevsky, ed., Kiev, 1928, pp. 57-68; "Otvet g. Padalitse," in Ibid., pp. 68-74; "Otvet na vykhodki gazety (Krakovskoi) 'Czas' i zhurnala 'Revue contemporaire,'" in Ibid., pp. 75-84.

[45] See W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 322-24.

[46] See "Chto ob etom dumat?", Osnova, no. 7, 1861, pp. 7-13. Reprinted in Tvory, pp. 93-99. This is the first published article in which he attacked Polish journalists and historians concerning their interpretation of the history of Right-Bank Ukraine, specifically their attempts to show that Right-Bank Ukraine was a Polish territory. See Chapter Five for an assessment of Antonovych's historical views. He also continued his long-running dispute over the role and position of the szlachta in the past as well as in the present.

and labelled him a turncoat for doing so.[47] Antonovych responded to this attack by writing an article entitled "Moia ispoved" (My Confession),[48] where he explained his reasons for leaving Polish society. The article was, in his own words, "the last public act of breaking with Polish society."[49]

"My Confession" was one of Antonovych's finest polemical articles, and, as well, his profession de foi, that was accepted by his closest followers, the Ukrainian khlopomany. The declaration, however, became much more than just the manifesto of Antonovych and a small group of Right-Bank Ukrainian ex-Poles. It became a statement accepted by most mainstream Ukrainian populists as one they could closely identify with, as representing their ideals. In short, "My Confession" became a classic of Ukrainian populist political thought.[50]

---

[47] Tadeusz Padalitsa [Zenon Fis], "Pan Padalytsia do pana Vladymyra Antonovycha," Osnova, 1861, no. 10. Reprinted in D. Bahalii, ed., Materiialy dlia biohrafii V.B. Antonovycha, pp. 19-23.

[48] Antonovych, "Moia ispoved," Osnova, 1862, no. 1, pp. 83-96. Reprinted in Tvory, pp. 100-15. The English-language translation of parts of "Moia ispoved" that follows was prepared for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute by Richard Hantula, to which I have made some changes.

[49] Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 60.

[50] Part of Antonovych's article is an exposition of his historical views, which will be examined in Chapter Five. Here I will limit myself largely to highlighting Antonovych's reasons why he chose to leave Polish society and go over to the Ukrainian camp, and to his accusations levelled at Polish society.

Part of Antonovych's "Confession" repeated assertions made and accusations previously levelled against Polish society, particularly the szlachta. Turning to the question of social classes and national identity, Antonovych reminded Padalica that the Poles in Right-Bank Ukraine were still identified with the szlachta, whereas Ukrainians were synonymous with the common folk. He saw this as a core problem of the Polish national movement in Ukraine. He even criticised the Polish left, among them the Polish khlopomany with whom he had, until not that long ago, worked so closely. It was "painful," he wrote, to see that some individuals still believed that they could reconcile the interests of the common folk with the contemporary Polish movement. This strategy, he claimed, was unrealistic, and that sooner or later, a choice would have to be made between one or the other.[51]

In a direct address to Padalica, but having all of the Polish szlachta in mind, Antonovych accused him of wanting to "perpetuate the szlachta in Southern Rus; you wish to destroy the South-Russian[52] nationality, and you will stop at nothing to achieve these ends." Connecting Polish national goals with the social interests of the szlachta, he continued: "The people want land and by your good graces cannot obtain it. You could not deny the people allotments, but you did not forget to trouble yourselves over [establishing] incredibly

---

[51] V. Antonovych, "Moia ispoved," p. 107.

[52] South Russian is clearly equivalent to Ukrainian here.

high redemption prices [for land]. You not only do not yourselves promote popular education, but attempt to block the efforts of those who do... you zealously see to the repression of anything that represents a manifestation of the local nationality."[53]

Antonovych accepted the epithet "turncoat" that Padalica had branded him with. But, he pointed out that,

> by itself, the word 'turncoat' is meaningless. In order to form a conception of the person to whom this epithet is applied, it is necessary to know what cause was renounced and precisely which one joined; otherwise the word is devoid of meaning and is an empty sound.
>
> You are indeed right. By the will of fate I was born in Ukraine a member of the szlachta. In childhood I possessed all the habits of a szlachta youth, and I long shared all the class and national prejudices of the people in whose company I was raised. When, however, I reached the age of self-awareness, I objectively evaluated my position in [this] land. I weighed its shortcomings, all the aspirations of the society in which fate had placed me, and I saw that its position was morally hopeless if it did not renounce its narrow point of

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 107-08.

view, its arrogant encroachments on the country and its people.

I saw that Poles [as members of the] szlachta, who lived in the South-Russian land had before the court of their own consciences only two choices. Either one was to love the people among whom one lived, become imbued with its interests, return to the nationality one's ancestors had abandoned, and, as far as possible, by unremitting love and labour, to compensate the people for the evil done to it.[54] [The people] had fed many generations of grand colonists by whom it had been repaid for its sweat and blood with contempt, curses, and disrespect for its religion, customs, morality and person. The other choice, for [those who] lacked sufficient moral strength, was to emigrate to Polish lands inhabited by Polish people, in order that there be one less parasite and, in order, finally, that he might free himself in his own eyes of the accusation that he too was a colonist and a

---

[54] The concept of the repentant nobleman was one of the distinctive features of populism among the East Slavs. The classical exposition of this idea by a Russian populist was made by Petr Lavrov in his Istoricheskie pisma, first published in Nedelia in 1868 and 1869. Translated in P. Lavrov, Historical Letters, Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1967.

planter,[55] that he too, directly or indirectly, lived off the labour of others, that he had closed off the road of development to the people into whose homes he had entered uninvited with his alien aspirations, that he belonged to the camp striving to suppress the national development of the native inhabitants, and that he, although not by intention, shared responsibility for the actions of that camp.

I, of course, decided upon the first, because no matter how much I had been corrupted by szlachta education, habits and dreams, it was easier for me to part with them than with the people in whose midst I had grown up, the people whom I knew, the people whose sorrowful fate I saw in every village owned by a member of the szlachta, the people from whose lips I heard sad songs that tore at my heart, friendly words (although I too was a member of the szlachta), and tragic stories about lives reduced to ashes by grief and fruitless labour..., the people which, in a word, I had come to love more than my szlachta habits and reveries.

---

[55] It is clear here that Antonovych compared the szlachta and serfdom with American southern planters and slavery. Antonovych's candidate's essay, which he wrote to fulfill graduation requirements in 1860, was entitled "O torgovle negramy," which dealt with the question of slavery and the slave trade. See TsNB, Fond I, no. 7912.

You well know, Mr. Padalica, that before I resolved to part with the szlachta and all its moral baggage, I tried the various paths of reconciliation. You also know how your side received all attempts to persuade the lords to treat the peasants like human beings, to devote attention to popular education based on national foundations, and to acknowledge that which is South-Russian and not Polish as being South-Russian and not Polish. You were, after all, a witness to how such ideas aroused at first whistling and laughter, then anger and abuse, and finally false denunciations and hints about a koliivshchyna. After this, of course, there remained [the choices of] either to disavow my own conscience or leave your society. I chose the second, and I hope that through work and love I some day will earn the Ukrainians' recognition of me as a son of their people, for I am ready to share everything with them. I hope also that in Polish szlachta society in Ukraine with time, a turning to the people and an awareness of working for their good sooner or later will become a moral requirement not only for individuals, as now, but in general for all who have the strength to consider their position and their responsibilities and will not prefer dreams

to the urgent cause given rise by their own consciences.

And so, Mr. Padalica, you are right! I am a turncoat and proud of it, just as I would be proud in America if I had turned from planter into an abolitionist, or in Italy, if I had enlightened my way of thinking and from a papist had become an honest and hard working servant of the national cause.[56]

Shortly after it became absolutely clear that Antonovych had broken off relations with the Polish camp he agreed to meet with a group of his former admirers and friends, to explain to them his reasons for leaving. According to Mioduszewski, he told the gathered group that it was extremely difficult to break off relations with people with whom he had worked for years, with whom he had shared much in life. He had loved Poland and had worked to rebuild Poland on new foundations. In this work, he came to the conclusion that this had to be done together with the common folk and through their efforts. He recognized that the situation was different in Ukraine, where Polish rule was not liked, than in the Congress Kingdom or Poznan. He believed that Polish society would come to understand its own interests and recognize the obligations owed to the people among whom they lived. Yet,

---

[56] V. Antonovych, "Moia ispoved," pp. 112-14.

Antonovych continued, he discovered that this was an illusion, that Polish society was too blind and egoistic to change.

Although, Antonovych continued, his friends still believed sincerely that it could be changed, and that they themselves would be different from preceding generations, Antonovych believed that their Polishness would prevail in the end, and that eventually even they would attempt to Polonize the Ukrainian population. He had reached this conclusion after observing that the older generation of students, who were more liberal and democratic than their fathers, turned into radical Polonizers.[57]

The break with Polish society had to have been traumatic for Antonovych and his closest friends who left. Mykhalchuk, who left Polish society along with Antonovych, characterized their act as heroic. He stressed that they needed great moral strength and deeply thought out motives. It must have been extremely difficult for these young men, who were closely tied to Polish culture and the Polish movement, to leave and to justify this to society and in their own consciences. The prestige of the Poles in Europe was high, and liberal Russia was sympathetic to the Poles as well. In the midst of a tremendous rise in Polish national feeling, that was so sure of itself, in its cause, in the righteousness of its ideology and its goals, there occurred this split within its ranks.

---

[57] Mioduszewski's recollections were relayed by Lasocki in his Wspomnienia, pp. 325-26.

For Polish patriotic youth this was an unexpected and unbelievably bold move. This split was certainly a great blow to the movement in Ukraine, and was perhaps even more astounding in that it occurred within the ranks of its respected, patriotic youth, and that some of those who left were considered leaders.[58]

One memoirist analyzed the khlopoman split in the following way. In the context of the Polish national movement, the khlopomany stood on the left wing of the Reds. There were considerable differences on social questions between the Reds, and the more conservative Whites, to which the traditional landowning Polish szlachta belonged. Yet the Reds did compromise with the Whites, which dissatisfied the more radical wing of the khlopomany, as social questions were more important to them than the national goals of the Polish movement. Yet, the split also had a national dimension to it. The more radical khlopomany recognized that their social propaganda had more chances of success among Ukrainians than Poles.[59]

Although certainly dramatic and seemingly unexpected, the split that occurred should be looked at in its historical context. In his analysis of the background, origins and development of the split, the historian V. Lypynsky, who also

---

[58] K. Mykhalchuk, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, no. 8-10, pp. 70-71.

[59] V.M. Iuzefovich, ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 15-16.

like Antonovych was a Ukrainized Pole, showed the continuity of the process of the Ukrainization of the Polish szlachta in Right-Bank Ukraine, that began early in the first half of the 19th century.

Lypynsky wrote that the Polish szlachta was largely alienated from and lived a life apart from the rest of the society, which was largely Ukrainian and peasant. This was not only because the szlachta did indeed form a separate culture and constituted a separate nationality, but also because the szlachta lived a life of its own, turned in towards itself, and formed a specific caste philosophy to justify this setting up of "a Chinese wall from surrounding life."[60]

When the common people began to become an object of concern and, consequently, a factor in politics, part of the Polish szlachta convinced themselves the people of Ukraine were Polish; another part, however, recognized the truth and eventually Ukrainized themselves. Lypynsky also noted the similarity of Ukrainization processes occurring among the Russified Left Bank dvorianstvo and the Right Bank szlachta, which constituted one aspect of the process of the Ukrainian national rebirth.[61]

---

[60] V. Lypynsky, Szlachta na Ukrainie, p. 57.

[61] Ibid., pp. 57-58. One should add here that the processes of Ukrainization of the nobility also have to be seen in the context of the democratization of society and of the disintegration of the old feudal order. In the context of the histories of other European nations, one could compare

Lypynsky pointed to the role that the romantic movement played in the rebirth of the Slavic nationalities, among them Ukrainians. He traced the process of this change in national identity of the Right-Bank nobility as beginning with the Ukrainophile tendencies of Polish cultural figures expressed in their works already in the early 19th century. In literature this became known as the Ukrainian school in Polish literature. However, these people, like Michal Czajkowski, an avid Cossackophile, were as yet unable to overcome their attachments to the historical traditions tied to the szlachta, especially to the Polish state.[62]

According to Lypynsky, the "last convulsion of historical Poland", of szlachta Poland, was the 1830-31 uprising.[63] Among many Polish emigres, a re-examination of relations with the peasantry took place, and a critical attitude developed towards the ideals of szlachta society.[64] In Right-Bank Ukraine, a burlesque and grotesque form of critique of the old society among the szlachta emerged that was called

---

this process to the Finnization of the Swedish nobility and of the Czechization of the Germanized Bohemian nobility.

[62] Ibid., pp. 58-59. B. Poznansky described traditional Polish Ukrainophilism as an expression of the love of what remained of old, native Ruthenian-Ukrainian ways of life that had not yet been lost to Polonization. However, this love was self-serving, as it was tied to the privileged position of the lord. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, p. 17.

[63] V. Lypynsky, Szlachta na Ukrainie, pp. 56, 61.

[64] This critical re-examination led to the development of Polish populism, which was especially strong among Polish emigres. See P. Brock, Polish Revolutionary Populism.

balaqulstvo. Balaguly showed their rejection of the old society by discarding its dress and dressing in peasant clothing instead, speaking Ukrainian rather than Polish or French, and mixing and carousing with the peasantry, especially in the taverns. Lypynsky considered the balaguly as epigones of the pre-1831 Ukrainophiles and Cossackophiles such as Czajkowski and forerunners of the khlopomany.[65]

The phenomenon of khlopomaniia then, according to Lypynsky, was the logical outcome of a process of the development of a Ukrainian national consciousness among the szlachta that was inevitable. The social views openly espoused by the khlopomany, the change and evolution of national consciousness, had to lead to a manifesto from within the szlachta that declared it was going over to the Ukrainian side. Antonovych's "My Confession," was just this manifesto.[66]

The historian Miiakovsky concluded that the ideology of the khlopomany was directly tied to the development of democracy and of democratic ideas in Polish society beginning in the late 18th century into the mid-19th century. The growth of revolutionary ideas was particularly strong among the declasse impoverished szlachta, many of whom became the new Polish intelligentsia, that throughout the 19th century grew in numbers and began to have a greater influence in

---

[65] V. Lypynsky, Szlachta na Ukrainie, p. 63.

[66] Ibid., p. 64.

society. The khlopoman phenomenon was just one of the later manifestations of this process.[67]

Miiakovsky continued that the major difference between the earlier Ukrainophiles and the Ukrainian khlopomany was in their political allegiances. This changed from allegiance to the Polish state, of a Poland "from sea to sea," to a sense of obligation towards one's own native land, in this case, to Ukraine and its people. In the specific case of the Ukrainian khlopomany led by Antonovych, as pure populists, concerned with the well-being, including both cultural and socio-economic advancement of the common folk, they rejected politics. In the specific instance of the uprising of 1863, they rejected the uprising as it aimed to restore the Polish state, which was opposed by the common folk. This divided them not only from their predecessors, but also from their contemporaries, among whom were the Polish khlopomany, who identified themselves strongly as Ruthenians, but who also elected to participate in the uprising.[68]

One of the khlopomany who decided to participate in the Polish uprising was Paulin Swiecicki.[69] It was clear that

---

[67] V. Miiakovsky, "V.B. Antonovych. Pered slidchoiu komisiieiu," in UFW, p. 312.

[68] Ibid., pp. 65-66.

[69] On Swiecicki see V. Razykevych, Pavlyn Svientsytsky. Publitsystychna, naukova ta literaturna ioho diialnist, Lviv, 1911. See also A.N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, vol. 3, Malorusskaia etnografiia, St. Petersburg, 1891, pp. 282-88.

loyalty to his native land, Ukraine, was strong. Yet, Swiecicki remained a Polish khlopoman and, as a representative of this group, attempted to reconcile his dual allegiance to both Ukraine and Poland. These Polish khlopomany called themselves Polacy-Rusini (Poles-Ruthenians). Swiecicki stressed that the only difference between the Polacy-Rusini and the members of the Hromada of Kiev, in which Antonovych played a leading role, was that the latter rejected completely any connection with the state, and only recognized work among the common folk as their goal, leaving political questions to providence.[70] The Polacy-Rusini, on the other hand, wished to free themselves of Muscovite rule and establish a federation with Lithuania and the Congress Kingdom of Poland.[71]

Evidently loyalty to Ukraine was strong among the Polish khlopomany. Swiecicki wrote that tensions did exist between the Poles from Ukraine and from Congress Poland. At a meeting that took place in Kiev before the uprising, a deputy from Congress Poland stated that Rus' (Ukraine) and Lithuania had to listen to directives from Congress Poland. Stefan Bobrowski, one of the leaders of the Reds in Kiev, replied that, if this was indeed the case, then Ukraine would have

---

[70] See Chapter Four, where the formation and ideological underpinnings of the Kiev Hromada in the early 1860s is discussed.

[71] See Siolo, vol. II, 1866, pp. 162-63. Cited by V. Lypynsky, Szlachta na Ukrainie, pp. 66-67.

nothing to do with Congress Poland.[72] In his memoirs, Poznansky mentioned the names of some of the Polish khlopomany and claimed that they were the most liberal and patriotic of the Poles he knew and that they, as Poles, did not have any pretensions to Ukrainian lands.[73]

Despite the importance of the conversion to the Ukrainian movement of Antonovych, Rylsky, Poznansky and Mykhalchuk, the process of going over to the Ukrainian side was far from being a massive phenomenon. Poznansky wrote that in Right-Bank Ukraine, because almost all the noblemen were Poles while Ukrainians were almost exclusively peasants, it was clear that the Polish khlopomany there would sooner or later become Ukrainophiles, or Ukrainian populists. This natural, evolutionary development would have taken place had it not been for the Polish uprising of 1863. The Ukrainian national movement suffered because of the Polish uprising, he concluded. Had the insurrection not taken place in Ukraine, Poznansky notes, many more of his colleagues would have gone over to the Ukrainian side and become sincere Ukrainian patriots. He characterized the Polish uprising as "a violation of the proper course of the intellectual development of the historical life of Ukraine..."[74] The Polish

---

[72] Siolo, vol. II, 1866, p. 164. Cited in Ibid., p. 67

[73] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, p. 43.

[74] Ibid.; see also no. 2, pp. 17, 19.

memoirist Lasocki concluded much the same when he wrote that it would have been impossible to guess the number of the best of the young people Antonovych would have "led astray" had it not been for the events of 1861-63, which forced him "to throw off his disguise..."[75]

This observation of Poznansky is extremely significant. One of the factors that impeded the growth of the Ukrainian national movement in Russian Ukraine was the small number, conservatism and weakness of its leading cadres, who were intellectuals. It is undoubtably true that the Polish movement in Right-Bank Ukraine attracted many of the best and idealistic of the educated youth among the Poles. This was also the case among the khlopomany, who were strong Ukrainophiles and social radicals. As Poznansky claimed, with time, many of these probably would have gone over to the Ukrainian movement. As it turned out, some of them lost their lives in the insurrection, were exiled, emigrated, or became engaged in the invigorated and dynamic Polish movement.[76]

Despite the significance of the defections of Antonovych and other khlopomany, preparations for the insurrection were not impeded in Right-Bank Ukraine and the defections did not seriously had a significant effect on them. Poznansky

---

[75] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 231.

[76] One can make a comparison here to the loss of the more radical and energetic of the Russified Ukrainian youth of the 1870s and 1880s to the Russian revolutionary populist movement.

noted that in 1862 the large number of Poles from Congress Poland in Kiev dropped significantly; many went back home to help in the organization of the rebellion back in central Poland. But, at the same time, local Poles continued their preparations in Kiev. In January 1863, he further noted, the antagonism that had existed between the youth and the older generation of landowners, that had been so important in the late 1850s, no longer existed.[77]

According to Poznansky, prior to the outbreak of the insurrection in Right-Bank Ukraine, Antonovych and Polish leaders of the insurrection in Kiev came to an agreement that Ukrainians would not be affected by their actions. Antonovych had been discouraging individuals from participating in the uprising and thereby had earned the enmity of the Poles, who had even offered him a substantial amount of money to emigrate. Antonovych, from the Ukrainian side, agreed to maintain "complete neutrality" as regards the uprising. This was important, because, according to Poznansky, Antonovych knew much about the preparations of the Poles and could have damaged their efforts considerably had he revealed this information to the authorities.[78]

---

[77] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, pp. 43-44. See also his "Vospominaniia o polskom vozstanii v Ukraine 1863 goda, KS, 1885, book 11, p. 438.

[78] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, p. 46. Not only did Antonovych maintain neutrality during the uprising, but he even helped hide one of his khlopoman friends, Antoni Chamiec, thereby saving him from capture by the authorities. See M. Vasylenko, "Akademyk Bohdan

In April 1863, just prior to the outbreak of the uprising in Right-Bank Ukraine, Antoni Mioduszewski went to visit his two old friends, Antonovych and Rylsky, to learn what they planned to do during the uprising, which was imminent. Evidently, he still entertained hopes that that they could still be persuaded to throw in their lot with the Poles. Antonovych, speaking for both himself and Rylsky replied that they had chosen to be with the people, and since the Ukrainian folk opposed the Poles, then he could not stand together with them. In a seemingly cold and detached analysis, Antonovych predicted that the uprising would have a fatal ending for the Poles. The best of the Poles, he claimed, would be killed, exiled, or would emigrate to the West. The "trash," he claimed, would remain. He concluded that the Ukrainian cause

---

Oleksandrovych Kistiakovsky (16/29 kvitnia 1920 roku).," Zapysky sotsiialno-ekonomichnoho viddilu UAN, vol. 1, Kiev, 1923, p. xii, n. 3. See also M. Antonovych's comments to "Nedrukovani lysty V.B. Antonovycha do F.K. Vovka," Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1989, no. 1-3, p. 93, n. 75. Chamiec successfully evaded capture and emigrated to Austria, where he made a fine career for himself in politics, at both the imperial level as well as on the provincial level, in Galicia. Chamiec was later extremely helpful in facilitating a Polish-Ukrainian compromise in 1890, known as the "New Era," which Antonovych helped negotiate. That Antonovych was not vengeful against the Poles who participated in the insurrection and even protected them from persecution by the authorities, is clear from another incident. Poznansky had his memoirs on the Polish uprising published in 1885. See his "Vospominaniia o polskom vosstanii v Ukraine 1863 goda," KS, 1885, book 11, pp. 436-65; book 12, pp. 571-611. He later wrote in a letter, concerning these memoirs, that Antonovych and Rylsky advised him not to include much of the material he had in mind for fear of bringing repressive measures from the government against some of the survivors. See M. Takarevsky, "K istorii vozniknoveniia 'Vospominanii' B.S. Poznanskago," UZh, 1914, no. 3, p. 62.

could only benefit where the stronger enemy would be weakened, obviously referring to the Russian state, whereas the other enemy, the Poles, would be weakened to such a degree that the Ukrainians now would not have to worry about them.[79]

Poznansky was also visited by his Polish khlopoman friends Wasilewski and Przedpelski shortly before the insurrection broke out. They asked him for his opinion on the situation in the countryside. Poznansky told them that the peasantry associated the name Pole with landlords and that the uprising would be treated as a manifestation of dissatisfaction with the emancipation of the peasantry from serfdom. It was impossible to think that the peasantry would support them, he said, and that one could not even count on their neutrality. Przedpelski agreed with Poznansky's assessment.[80] Mioduszewski also had revealed to Antonovych that he knew the situation in the Ukrainian countryside well and acknowledged that the Polish side had no chance of winning. But, he reconciled himself with the belief that he had to fulfill a "holy obligation" that would establish a new tradition of heroes.[81]

---

[79] A. Mioduszewski's unpublished memoirs, as cited by W. Lasocki in his Wspomnienia, pp. 327-28.

[80] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, pp. 47-48. See also Poznansky's memoirs on the insurrection "Vospominaniia o polskom vosstanii v Ukraine 1863 goda," KS, 1885, book 11, pp. 439-40.

[81] A. Mioduszewski's recollections, as relayed by W. Lasocki in his Wspomnienia, p. 327.

Although the outlook for success was hopeless, as it was obvious the Ukrainian peasantry would not support them, the uprising in Right-Bank Ukraine began in April 1863. The insurgents carried with them two proclamations, written in Ukrainian, that was to be distributed to the peasantry in the hope of gaining their support. These two proclamations were: "Zolota Hramota" (The Golden Charter) and "Ruskyi narode" (To the Ruthenian People).[82] Although their origins probably lay with the Polish khlopomany, the socio-economic promises to the peasantry made in these proclamations were watered down, which reflected the compromises that the Reds had made with the Whites.[83]

The uprising, of course, did end in tragedy. Poznansky wrote that he shed many tears over the senseless loss of many of his good friends during the "ruinous uprising."[84] It is obvious also, that despite his cold analysis of the outcome of the uprising, and his opposition to it, it would not be amiss to conclude that Antonovych was also troubled over the tragedy.

Antonovych's actions, his criticisms of the Poles and their plans, his going over to the Ukrainian side during a

---

[82] The two proclamations are in V. Miiakovsky, "Revoiutsiini vidozvy do ukrainskoho narodu," UFW, pp. 246-48.

[83] See V. Miiakovsky's analysis in "Revoliutsiini vidozvy," pp. 234-36.

[84] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, p. 19.

critically important time and the bitter defeat suffered by the Polish insurgents in 1863, caused some Polish memoirists and historians to portray Antonovych in a particularly negative light.[85] The memoirist Lasocki called Antonovych a schemer, a cynic and a traitor. He bitterly condemned Antonovych because many of his khlopoman followers, who continued to be critical of the szlachta, decided "to redeem their fathers with their own blood." They were the ones who distributed the Golden Charter in the countryside. The Ukrainian peasants, he wrote, "drunk on Muscovite vodka, slaughtered them, while Antonovych calmly looked on."[86]

One should not be surprised at the negative assessment of Antonovych by Polish contemporaries. He did, after all, participate in conspiratorial activities and left at a critical moment, taking several good people with him.[87] Moreover, Antonovych and his close friends were instrumental in aiding and participating in the organization of the Ukrainian movement in Kiev, specifically in the establishment of the Kiev Hromada (Commune), the most important Ukrainian populist organization.

---

[85] The biography of Antonovych by F. Fawita-Gawronski as well as his history of the 1863 insurrection in Ukraine, where Antonovych is discussed in some detail, are good examples of typical Polish assessments of Antonovych's actions by his contemporaries. See his Wlodzimierz Antonowicz and Rok 1863 na Rusi. There is no lack of epithets in these works.

[86] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, pp. 328, 329, 330.

[87] Ibid., pp. 328-29.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Formation of the Kiev Hromada

The key events and processes that led to the formation of the Kiev Hromada, the exact date of its formation, and Antonovych's role in these processes, have still not been definitively established. Antonovych's unfinished memoirs broke off at the point where he had begun to discuss the formation of the Kiev Hromada, and, unfortunately, this subject was not comprehensively treated in other published memoirs either.[1]

One of the problems in assigning an exact date to the establishment of the Kiev Hromada is that there was no founding congress or published program.[2] Detailed accounts

---

[1] Some of the more important memoirs that shed light on the origins of the Kiev Hromada are: V. Antonovych, "Memuary"; K. Mykhalchuk, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo" and "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska"; B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia"; N.K. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina"; B. Iuzefovich,ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad; W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia; M. Drahomanov, "Avstro-ruski spomyny" and "Avtobiografichekaia zametka"; L. Syroczynski, Z przed 50 lat.

[2] No formal or detailed program of the Kiev Hromada appeared to have ever been adopted and people with different political views belonged to it. There was no party discipline that obligated members one way or another. Its members were, however, united around the broad principles of social, economic and, above all, cultural work for the benefit of the Ukrainian nation. In its earliest phase of activity (1861-64), the cultural work of the Hromada was for the most part oriented towards the needs of the peasantry. This reflected the democratic and populist ideals of its members to assist the peasantry to become full-fledged citizens of society, which they believed should take place in conjunction with and as soon as possible after their liberation from serfdom. For the most part their activities consisted of participation in and promotion of popular education, preparation and publication of primers and other educational material, as well

of discussions on the origins of the Hromada are also apparently not extant, minutes of meetings that led to its formation were evidently not kept, while what little memoiristic literature there is about the early years of the Hromada is often confusing and contradictory. Antonovych himself wrote in one passage in his memoirs, referring to the meeting of khlopomany where the decision to break with Polish society was taken in the fall of 1860, that they decided at that time "to form their own truly Ukrainian hromada..."[3] Elsewhere he wrote that following the break with the Polish corporation, "we decided to join the Ukrainian hromada, which already existed..."[4]

The two most important studies on the formation and activities of the Kiev Hromada in the 1860s were published in the 1920s[5] and differ somewhat in their conclusions on the

---

as the writing and publication of popular literature. In addition, and especially in its later phase of activity (after 1870), Hromada members became involved in literary and scholarly work aimed for consumption by the intelligentsia. K. Mykhalchuk wrote that "Ukrainianism" (Ukrainstvo) became a type of religion for the Hromada members; to serve this idea, they "composed a program of action", the main goals of which were "above all the raising of the cultural level and development of national consciousness and [the participation in] allowable activities to liberate the people from under their social, economic and political oppression." See his "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," p. 222.

[3] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 53.

[4] Ibid., p. 59.

[5] See V. Miiakovsky, "Kievskaia Gromada (Iz istorii ukrainskogo obshchestvennogo dvizheniia 60-kh gg.)," Letopis revoliutsii, 1924, no. 4, pp. 127-50. Reprinted and translated as "Kyivska Hromada (Z istorii ukrainskoho

origins of the Hromada. In the older study, Miiakovsky concluded that the origins of the Kiev Hromada were to be found in the Polish student corporations (gminy), and that Left-Bank Ukrainians joined those khlopomany that had broken with the Polish corporations to form the Kiev Hromada.[6] According to this theory, Antonovych played an important, even critical role in its formation. In its first public manifesto in 1862, Miiakovsky noted the Kiev Hromada accepted the epithet khlopomany. This indicated to him that the contingent of khlopomany in the Hromada, especially the role of Antonovych, was extremely important in the formative stages and early activities of the Hromada.[7] On the other hand, Zhytetsky concluded that the origins of the Kiev Hromada were to be found in the activities of students, largely Left-Bank Ukrainians, active in the popular education movement associated with the establishment of Sunday schools in Kiev.[8]

---

hromadskoho rukhu 60-tykh rokiv)," in V. Miiakovsky, UFW, pp. 264-86. Further references will be made to this translation; I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada za 60-tykh rokiv," Ukraina, 1928, book 1, pp. 91-125.

[6] V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," pp. 266, 271-72.

[7] Ibid., p. 282. The manifesto referred to was published as "Otzyv iz Kieva," and is discussed further in this chapter.

[8] The first Sunday school in Ukraine, indeed in all of the Russian Empire, except for the Baltic provinces, was the Podil school, opened in Kiev in the fall of 1859. The Kiev university history professor P.V. Pavlov as well as the curator of the Kiev educational district, N.I. Pirogov, were instumental in supporting the establishment of Sunday schools and encouraged Kiev university students to become involved in this movement. Unfortunately, there is no published

According to Zhytetsky, the key event in the formation of the Hromada occurred when the khlopomany merged with one of the groups of largely Left-Bank Ukrainian students associated with the Nove Stroiennia Sunday school; other circles and groups associated with the Sunday-school movement also joined this new formation.[9] In this interpretation, Antonovych's role in the formation of the Kiev Hromada was less important. Both researchers agreed that the Kiev Hromada was formed in 1861, although Miiakovsky believed this took place in the first half of the year, whereas Zhytetsky wrote that it occurred in the

---

comprehensive study on the movement in support of popular education associated with the establishment of Sunday schools in Ukraine. See the relevant passages in V.I. Borysenko, Borotba demokratychnykh syl za narodnu osvitu na Ukraini v 60--90-kh rokax XIX st., Kiev, 1980; F. Iastrebov, Revoliutsionnye demokraty na Ukraine vtoraia polovina 50-kh -- nachalo 60-kh godov XIX st., Kiev, 1960; G.I. Marakhov, Sotsialno-politicheskaia borba na Ukraine v 50-60-e gody XIX veka, Kiev, 1981; M. Hnip, Poltavska Hromada, Poltava, 1930; M. Drahomanov, Narodni shkoly na Ukraini, Geneva, 1877; M. Drahomanov, "Avstro-ruski spomyny." See also V. Bilan, "Merezha nedilnykh shkil na Ukraini (1859-1862 rr.)," Arkhivy Ukrainy, 1966, no. 5, pp. 31-40; L. Strunina, "Pervyia voskresnyia shkoly v Kieve," KS, 1898, book 5, pp. 287-307; S. Hlushko, "Drahomanov i nedilni shkoly," Ukraina, 1924, book 4, pp. 35-42; L. Mylovydov, "Nedilni shkoly na Chernihivshchyni v 1860-kh rr.," in Chernihiv i pivnichne Livoberezhzhia, Kiev, 1928, pp. 431-42. D. Hrakhovetsky, "Pershi nedilni shkoly na Poltavshchyni ta ikh diiachi (1861-1862 rr.)," Ukraina, 1928, book 4, pp. 51-72. N.I. Pirogov, "O voskresnykh shkolakh," in N.I. Pirogov, Sochineniia, vol. 1, Kiev, 1910, 280-91. In English see the very general essay of R.E. Zelnik, "The Sunday-School Movement in Russia," Journal of Modern History, 1965, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 151-70.

[9] I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada," pp. 94-95.

second half.[10] Miiakovsky and Zhytetsky also agreed that the Kiev Hromada was formed largely as a result of a merger between the Right-Bank khlopomany and the Left-Bank

---

[10] V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 271; I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 96. Although it appears that the Kyiv Hromada was indeed founded in 1861, one cannot completely exclude the possibilities that it was founded earlier, or even later. In his autobiography, Drahomanov wrote that there were Ukrainian groups at Kiev university when he became a student there in 1859. See his "Avtobiograficheskaia zametka," p. 43. He did not, however, name any of these as the Kiev Hromada. In another memoir, Drahomanov wrote that the Kiev Hromada came into existence in 1862, when Ukrainophile student circles "merged into a large hromada of 250-300 souls." See his "Avstro-ruski spomyny," p. 157. Another memoirist wrote that there was a Ukrainian literary-scholarly circle at Kiev university already in 1858; yet, he continued, another circle, that was under the influence of the journal Osnova, came into existence in 1861-62. See P.Iefymenko [P.E.], "Iz epokhy krestianskoi reformy na iuge Rossii (narodnye slukhi i tolki o vole i zemle)," KS, 1886, book 1, p. 102. Iefymenko was probably referring to the latter group as the Kiev Hromada. The Polish memoirist Lasocki dates the founding of a hromada led by Antonovych to the beginning of 1861. See his Wspomnienia, pp. 323-24. One historian, based in part on Iefymenko's memoirs, concluded that the Kiev Hromada was probably founded already in 1858. See M. Antonovych, "Koly postaly hromady?" in Zbirnyk na poshanu prof. d-ra Oleksandra Ohloblyna, New York, 1977, p. 134. Most recently, a Soviet scholar has concluded, based on archival documents, that the Kiev Hromada was founded by P. Iefymenko himself, which means that a hromada was founded in the late 1850s, perhaps as early as 1858. Despite this, there is no evidence to suggest that this group, founded by Iefymenko, was the the organizing nucleus around which other groups united. There is no evidence of continuity either. Iefymenko himself was arrested and exiled in 1860. See N.A. Ship, Intelligentsiia na Ukraine (xix v.). Istoriko-sotsiologicheskii ocherk, Kiev, 1991, p. 120. On the other extreme, in a commentary to B. Poznansky's memoirs, B. Kistiakovsky wrote that the Kiev Hromada was established in mid 1863. Kistiakovsky pointed to Poznansky's mention of Antonovych's marriage to Varvara Mikhelson, P. Chubynsky's cousin, in 1863, and of his father Oleksander's marriage to Varvara's sister, Oleksandra, in 1864, as helping cement the merger of the various Ukrainian circles to form the Kiev Hromada. See B. Kistiakovsky, "Po povodu vospominanii B.S. Poznanskago," UZh, 1913, no. 10, p. 55.

Ukrainians, although they both saw this process as occurring differently.[11]

Despite Zhytetsky's corrective to Miiakovsky's thesis on the origins of the Kiev Hromada, the role of Antonovych as leader of the khlopomany was indeed crucial to its formation. Mykhalchuk wrote that following the decision to break with the Polish corporation in the fall of 1860, the khlopomany led by Antonovych formed their own independent Right-Bank Ukrainian hromada. Under Antonovych's leadership, he wrote, "our 'hromada' became that contingent in the Ukrainian national-cultural movement to which (contingent) all the conscious and patriotic Ukrainian elements joined in time, not only from the Right Bank, but also from the Left Bank..."[12] Mykhalchuk's brief comment on the formation of the Kiev Hromada is supported in part by M. Starytsky, a Left-Bank Ukrainian from Poltava, who wrote that after he moved to Kiev to attend the university there in 1860, he "became a fanatical populist, having joined Antonovych's group..."[13] Mykhalchuk, who shared an apartment with Antonovych from around the beginning

---

[11] B. Kistiakovsky concluded that those who formed the Kiev Hromada belonged to various groups that did not have a permanent link with one another. That is why, he explained, various members of the Hromada explained its origins differently. B. Kistiakovsky, "Po povodu vospominanii B.S. Poznanskago," UZh, 1913, no. 10, p. 55.

[12] K. Mykhalchuk, "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," p. 220.

[13] Letter of M. Starytsky to I. Franko, probably from early June 1902. In M. Starytsky, Tvory v shesty tomakh, vol. 6, Kiev, 1990, p. 618.

of 1860, wrote that it played "a memorable role in the history of the formation of the 'Old Ukrainian Hromada'."[14] The Polish memoirist Lasocki wrote that Antonovych, soon after breaking with the Poles around March 1861, formed his own hromada and began "to recruit his members from among the Little Russian youth."[15]

It appears that the process of the formation of the Kiev Hromada was a complicated and drawn out affair that took place over a period of at least a few months, probably longer, and involved many meetings and negotiations among leaders and members of various Ukrainophile circles and groups. Its formation was probably not the result of a simple one-time merger of these groups; it is also quite likely that not all of the groups merged or joined at the same time to form the Hromada. Before any merger could take place it seems that the different groups would have had to realize that there were needs or benefits to be gained in merging into one organization; a relationship of trust with one another had to develop as well; in addition, a determination on what basis the merger should take place had to be decided. One should note that there were significant differences in views even among the three Sunday school groups, where Left-Bank

---

[14] Mykhalchuk was referring to the apartment as the scene of meetings that led to the formation of the Hromada. See his "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, no. 8-10, p. 85.

[15] W. Lasocki, Wspomnienia, p. 324.

Ukrainians predominated.[16] In addition to the differences that existed among Left-Bank Ukrainian groups, perhaps more importantly, the Left Bank students simply did not know who Antonovych and his khlopoman followers were, nor did they trust them. Mykhalchuk wrote that immediately after their separation from the Polish corporation and the formation of their own group, Antonovych and the khlopomany were looked on with suspicion by Ukrainians and regarded as pro-Polish (nedoliashky).[17] This lends more credence to the idea that the establishment of the Kiev Hromada, in which Antonovych played a key role, took place over a period of several months. It is probably not possible then to assign a precise date to

---

[16] The Nove Stroiennia group wanted to teach only in Ukrainian, and ignored Russian-language texts and primers. The Podil group, on the other hand, to which Drahomanov belonged, were known as "cosmopolitans", because they felt that one could not do without utilizing Russian-language materials. See I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 94.

[17] K. Mykhalchuk, "Avtobiohrafichna zamitka," p.220. The word nedoliashok is a derogatory term applied to Polonized Ukrainians. Poznansky wrote that following the decision to leave the Polish corporation the Ukrainian khlopomany did not join the Ukrainians but stood apart as a separate group. As late as May 1861, he noted that Ukrainians still treated him as a stranger. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 4, p 31; no. 5, p 41. This distrust of the Ukrainized Poles among Ukrainians continued long after they had joined with them. Ivan Luchytsky, a professor of history at Kiev university and member of the Kiev Hromada, referred to Antonovych in the 1890s as "a sly Pole" (khytryi liakh). See Ie. Chykalenko, Spohady (1861-1907) (Reprint edition), New York, 1955, p. 320. The historian Oleksander Lazarevsky, although not a Hromada member, collaborated with Antonovych on the journal KS. He referred to Antonovych around 1890 as being "too Polish" (cherezchur poliakom). See M. Vasylenko, "Oleksander Matvieevych Lazarevsky (1834-1902) (Materiialy dlia ioho biohrafii)," Ukraina, 1927, book 4, p. 69.

the Kiev Hromada's formation. What is clear is that Antonovych and Left-Bank Ukrainians were in the process of establishing both personal and organizational ties throughout 1861. In May 1861 Antonovych participated, along with other Ukrainophile students, in services and commemorative meetings that took place in Kiev during the transfer of the poet Taras Shevchenko's body from St. Petersburg to Kaniv for burial. In Kiev, Antonovych, Drahomanov and Oleksander Stoianov[18] gave speeches near Shevchenko's coffin.[19] I. Zhytetsky wrote that the Kharkiv Ukrainophile V.S. Hnylosyrov, who visited Kiev in the summer and early autumn of 1861, noted in his diary that he met Antonovych in the company of other Ukrainophiles both times.[20] Poznansky, who left Kiev in early 1861, noted upon his return in the winter of 1861, that Antonovych and Rylsky

---

[18] Oleksander Stoianov has been generally recognized as one of the first leaders of the Hromada along with Antonovych. He was a member of the Nove Stroiennia Sunday School group. See I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 94.

[19] Miiakovsky concluded that the speeches given here represented one of the first public acts of the newly-organized Kiev Hromada. See his "Kyivska Hromada," p. 272. However, one Polish researcher wrote that the services and events in Kiev then represented one of the last times that Polish and Ukrainian students appeared together. See W. Wierziejski, Fragmenty z dziejow, p. 42. See also L. Syroczynski, Z przed 50 lat, p. 32. It is likely here that the three spoke as representatives of different groups, or on their own initiative, and that Antonovych was still regarded as a Pole by at least some from both the Ukrainian and Polish camps.

[20] Hnylosyrov, according to his diary entry, arrived in Kiev 28 July, left Kiev on 6 August, and returned again on 21 September. He met with Antonovych on both occasions. TsNB, Fond I, no. 352, pp. 3-4 ob. See also I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada," pp. 95-96.

had become very close with the Ukrainians by that time.[21] In 1862, according to Poznansky, Antonovych and Rylsky were able to completely merge with the Ukrainians. The following year, Antonovych married Varvara Ivanivna Mikhelson, a cousin of Pavlo Chubynsky, one of the leaders of the Left-Bank Ukrainians, an event which, according to Poznansky, cemented ties with the Left-Bankers.[22]

The formation of the Kiev Hromada was also linked to events that took place at Kiev university in 1861-62, in particular the development of a split between Polish and Ukrainian students.[23] One can conclude that the formation of the Kiev Hromada, which involved a consolidation of Ukrainophile groups, composed almost exclusively of Kiev university students and of recent graduates like Antonovych, paralleled the disintegration of co-operation among Poles and Ukrainians at the university. It is clear that the activation of the Polish students, especially their activities in support of the Polish national movement, which began in earnest around

---

[21] See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, p. 41.

[22] Ibid., p. 44.

[23] The atmosphere surrounding the develcpment of the split is well illustrated in V. Iuzefovich's memoirs in B. Iuzefovich, ed.,Tridsat let tomu nazad, St. Petersburg, 1896. These memoirs should be treated with caution as they were written in part as a literary piece. Antonovych reacted to its publication by remarking that there were inaccuracies in it and that he would clear matters up in his own memoirs. This information was provided by Marko Antonovych. Unfortunately, his memoirs broke off at the point where the formation of the Hromada was being discussed.

1860, acted as a catalyst on Ukrainian students, who became more politicized, nationally conscious, and active in university student affairs as a result.[24] This activation of the Ukrainian student body was an important process in the formation of the Kiev Hromada.

Memoirists agree that there was general solidarity among the students of different nationalities at Kiev university as late as 1860. The students, who had been encouraged to organize themselves by Pirogov, practiced direct democracy in making decisions affecting all the students at general student meetings. The repressive political and social conditions and hopes for liberal changes, held in common by most university students, created favourable conditions for unity and co-

---

[24] The Polish question and the concomitant activities of Polish students at Kiev University had to have made a tremendous impact on the political and national consciousness of Ukrainian students. This is confirmed in part in memoiristic literature, but has not been the subject of any study. M. Drahomanov wrote: "The Polish movement had a great influence on my political education." See his "Avtobiograficheskaia zametka," p. 43. In his memoir on the Ukrainian composer Mykola Lysenko, Mykhailo Starytsky described some of the meetings at the university that took place in which Polish, Ukrainian and Russian students clashed over the question of nationality and national rights. "The national struggle," he wrote, "having flared up in the temple of learning, awakened many questions, that had slept so long in our brains, and in our hearts brought forward new, previously unknown passions. Together with Lysenko we stayed up at times whole evenings, discussing national goals, our country's past, and the miserable fate of our peasantry." Describing the aftermath of a student meeting, he wrote: "Lysenko left that meeting as if he were in a drunken state, and from that moment became a fanatical Ukrainophile..." M. Starytsky, "K biografii N.V. Lysenko," Tvory v shesty tomakh, Kiev 1990, vol. 6, pp. 403; 405.

operation among Ukrainian, Polish and Russian students.[25] Some Ukrainophile Polish students even participated in the Sunday school movement. Yet, memoirists noted, there was no real sympathy between Poles and Ukrainians and they generally did not mingle with one another. The Poles were the best organized among the three nationalities and had the most to gain from maintaining unity, as they held the initiative within the general student body and were able to get the others to support them in most cases. Yet, it became clear to the Ukrainians and Russians that the activities of the Poles were being increasingly focussed towards achieving their own

---

[25] Memoirists often referred to the student body as composed of Poles and Russians (russkii), not distinguishing between Ukrainians and Russians. They did, however, refer to groups that were obviously Ukrainophile as Ukrainian or Little Russian (malorossiiski). Nevertheless, the unclear differentiation by memoirists between Russians and Ukrainians within the student body can be confusing. It should be pointed out that from 1858-63, the percentage of ethnic Russians attending Kiev university was quite small. Only 3.5% of the students came from ethnic Russian provinces, whereas about 14.5% of the population of the student body came from the Left Bank provinces, and another 4% from the southern, or steppe provinces of Ukraine. About 48% came from Right-Bank provinces, approximately 16.5% from other western Russian provinces, where the Polish and Baltic German nobilities were strongly represented, about 4% from Congress Poland and 2% from outside of Russia. See Table II in R. Serbyn, "Les etudiants de l'Universite de Kiev d'apres les registres academiques, 1858-1863," Studia Ucrainica 2, 1984, p. 200. One has to make upward adjustments here in considering the percentage of ethnic Russians at the university. Neverthleless, it would seem that when memoirists referred to Russian students, the preponderant number of them were Ukrainian.

national aims.[26] This was especially true after 1860, when the Poles began to prepare in earnest for the uprising. One memoirist charged that Polish interest and participation in Ukrainian activities was to control them for their own purposes and to encourage anti-Russian tendencies amomg them.[27]

Two events that took place in 1861, described by memoirists in some detail, illustrate well the split as it developed. One involved the Polish student K. Penkowski,[28] who was briefly expelled from the university for not taking off his cap during the reading of the Emancipation Proclamation. At a general meeting called by the Poles to support sending a strongly-worded petition to the administration protesting the arrest, apparently, Stoianov and Drahomanov, future leaders of the Kiev Hromada, as delegates

---

[26] N.K. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," pp. 36-37. B. Iuzefovych, ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 13-14.

[27] The memoirist V. Iuzefovych wrote that Antonovych and the khlopomany originally became close to Ukrainian groups in order to influence them, and that the aim of the Poles was to stir up hatred among the Ukrainians against Muscovite rule. See B. Iuzefovich, ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 13-14. One should be cautious in accepting this accusation, but it is indicative of the suspicion of Ukrainians towards Poles. On the other hand, the Russian administration was keen on exploiting the animosity between the Poles and Ukrainians. Pointing to the Poles as an example, Pirogov encouraged the Ukrainian students to organize their own student groups. See P. Zhytetsky, "Z istorii kyivskoi hromady," ZNTSh, 1913, vol. 116, book 4, p. 179.

[28] The student is referred to as Paskowski by the historian J. Tabis. See his Polacy na Uniwersitecie, pp. 110-11.

of the Ukrainian and Russian students, spoke out against lending support.[29] The break-up of general student solidarity seemed imminent. The Ukrainians and Russians broke up into three separate groups and advised the Poles to form their own separate group. They also proposed that in the future, in treating questions concerning the general student body, voting should take place within each group, rather than at general meetings of all the students, as had been the custom; each group would then have one vote each. The Polish students, not wishing to definitively split the student body, nor end up in a minority position, withdrew their petition.[30]

If student solidarity still existed at the university following the Penkowski affair, it was certainly shattered in the fall of 1861, shortly after the return of the students from their summer holidays. In October a police surveillant was beaten up by Polish students. Immediately thereafter a crowd of mostly Polish students entered the university, held a noisy meeting, broke a glass encasement and tore down the adminstration's announcements that had been enclosed therein. At the general student meeting that took place the following day, Ukrainians and Russians appeared as a solid group opposed

---

[29] See Chapter Three for details on this incident.

[30] See Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," pp. 37-39. A slightly different version of events is given by V. Iuzefovich in Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 17-19. The Polish historian J. Tabis, does not mention this split in his account of the incident. See his Polacy na Uniwersytecie, p. 109.

to the Poles, which caused the latter to leave. Ukrainian and Russian students now composed their own anti-Polish address to the curator of the educational district; apparently, among the signatories were Stoianov, Drahomanov and Antonovych.[31]

These two specific incidents illustrate events where actual breaks in relations between Poles and non-Poles took place. At some general student meetings at the university that year, questions of national identity, the national character of Right-Bank territories, the nationality of the peasantry there, and even the national character of Kiev university were often and fiercely debated. These heated discussions, especially the claims of Poles to Right-Bank lands as being Polish, helped forge a Ukrainian national consciousness and spurred Ukrainians to organize in response to Polish claims and activities. In 1861 then, Ukrainian students at Kiev university became more assertive, organized themselves further, began to co-ordinate their activities and act as an independent group. Iuzefovich noted in his memoirs that although a "Little Russian party" existed at Kiev university in early 1861, it was not an important factor in

---

[31] See N. Rennenkampf, "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," pp. 39-41. The October events are described in some detail by V. Iuzefovich in Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 39-46. See also B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, p. 41. Some of the Ukrainian and Russian students even went so far as to co-operate with the authorities against the Poles. See Poznansky, Ibid., p. 45. The Polish historian J. Tabis does not mention the confrontation that occurred between the Ukrainian and Polish students, nor the anti-Polish petition drafted. See his Polacy na Uniwersytecie, pp. 110-11. See also Chapter Two.

student politics then. However, under the influence of the khlopomany, who joined its ranks, the Ukrainians began to coalesce as a more or less united group, and began to speak and act as an independent group at student gatherings.[32]

In the fall of 1861, Iuzefovich noted that the character of the Ukrainian party had changed. It is at this point that he used the term hromada for the first time, and indicated it was the same as the Ukrainian, or "Little Russian party."[33] At meetings of the non-Polish student body, which also had organized itself into corporations by this time, the Ukrainian party began to act as "a body within a body". The Hromada had also grown significantly and was seen as an effective force in fighting the Poles.[34] It also appears that as new members joined, especially Left-Bankers, a purge of khlopomany, who were members of the Hromada, but still maintained

---

[32] B. Iuzefovich, ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 13-14; M. Starytsky, "K biografii N.V. Lysenka," pp. 402-05. It should be stressed that the debate on the national question at Kiev university was particularly acute. This affected the overall political atmosphere at the university, which was different than at Moscow or St. Petersburg university, primarily because of the national conflicts. According to Iuzefovich, the predominant mood among Kiev university students was more conservative than in the two capitals of the Russian Empire. Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 29-32.

[33] One should bear in mind that the Kiev Hromada, although in its early stages of development, was closely tied to the university; it was not, strictly speaking, a student body.

[34] See B. Iuzefovich, ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad, pp. 38-39. Drahomanov noted that in 1862 the membership of the Hromada had swelled to 250-300 members. See his "Avstro-ruski spomyny," in p. 157.

organizational ties and sympathized with the Poles, took place.[35] One Polish memoirist, a member of the Kiev Hromada, wrote that a purge of pro-Polish khlopomany, instigated by Stoianov and supported by Antonovych, took place as late as February 1862.[36]

The merger of the various circles and groups to form the Kiev Hromada was paralleled by the beginning of efforts to establish closer ties with other Ukrainophile circles and groups that were organizing hromady in other cities of the Empire. The most influential of these in this period, the St. Petersburg Hromada, was led by the older generation of Ukrainophiles, the former Cyrillo-Methodians, who had begun publishing the journal Osnova in St. Petersburg in 1861. Antonovych met with at least Vasyl Bilozersky, the editor of Osnova and a former Cyrillo-Methodian, during his trip to St. Petersburg in the winter of 1860-61.[37] It appears that the older Ukrainophiles had organized a hromada in St.

---

[35] Iuzefovych pointed out that even the more radical khlopomany, such as Antonovych, who had broken with the Poles, were not trusted by some Left-Bank Ukrainians. See his Tridsat let tomu nazad, p. 51, where where he described Stoianov's distrust of Antonovych and of Polish influences in the Hromada. See also below, n. 17.

[36] L. Syroczynski, Z przed 50 lat, p. 30. Syroczynski also wrote that Antonovych had remained a member of the Zwiazek Trojnicki until October 1861. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[37] See Chapter Three.

Petersburg in 1858.[38] Other hromady were being formed towards the end of the 1850s and early 1860s in Chernihiv, Poltava and Kharkiv, all cities in Left-Bank Ukraine. The establishment of the hromady clearly showed that the Ukrainian national movement was organizing itself for the first time since the set-back of the arrests of the Cyrillo-Methodians in 1847, and, unlike the earlier period, the organizing was taking place in several cities. The formation of the Kiev Hromada and the participation of Antonovych in its establishment must be considered then in the context of the general revival and growth of the Ukrainian national movement of the period. As one of the leading figures in the just emerging Kiev Hromada, Antonovych was already at this early stage a potentially important figure in the Ukrainian national revival.

In a broader context yet, this activation of the Ukrainian movement was part and parcel of the overall activation of educated society in the Russian Empire, which was made possible following the death of Nicholas I and the adoption of a course of liberal reforms by his successor, Alexander II. The relaxation of censorship and state police controls over some activities of society by the new regime allowed hitherto dormant and self-suppressed liberal, radical

---

[38] M. Antonovych, "Koly postaly Hromady?," p. 132. See also his "Ukrainska Peterburzka Hromada," in Iuvileinyi Zbirnyk Ukrainskoi Vilnoi Akademii Nauk v Kanadi, Winnipeg, 1976, pp. 75-76.

and even unofficial conservative individuals, circles and groups to emerge from inactivity, organize and propagandize at least some of their ideas openly. The freer conditions allowed the Ukrainophiles the opportunity to do the same.

The Ukrainian national revival should also not be seen in isolation from the revival, or establishment, of other modern national movements among several nationalities of the Russian Empire that was taking place at this same time. In addition to the Poles, the strongest and best-organized of the non-Russians, who took up arms to regain their lost independence, leaders of other nationalities began to establish organizations, revive or establish literatures in their own languages, and make demands upon the authorities.[39] The Ukrainian national revival therefore, must also be seen in the context of the national revivals of other nationalities within the Russian Empire. Demands for the revival of autonomous institutions were made by the Finns, who were allowed to reconvene their diet in 1863.[40] One can date the revivals of the Lithuanian, Estonian, Latvian, Georgian and Armenian, and the beginning of the Belarus' national movements from this

---

[39] See T. Zinkivsky, "Natsionalne pytannia v Rossii," in Pysannia Trokhyma Zinkivskoho, B. Hrinchenko, ed., book 2, Lviv, 1896, pp. 3-37.

[40] Antonovych must have been well aware of the important developments that had been taking place within the Finnish national movement, especially the role of the ethnic Swedish noblemen, many of whom supported the movement and provided leadership cadres. See Chapter Two, where Antonovych expressed his views on the Swedish nobility of Finland at the meeting with the Polish szlachta in May 1860.

period also.[41] A faint, but still noticeable echo of the 1848 "Springtime of Nations" was heard in the non-Russian areas of the Empire in this early period of Alexander II's reign. In addition, recent successes of the Italian national movement had to have made their impact on leaders of the newly emerging national movements, including Antonovych.[42]

Within the context of the re-emerging Ukrainian movement, it was natural that the St. Petersburg Hromada took the lead and set an example that was taken up for the most part by the other hromadas. Members of the St. Petersburg Hromada concentrated on writing and publishing, both for intellectuals as well as for the common folk. The most important publication effort, aimed at the Ukrainian and Russian intelligentsia, was the journal Osnova, which became the organ

---

[41] On the beginnings of the modern Belarus' national movement see J.T. Stanley, "The Birth of a Nation: The January Insurrection and the Belrussian National Movement," in B.K. Kiraly, ed., The Crucial Decade: East Central European Society and National Defense, 1859-1870, New York, 1984, pp. 185-202.

[42] Antonovych clearly equated his joining the Ukrainian movement with those who had joined the Italian national movement in Italy. See his "Moia ispoved," p. 114. K. Mykhalchuk wrote, that in a discussion with Antonovych in late fall of 1859, he had expressed dismay over the low level of national consciousness among Ukrainians. Antonovych countered his pessimistic assessmant by mentioning the recent successes of the Italian national movement to him. See his "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, no. 8-10, p. 84. Excitement over the national liberation movement in Italy affected even the physical appearance of some young people. Some Georgian students at St. Petersburg University began wearing their hair like Garibaldi in 1861. See R.G. Suny, The Making of the Georgian Nation, Bloomington-Indianapolis-Stanford, 1988, p. 126.

of the Ukrainian movement in the Russian Empire during its existence in 1861-62.[43] The St. Petersburg Hromada contained the flower of the former Cyrillo-Methodians. The legendary poet Taras Shevchenko was a member until his death in early 1861. The controversial writer and historian Panteleimon Kulish was a strong supporter and major contributor of Osnova. Most importantly, Mykola Kostomarov, the brilliant populist historian and leading ideologue of the Cyrillo-Methodians, also settled in St. Petersburg from the late 1850s. It was during the period from the late 1850s to the mid 1860s that Kostomarov wrote the best of his historico-political, programmatic and publicistic essays, many of which were published in Osnova.[44] It is doubtless that Kostomarov's

---

[43] The role of Osnova in the context of the development of Ukrainian literature and of the socio-political movement of Ukrainophilism is discussed in M.D. Berenshtein, Zhurnal "Osnova" i ukrainskyi literaturnyi protses kintsia 50-kh--60-kh rokiv XIX st., Kiev, 1959. See also I. Steshenko, "Ukrainski shestydesiatnyky," Zapysky Ukrainskoho Naukovoho Tovarystva, 1908, vol. 1, pp. 29-83. The weekly journal Chernigovskii listok, which appeared from 1861-63, was also a Ukrainophile organ, but was not nearly as important as Osnova.

[44] The most important of the essays published in Osnova were: "Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi" (1861, no. 1), "Dve russkiia narodnosti" (1861, no. 3), "Cherty narodnoi iuzhno-russkoi istorii" (1861, no. 6; 1862, no. 6 and no. 10), "Pravda Poliakam o Rusi" and "Pravda Moskvicham o Rusi" (both in 1861, no. 10). It is difficult to overestimate the impact of these essays on the development of the idea that Ukrainians were a separate nationality that had their own history and that neither Poles nor Russians could claims these as their own. In the essay "Ukraina," published anonymously in Alexander Hertsen's Kolokol (January 1860, no. 61), Kostomarov spoke out even more openly and strongly against Polish and Russian claims to Ukrainian history and lands. M. Hrushevsky wrote that Kostomarov's articles created a revolution in the

essays had a great influence on the younger generation of Ukrainophiles, including Antonovych.[45]

Although Osnova was dominated by the former Cyrillo-Methodians, and the most important material in the journal was written by them, several Kiev Hromada members had essays published there, including Antonovych. Among these were the important polemical and programmatic essays: Antonovych's "Moia ispoved"[46] and P. Zhytetsky's "Russkii patriotizm."[47]

In addition to the influence of the Cyrillo-Methodians, and especially Kostomarov, on the younger generation in the realm of ideas, they also influenced their practical work. In the first place this had to do with activities in the field of popular education, including the preparation of primers and

---

historical thinking of the Eastern Slavs. See his "Z publitsystychnykh pysan Kostomarova," in Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova, Kiev, 1928, p. x. D. Doroshenko wrote that the essay "Dve russkiia narodnosti" served for a long time as "'the gospel of Ukrainian nationalism.'" See his A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography, New York, 1957, p.139.

[45] P. Zhytetsky wrote that, "Our teacher, in national-political questions was a man of the older generation, a friend of Taras [Shevchenko], the unforgettable M. Kostomarov." See P. Zhytetsky, "Z istorii kyivskoi hromady," ZNTSh, 1913, vol. 116, book 4, p. 181. There is no doubt that Antonovych's views on Ukrainian history and on the character of the Ukrainian and Russian nationalities were shaped in part, or were confirmed by Kostomarov's views. See Chapter Five, where this is discussed.

[46] See Chapter Three for excerpts from this manifesto as well as background on its appearance and a brief discussion of some of its contents.

[47] Zhytetsky's "Russkii patriotizm" was published in Osnova, 1862, no. 3, pp. 1-21.

popular literature. The publication of popular literature and educational materials had already been discussed by the Cyrillo-Methodians prior to their arrests in 1847.[48] It was only natural then that they began to publish such materials and encouraged other Ukrainians to join in their efforts soon after conditions allowed for such work. The St. Petersburg Hromada, and especially Kostomarov, became involved in raising money for the publication of primary education materials, religious and popular literature, and involved the other hromady in this fund-raising effort. Numerous articles on the topic of popular education appeared in Osnova throughout its existence.[49] Kulish had prepared and published a primer already in 1857.[50] It is possible that Shevchenko gave impetus to the founding of the first Sunday school in Kiev in

---

[48] See I. Zhytetsky, "Z lystuvannia Kostomarova. Lystuvannia Kostomarova z kharkivskymy hromadianamy pro vydannia narodnikh knyzhok," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, p. 69.

[49] See the discussion of this in M.D. Bernshtein, Zhurnal "Osnova", pp. 49, 56-62.

[50] Shevchenko had his Bukvar iuzhnorusskii published in 1860, shortly before his death. A list of other primers published in the early 1860s is found in M.D. Bernshtein's, Zhurnal "Osnova", p. 61. Antonovych and the khlopomany had distributed Kulish's primer, as well as other publications for the peasantry since the late 1850s, during their summer excursions into the countryside. Antonovych had been accused of distributing inflammatory material to the peasantry during these trips. Kulish's primer was cited as evidence of this during Antonovych's "trial" by the Polish szlachta in May 1860. See Chapter Two.

1859. He did, in any strongly support the Sunday school movement.[51]

The importance of popular education in the immediate practical work of hromada members, as well as its place in the long-term strategy and program of the majority of the Ukrainophiles, was eloquently expressed in a letter Kostomarov wrote in early 1863 to the Kharkiv Hromada member V.S. Hnylosyrov. In his letter Kostomarov declared: "Popular education - this is the most important thing, the all-encompassing foundation. When the people learn to read in their own [language], they will begin to like to read, will come to see things clearly; then they will become stronger, create their own literature and will turn into a strong nation, which will understand and respect itself." Kostomarov appealed to the younger Ukrainophiles to continue the work of the older generation, which he represented. He acknowledged that the results of this work would not be seen for some time. "Perhaps you will not live to see that day, but, like Moses from the mountain [you] will see the promised land, where your children, and perhaps even your grandchildren will enter. But your task right now is to work as much as possible to pull your nation from out of the bogs of darkness, poverty and

---

[51] See F.Ia. Pryima, "Shevchenko i nedilni shkoly na Ukraini," Zbirnyk prats chotyrnadtsiatoi naukovoi shevchenkivskoi konferentsii, Kyiv, 1966, pp. 170-94. I. Zhytetsky, "Shevchenko i kharkivska molod," Ukraina, 1925, books 1-2, pp. 143-48.

derision, where it had been trampled on by historical fate."[52]

The intellectual and symbolic authority of the older Ukrainophiles, the example of their own work, and appeals, such as the one by Kostomarov, certainly reinforced the tendency of the younger generation to enter onto the path of legal work that would sooner or later benefit the social position of the peasantry and raise their cultural level. At the same time the program put forward by Kostomarov was a national one that, as its long term goal, aimed at the creation of a "a strong nation," that would "understand and respect itself." For the foreseeable future, the work of the Ukrainophiles was to concentrate on participation in popular education: teaching and providing literature and educational materials in the people's language - Ukrainian. This national populist program of "small deeds," of concentrating on cultural work, certainly appeared to be realistic at that time and was one that united most of the Ukrainophiles who were realists in politics or moderate or conservative in their political beliefs.

This certainly was a program that Antonovych not only agreed with but held dear. He had already been active in the field of popular education since at least 1859 and had

---

[52] Letter of Kostomarov to Hnylosyrov of Feb 1863, in I. Zhytetsky, "Z lystuvannia Kostomarova. Lystuvannia Kostomarova z kharkivskymy hromadianamy pro vydannia narodnikh knyzhok," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, p. 71.

expressed his views to Mykhalchuk that same year on the changes that had to be achieved in the realm of consciousness among the common folk before significant political, national and social progress could take place. Mykhalchuk, in one of his first meetings with Antonovych, had despaired over the low level of national consciousness among Ukrainians. Antonovych replied by pointing to the successful rebirth of the Czechs, who had seemed Germanized, and also to the Italians. He claimed that the success of both movements and the guarantee of their eventual victory was the more or less widespread extension of popular education and enlightenment among the people. He added that culture was, in general, the only lever that could raise the economic, political, moral and intellectual level of the people, that would lead to their liberation. He also noted the failures of revolutionary movements among uneducated and undisciplined peoples. According to Mykhalchuk, these ideas expressed by Antonovych formed the foundation upon which they based their activities in future years.[53]

It is clear then that Antonovych was a strong partisan of cultural work and sceptical, to say the least, of revolutionary politics. The investigations of his activities by the authorities that began in 1860 did not reveal any

---

[53] See K. Mykhalchuk, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, no. 8-10, pp. 84-85. The cultural factor in Antonovych's interpretation of Ukrainian history was extremely important. See Chapter Five.

evidence that linked him to revolutionary activities, even though he was a member of the Polish student secret organization of the Związek Trojnicki at that time and undoubtedly held strong democratic views. It is likely that these investigations were a sobering experience, and that they also played some role in steering him onto the path of legal work. Nevertheless, it seems that Antonovych consciously chose the path of cultural work, because, following careful analysis and personal experience, he believed it was the method that would eventually lead to success. Yet, he never rejected illegal activities as such. The Kiev Hromada itself was a semi-legal, semi-clandestine organization, and not all of its activities were legally sanctioned.

The government was monitoring Ukrainian activities, which it regarded with some suspicion and concern. Leaders of Polish szlachta society in Right-Bank Ukraine had achieved partial success in raising the Russian government's suspicions concerning the activities of Antonovych and the khlopmany back in 1860.[54] Yet, the government had tolerated and even supported to a certain degree Ukrainophile activities, in part as a counterweight to Polish influence in Right-Bank Ukraine.[55] This indulgent attitude changed. Despite the

---

[54] See Chapter Two regarding the investigations of Antonovych by the Russian administration, which were instigated by complaints from the Polish szlachta.

[55] The government had even commissioned Kulish to translate the Emancipation Proclamation into Ukrainian and had initially looked on the publication of Ukrainian-language

legality of mainstream Ukrainophile activities, the Russian government began to take repressive measures against Ukrainophiles and Ukrainian activities by the second half of 1862.

The anti-Ukrainian measures should not be viewed in isolation from the beginnings of repressive measures taken by the government against well-known Russian radicals like N. Chernyshevsky in 1862 and against the Polish movement. The government was already uneasy over peasant disaffection with the terms of the emancipation and was naturally concerned about activities of Ukrainophiles among the peasantry. The authorities looked on with alarm at the increasing outspokenness of the radical wing of Russian society, especially in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Radical clandestine groups there began printing and distributing leaflets in 1861-62, such as Velikoruss and Molodaia Rossiia, the second of which called for the overthrow of the old order.[56] Serious student disturbances at the universities took place in

---

books meant for the peasantry with indulgence. See P. Zhytetsky, "Z istorii kyivskoi ukrainskoi hromady," p. 179. See also B. Dmytryshyn, "Introduction," in F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 p. (Reprint edition), Munich, 1970, p. xv. Poznansky wrote in his memoirs that in Kiev, the governor-general, P.V. Annenkov, saw that as a counterweight to the Poles in Right-Bank Ukraine he could rely on the bureaucracy, the peasantry, and the Ukrainophiles, the newly-emerging force among the intelligentsia. See his "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, p. 42.

[56] On the leaflets Velikoruss and Molodaia Rossiia see F. Venturi, Roots of Revolution, pp. 237-40; 285-302.

1861.[57] The Polish movement, however, was the most serious problem for the government to deal with. In addition to the danger that the Polish movement itself created, the government feared the possibility of co-operation among the radicals, Ukrainophiles and the Poles. The likelihood that army officers would support the Poles especially frightened the ruling circles and, finally, the government also feared the possibility of a European war in support of the Poles.

The majority of the Ukrainophiles held moderate views and limited their activities to what was allowed by law. Nevertheless, there were radicals within the hromady, some of whom co-operated or maintained contacts with the all-Russian radical movement in the capitals. There were also radical conspiracies based in Ukraine.[58] And, in spite of the

---

[57] Ibid., pp. 220-31.

[58] The radical movement in Ukraine and especially the portrayal of radical Ukrainophiles, members of the hromady, has been, for the most part, tendentiously treated by Soviet scholarship to date. For published documents see the two-volume collection, H.I. Marakov et al., eds., Suspilno politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1856-1862 rr., Kiev, 1963, and Suspilno politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1863-1864 rr., Kiev, 1964. A critique of this collection by M. Rudko pointed out that the editors had ignored or downplayed the ties that existed between the left wing of the hromady and Russian radicals. See his review, "Dokumenty z istorii hromadsko-politychnoho rukhu 60-kh rokiv na Ukraini," Arkhivy Ukrainy, 1965, no. 5, pp. 73-76. The series edited by M.V. Nechkina, et al., Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg., 7 vols., Moscow, 1960-1978, contains some published material on radical groups in Ukraine. See especially excerpts from the diary of N.P. Ballin, "50 let moei zhizni," in Ibid., vol. 5, Moscow, 1970, pp. 322-37. The only monograph on the activities of a hromada and its members was M.Hnip's Poltavska Hromada, Kharkiv, 1930. Hnip's monograph contains documents of the investigations of some of its members following their

opposition of the Ukrainophiles to Polish pretensions to Right-Bank Ukraine, there were Ukrainians, among them some

---

arrests in 1862. One of the first post-Crimean War conspiratorial groups in the Russian Empire was the Kharkiv-Kiev Secret Society, which existed from 1856-60. See F. Iastrebov, Revoliutsionnye demokraty na Ukraine: Vtoraia polovina 50-kh--nachalo 60-kh godov XIX st., Kiev, 1960. One of its members, P. Iefymenko, was a Ukrainophile who, apparently, founded a Ukrainophile group in Kiev in the late 1850s and who also maintained close relations with members of the Kiev and Poltava hromady. See n. 10 above. See also R. Serbyn, "La 'Societé politique secrete' de Kharkiv (Ukraine), 1856-1860," Historical Papers, 1973, pp. 159-77. Z.V. Pershina's study, Ocherki istorii revoliutsionnogo dvizheniia na Ukraine, Kiev-Odessa, 1975, touches on the activities of revolutionary groups in southern Ukraine. Two recent studies by H.I. Marakhov, Kievskii universitet v revoliutsionno-demokraticheskom dvizhenii, Kiev, 1984, and Sotsialno-politicheskaia borba na Ukraine v 50--60-e gody XIX veka, Kiev, 1981, does not contain much new material that had not already been discussed in his earlier Polskoe vosstanie 1863 g. na Pravoberezhnoi Ukraine, Kiev, 1967. In these studies Marakhov claims that a Little Russian Revolutionary Committee existed in Kiev that maintained ties with Polish and Russian revolutionaries, not left-wing hromada members. See also his Andrii Krasovsky - borets proty kriposnytstva i samoderzhavstva, Kiev, 1961. In her recent article on co-operation between radicals in the hromady and Zemlia i volia, the Russian revolutionary organization, R.P. Ivanova criticized Marakhov for ignoring the ties between the hromady and Russian revolutionaries in his studies. See her "Obiednavcha diialnist 'Zemli i voli' na Ukraini u 60-rr. XIX st.," UIZh, 1988, no. 9, pp. 60-70. The literary-historical studies of M.Ie. Syvachenko, Anatolii Svydnytsky i zarodzhennia sotsialnoho romanu v ukrainskii literaturi, Kiev, 1962, and M.Ie. Syvachenko and O. Deko, Leonid Hlibov, Kiev, 1969, discuss to some degree the general political context as well as the participation of the two writers Svydnytsky and Hlibov in the hromady and radical politics. The latter work contains one chapter on the ties between the Chernihiv Hromada members I. Andrushchenko and S. Nis with Zemlia i volia. See also the older study of M. Iavorsky, Narysy z istorii revoliutsiinoi borotby na Ukraini, vol. 1, Karkiv, 1927, in which he exaggerates the revolutionary character of the hromady.

members of the hromady, who co-operated with or participated in revolutionary activities to aid the Poles.[59]

The division betwen radical and moderate Ukrainophiles in the Kiev Hromada was reflected in the handwritten journals Samostaine slovo and Hromadnytsia, the latter being, apparently, put out by Antonovych, Rylsky, Mykhalchuk and other moderates in the Kiev Hromada.[60] There is evidence

---

[59] There is much literature on Russo-Polish co-operation in support of the 1863 uprising. An important collection of documents on this topic is I. Miller, ed., Russko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazi, Moscow, 1963. Much less has been published on Ukrainian-Polish co-operation. This topic has been studied almost exclusively by Soviet scholars, whose conclusions and selection of evidence has been tendentious. See the two-volume collection of documents edited by H.I. Marakhov et al., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini. There is no specific monograph on Polish-Ukrainian co-operation, but the subject has been broached in H.I. Marakhov, Polskoe vosstanie 1863 g.; idem., Andrii Krasovsky; Z. Mlynarsky and A. Slish, Andrii Potebnia -- borets za spilnu spravu bratnikh narodiv, Kiev, 1957. See also the essays of A.Z. Baraboi, "Popytka ukrainskikh revoliutsionerov organizovat pomoshch polskomu vosstaniu 1863 godu," Voprosy istorii, 1957, no. 1, pp. 109-16; R.P. Ivanova, "Ukrainsko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazi kontsa 50-kh--nachalo 60-kh godov XIX veka," Ibid., 1979, no. 3, pp. 32-42; idem., "Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie na Ukraine i polskoe vosstanie 1863 goda, Sovetskoe slavianovedenie, 1978, no. 3, pp. 47-58. V.U. Pavelko, "Uchast ukraintsiv u povstanni 1863," UIZh, 1963, no. 1, pp. 34-41.

[60] See O.I. Dei et al., Istoriia ukrainskoi dozhovtnevoi zhurnalistyky, Lviv, 1983, pp. 155-57. H.I. Marakhov wrote that the first issue of Hromadnytsia came out in September 1861, whereas the first issue of Samostaine slovo was out in April of that year. See his Sotsialno-politicheskaia borba na Ukraine v 50--60-e gody XIX veka, Kiev, 1981, pp. 116-17. See also his Polskoe vosstanie, pp. 132, 134. Marakhov emphasized the ideological divisions among the Ukrainophiles in his works. He wrote that there was a struggle between the liberals, headed by Antonovych, and radicals, who were united in a "Little Russian committee," over control of the Kiev Hromada. According to him, the radical-democratic wing wanted to work together with the Poles to fight against the Tsarist

that points to co-operation between radical Ukrainophiles, who were members of the hromady, and their counterparts among Russians and Poles. But, there were instances where even moderates from the Kiev Hromada had disscusions and made contacts with Russian and Polish revolutionaries. Also, the moderates maintained their friendships and ties with Ukrainian radicals in the hromady. There is no evidence that Ukrainian radicals were purged from the ranks of the hromady.

Even the moderates themselves considered the possibility of taking up arms. P. Zhytetsky revealed that prior to the Polish uprising the Kiev Ukrainophiles had organized themselves into groups of threes, just as the Poles had done earlier. Their strategy was to remain neutral in the upcoming uprising, but, "at the right moment, let our desires be known. For this purpose we intended to organize our own company (kurin) in the Podil [district of Kiev], in the Kozhumiaka [quarter], among our city acquaintances."[61] Antonovych, as

---

government. As evidence to support this he cited the testimony of V. Pylypenko before a government investigating committee in 1863 that the Kiev Hromada was divided into two camps: the first wanted to support the Poles, while the second wanted to remain neutral and join the side that appeared to be winning. Ibid., pp. 131-32. Marakhov, in emphasizing the differences between the radicals and the moderates, claimed that the radicals even had their own organization in Kiev, the Kiev Secret Society, which put out Samostaine slovo. Ibid., p.132. The Kiev Hromada also put out a humouristic-satirical journal called Pomyinytsia, four numbers of which were published in Nashe mynule, 1919, no. 1-2, pp. 73-122.

[61] P. Zhytetsky, "Z istorii kyivskoi ukrainskoi hromady," p. 181. See also S. Iefremov, "Zhytetsky pro Antonovycha," Rada, 7/20 March 1912, no. 55, as cited in D. Doroshenko,

a leading member of the Kiev Hromada, had to have known of these plans.

It is known that Antonovych associated closely with the radical writer A. Svydnytsky in 1859-60, who wrote poems that had radical social and Ukrainian national themes.[62] Some of his poems were put to music and taught by Ukrainian radicals, such as V. Syniehub, a member of the Kiev Hromada, to peasants in Pereiaslav county, Poltava gubernia.[63] Syniehub, who tried to organize a peasant hromada to aid the Poles, was arrested along with three others in April 1863, that is, at the same time that the Polish rebellion broke out in Right-Bank Ukraine. In his testimony to the investigating committee, he said that Antonovych and Chubynsky had recruited him to the Kiev Hromada, and also named Antonovych as one the Hromada's leading members.[64] Antonovych, questioned about

---

Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 54.

[62] Antonovych wrote down Svydnytsky's poems from memory, apparently, and passed them on to I. Franko in 1885, along with a brief biografical sketch of Svydnytsky, which Franko published in the Ukrainophile Galician literary journal Zoria. See V. Antonovych [V.], "Do biohrafii A.P. Svydnytskoho," Zoria, 1886, no. 11, p. 195. The poems were so inflammatory, however, that Franko did not publish them until 1901, and even then he left out "a few harsh words." See I. Franko [Fr.], "Pisni Anatolia Svydnytskoho," LNV, 1901, book 4, p. 43. See also M.Ie. Syvachenko, Anatolii Svydnytsky, pp. 39-66.

[63] M.Ie. Syvachenko, Anatolii Svydnytsky, pp. 56-58.

[64] See G.I. Marakhov, Polskoe vosstanie, p. 131. In his testimony, which must be treated cautiously, Syniehub made a clear demarcation between his activities, which he said were revolutionary, and the primary activities of the rest of the Hromada members, preparing booklets for the common folk. Part of Syniehub's testimony was printed in V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska

the Kiev Hromada's activities in 1863, claimed, however, that its members were involved only in scholarly, literary and educational-pedagogical work.[65]

A close friend of Antonovych, Chubynsky, was also, apparently, involved in illegal activities. Apparently, Chubynsky headed a circle within the Kiev Hromada to which Syniehub belonged. It was this circle that evidently produced the revolutionary appeal to the peasantry, "To all the good people," (Usim dobrym liudiam). In his testimony, Syniehub said that Chubynsky did not favour revolutionary methods, but it is known that Chubynsky held radical views, both on social matters and on the national question, favouring an independent Ukraine.[66]

Hromada," p. 273.

[65] Part of Antonovych's testimony was published in V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," pp. 274-75. In his testimony, Antonovych stated that meetings of the Hromada had taken place for about two years (1861-2). The purposes for calling meetings were to promote the study of the country (krai), its ethnography, common law and geography, as well as to prepare and publish primers and books for the common folk. Antonovych claimed that at their meetings only scholarly, pedagogical and literary matters were discussed, and if other matters were raised, they concerned the fact that the Hromada members were firmly convinced of the necessity and value of popular education, were morally committed to promote popular education, and that they believed that progress in this field required that the population be educated in its native language, Ukrainian. See also, M.Ie. Syvachenko, Anatolii Svydnytsky, p.63.

[66] See R.P. Ivanova, "Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie na Ukraine i vosstanie 1863 g.," Sovetskoe slavianovedenie, 1978, no. 3, pp. 53-54. The appeal "To all the good people" is reprinted in V. Miiakovsky, "Revoliutsiini vidozvy do ukrainskoho narodu, 1850-1870 rr.," pp. 244-45. Chubynsky is the author of the national anthem of Ukraine, "Ukraine still

Even completely legal activities among the peasantry raised the suspicion of the authorites. Some Kiev Hromada members, desiring to become close to the peasantry and act as their advisors following their liberation from serfdom, moved to the countryside, most taking positions as arbitrators (or mediators) of the peace (mirovi posredniki).[67] Antonovych's close friend, Poznansky, secured a position as secretary in the estate of a progressive landowner, the widow Gabel, in the village of Dudary, Kaniv county, whose two sons were khlopomany. Here, he lived among the peasantry, married a peasant girl, acted as a legal advisor to them, and consequently developed a good rapport with them. Landowners of the region reported to the authorities, however, that he was instigating the peasantry to slaughter them. Poznansky was arrested and although soon released for lack of evidence,

---

lives" (Shche ne vmerla Ukraina), which was based on a Serbian patriotic song. See B. Iuzefovich, ed., Tridsat let tomu nazad, p. 71. Chubynsky was arrested and exiled to Arkhangelsk province in 1862. See V. Miiakovsky, "Istoriia zaslannia P. Chubynskoho," Arkhivna sprava, 1927, book 4, pp. 6-13. See also F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva, pp. 188-89.

[67] The office of mirovoi posrednik was created following the peasantry's emancipation in March 1861. The arbitrators investigated disputes between peasants and landlords and approved the ustavnye qramoty, supervised local institutions of peasant self-government, and held limited police and judicial powers. The ustavnaia qramota was a charter or inventory, specifying the size, location and boundaries of a peasant was to receive following his emancipation, and the compensation owed by the peasant to the landlord.

Antonovych and other friends were called in for questioning concerning this matter.[68]

During the period he lived in Dudary, Poznansky was often visited by his friends from Kiev. The lieutenant-colonel, Andrii Krasovsky, visited him together with Petro Kosach in the fall of 1861.[69] Krasovsky was a radical Ukrainophile and member of both the St. Petersburg and Kiev hromady, who was arrested in 1862 for distributing leaflets among soldiers of his regiment urging them to disobey orders to put down a peasant revolt by force.[70]

Russian revolutionaries made attempts to come to an understanding with the Kiev Hromada and gain its support for revolutionary activities, specifically, support for the Polish insurrection. L.F. Panteleev, a member of Zemlia i volia, wrote that in late 1862 T. Rylsky, Antonovych's close friend, went to St. Petersburg to discuss co-operation with the

---

[68] Poznansky moved to the widow Gabel's estate in March 1861. Gabel was a progressive landowner, whose two sons were khlopomany. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 55. See also V. Miiakovsky, "B.S. Poznansky (Narodnyk 60-kh rokiv)," Ukraina, 1926, book 1, pp. 72-93.

[69] Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 5, p. 41. On Kosach see V. Miiakovsky, "Batko Lesi Ukrainky," in UFW, pp. 372-77.

[70] See the biography by H. Marakhov, Andrii Krasovsky, Kiev, 1961. Krasovsky's manifesto was published in H. Marakhov et al., eds., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1856-1862 rr., pp. 265, 267.

revolutionaries.[71] That Rylsky came to Kiev for a meeting was confirmed by another member of Zemlia i volia, I.G. Zhukov, who brought Rylsky to St. Petersburg and put him up in his apartment.[72] Evidently, nothing came of these talks.

Available evidence shows Antonovych was not directly involved in radical activities, nor did he sanction them, but he was a personal friend of some radicals. It seems highly unlikely that he did not know about or sanction Rylsky's trip to St. Petersburg to discuss the possibility of co-operation with Zemlia i volia. It is also clear that Antonovych was a cautious man, having had several years of experience of conspiratorial work in the Polish movement, and was careful not to incriminate himself. Nevertheless, the activities of the Ukrainophiles, both the illegal measures taken by the radicals, as well as the legal work of its mainstream majority, raised the government's suspicions and, despite his caution, Antonovych, a well-known Ukrainophile leader, was also implicated and brought before numerous investigating committees to testify regarding Ukrainophile activities and

---

[71] L.F. Panteleev, Vospominaniia, Moscow, 1958, p. 242. See also R.P. Ivanova, "Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie na Ukraine i polskoe vosstanie 1863 goda," Slavianskoe slavianovedenie, 1978, no. 3, p. 47.

[72] See I. Zhukov, "Iz Vospominanii shestidesiatnika," in M. Nechkina, ed., Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg., Moscow, 1962, p. 552. See also R. Ivanova, "Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie na Ukraine," p. 48.

his participation in them, as well as other related activities.[73]

During one of these sessions he was interrogated by the police official Matkovsky, who also oversaw his surveillance. According to Antonovych, Matkovsky let it be known that he required someone to write an article in the local newspaper, Kievskii telegraf, to defend him from accusations of abuse of his authority. Matkovsky hinted that if Antonovych agreed to do this, he would reciprocate the favour. Antonovych agreed on condition that he would not have to sign the articles and, accordingly, wrote polemical pieces for Matkovsky that appeared in Kievskii telegraf. Matkovsky, apparently, in return, wrote innocent reports on Antonovych's behaviour and activities.[74] It is possible that this arrangement saved Antonovych from arrest and exile.

Secret and, for the most part, overblown accusations against Ukrainophiles continued to be sent to higher authorities. In June 1862, the Minister of War, D. Miliutin, sent a memo to the Acting Chief of the Police, Potapov, concerning the activities of the Kiev Ukrainophiles, based on a report from Major-General Sivers. In his report, Sivers had written that a society called khlopomany, dressed in national Ukrainian dress, were creating social unrest, conducting

---

[73] In his memoirs Antonovych wrote that he was called to testify in twelve different matters in a period of two years. See his "Memuary," pp. 54-58.

[74] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 57-59.

agitation among the peasantry, which was aimed against the landowners and the army. Separatist aims were hinted at in the report; Antonovych and Rylsky were named as two of the major leaders of this society.[75] Further investigations by local police agents, however, concerning Antonovych, contradicted Sivers' report. Antonovych was described here as an intelligent and cautious young man. It was common knowledge that he was the leader of the khlopomany, although this society was not considered to harbour separatist aims. Antonovych, it was noted, was under constant police surveillance and no suspicious activities of his were reported.[76]

In February 1863 the Chief of the Third Section, Prince V.A. Dolgorukov, received an anonymous report in which Hromada activists, called khlopomany, were accused of working to separate Ukraine from Russia to federate with Poland.[77] The former Kiev governor-general, P.V. Annenkov, who received a copy of this accusation in early March, responded later that month that although the Poles and Ukrainians were not allied,

---

[75] Parts of Sivers' memo were published in F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva, pp. 183-85.

[76] The report of colonel Hrybovsky of the Kiev police, dated 29 July 1862 is printed, in part, in Ibid., pp. 185-86.

[77] The report is cited in Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," pp. 277-78. The secret accusation was made in the name of a group of "well-intentioned Little Russians." It also claimed that the publishing of books in Ukrainian was the first step towards political separation.

the publishing of books in Ukrainian was "harmful" and that "the Ukrainian party" (the Kiev Hromada), was potentially "a threat to peace" in the Russian Empire. Annenkov noted that the desire to use the Ukrainian language was politically motivated, and that demands for political autonomy would follow.[78] In another memo to Dolgorukov, written in August 1863, Annenkov wrote that there were ties between some Ukrainians and Poles, and also between Ukrainians and the all-Russian secret society and revolutionary organization Zemlia i volia.[79]

In another report on the activities of the Ukrainophiles, commissioned in the latter half of 1863, aide-de-camp Mezentsov wrote from Kiev to Dolgorukov in October 1863, that the Ukrainian movement was clearly becoming separatist, that under the cover of scholarship and literature, individuals, such as Antonovych, Chubynsky, Syniehub, Krasovsky and others, had been spreading Ukrainian propaganda among the peasantry. The Ukrainophiles were divided into two camps: the majority, which was anti-Polish, had become cautious lately, but was

---

[78] Annenkov's memo is cited by Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," pp. 278-79, and F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva, pp, 191-92. Annenkov had earlier written a letter in 1862, published by M. Katkov in Sovremennaia letopis, in which he warned about the dangers of Ukrainophilism and the supposed connections beteen Polish revolutionaries and Ukrainophiles. See P.V. Annenkov, "Pismo iz Kieva," reprinted in P.V. Annenkov i ego druzia, St. Petersburg, 1892, pp. 370-82. Cited in A. Ivancevich, "The Ukrainian National Movement and Russification," Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976, pp. 488-91.

[79] V. Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 279.

still determined to introduce Ukrainian into the elementary schools; the minority was considering whether to support the Poles on the basis of an alliance guaranteeing autonomy. Antonovych, according to Mezentsov, appeared to have become less active lately, but, Mezentsov cautioned, this inactivity appeared insincere and suggested that Antonovych continue to be kept under strict surveillance. The Ukrainian movement, Mezentsov concluded, could only become dangerous if it united with the Polish movement, which was not likely. The Poles, in the meantime, were trying to portray the khlopomany in the worst possible way in order to provoke the government to crack down on them, which, the Poles hoped would force the Ukrainians to seek an alliance with them. Mezentsov concluded, therefore, that the government approach the Ukrainian party cautiously, putting pressure on the majority through the press and Orthodox Church. The more active members of the group, he concluded, who were considering co-operating with the Poles, should be exiled.[80]

---

[80] Parts of Mezentsov's report are cited by F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva, pp. 194-98. The government did show indulgence towards the Ukrainophiles prior to 1862 and, it seems, it also treated the Ukrainophile movement with some caution afterward, even after it began its campaign against Ukrainian activities. This policy, if it can be called that, was caused by the fear that a strong crackdown could provoke the Ukrainophiles to seek an alliance with the Poles. In his study, M. Iavorsky cited a letter written in 1863 by the Kiev governor general Vasilchikov to the Minister of Internal Affairs, P. Valuev, expressing exactly such a fear. See M. Iavorsky, Narysy istorii revoliutsiinoi borotby na Ukraini, vol. 1, pp. 278-79. One can make the assumption here that it is possible that this was a factor in Antonovych avoiding arrest and exile.

Several Ukrainophiles from the Kiev, Poltava, Chernihiv, and Kharkiv hromady were arrested and exiled beginning in 1862, among them, Chubynsky, Antonovych's friend and collaborator in the Kiev Hromada. Government actions aimed at individual members of the hromady were not the only means used to pressure and intimidate Ukrainophiles. More general measures that put impediments in the way of Ukrainian activities began to be adopted by the government in 1862. These decisions reflected the beginnings of a reaction in overall government policy, and a crackdown on what was considered by the government to be radical or harmful activities in the Russian Empire. In June 1862 the Sunday schools were ordered closed by the government, ostensibly because they were used by radicals to disseminate propaganda. The closure of the Sunday schools, naturally, adversely affected the educational projects of the Ukrainophiles. The greatest blow to Ukrainian activities came in July 1863, when the Ministry of Internal Affairs promulgated the Valuev ukaz, which forbade the publishing of educational or religious literature in the Ukrainian language.[81]

---

[81] The text of the the secret memo from the Minister of Internal Affairs, P.A. Valuev, to the Minister of Education, of 8 July 1863, that became known as the Valuev ukaz, was published in T. Zinkivsky, "Natsionalne pytannia v Rossii," Pysannia Trokhyma Zinkivskoho, B. Hrinchenko, ed., book two, Lviv, 1896, pp. 16-18. See also the discussion of the background to the adoption of the ukaz in B. Dmytryshyn, "Introduction" to F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva, xv-xxi. The background to the ukaz is also discussed by I. Krevetsky [N. Fabrikant], "Kratkii ocherk iz istorii russkikh tsenzurnikh zakonov k ukrainskoi literatury," Russkaia mysl,

In conjunction with the beginnings of reaction in government policy, some conservative, reactionary and nationalist leaders in Russian society began to hint at or even openly accuse the Ukrainian movement of unlawful and anti-state aims and activities in the newspapers and journals they controlled.[82] The most serious of these accusations were of separatism and co-operation with the Poles.[83] These

---

1905, book 3.

[82] Some of the more important organs of Russian conservatism and ultra-patriotism prominent in the anti-Ukrainian campaign of the early 1860s were: Moskovskiia vedomosti; Russkii vestnik; the Jewish journal, Sion; the organ of the Slavophiles, Den; Kievskii telegraf; Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii. The Moscow-based Mikhail Katkov, editor of Moskovskiia vedomosti and publisher-editor of Russkii vestnik, began his attacks against the use of the Ukrainian language already back in 1861. By 1863 his attacks aginst Ukrainophiles were quite strident. See a discussion of Katkov's accusations by A. Ivancevich, "The Ukrainian National Movement and Russification," pp. 547-57. On Katkov, see the biography by M. Katz, Mikhail N. Katkov: A Political Biography 1818-1887, The Hague, 1966. In Kiev, the attacks against the Ukrainophiles were led by supporters of the journal Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii, whose editor was K. Govorsky [Hovorsky] of the Kiev Theological Academy. Govorsky's policy towards the Ukrainophiles mirrored to a degree the turnaround in government policy. In 1862, in the 11th number of the journal, an article was published that defended the khlopomany against attacks from the Polish szlachta. See [O. Hattsuk], "Chto takoe khlopomaniia i kto takie khlopomany?" pp. 139-56. In 1863-64, however, the journal contained numerous articles attacking Ukrainophilism and the use of the Ukrainian language in schools and education.

[83] For an example of these accusations see M. Katkov's editorial in Moskovskie vedomosti, 1863, no. 136 (21 June 1863). Reprinted in M.N. Katkov, 1863 god. Sobranie statei po polskomu voprosu pomeshchavshchikhsia v Moskovskikh Vedomostiakh, Russkom Vestnike i Sovremennoi Letopisi, vol. 1, Moscow, 1887, pp. 273-82. The Jewish journal, Sion, was one of the first to raise the issue of separatism. See R. Serbyn, "The Sion-Osnova Controversy of 1861-1862," Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective, second edition, Edmonton,

warnings and accusations spurred a response in the Ukrainophile and liberal press and journals to the attacks,[84] but also acted to reinforce the growing reaction within government circles.

One of the replies of the Kiev Ukrainophiles was a collectively written manifesto, "Otzyv iz Kieva," published in October 1862 in M. Katkov's supplement to the journal

---

1990, pp. 85-110.

[84] See the articles of Kostomarov, reprinted in Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova, Kiev, 1928. Following the demise of Osnova Ukrainophiles published their replies to attacks in various publications in the Russian Empire, but also in Austrian Galicia, in the newspaper Slovo, and in the newly-founded Ukrainophile journal Meta, beginning in September 1863. For a discussion of the Ukrainian-Russian polemics in the Russian Empire as they related to Galicia and the beginnings of the Ukrainophile movement there see K. Studynsky, "Epizody borotby za ukrainstvo v 1863 p.," Iubileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademyka Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevskoho, vol. 2, Kiev, 1928, pp. 498-523. Antonovych had two poems of his published in Meta, 1863, no. 3. See "Vesniane sontse nad stepamy" and "Z kolyshnoho." Reprinted in V. Antonovych, Tvory, pp. 119-23. The poems were based on Cossack themes. Antonovych had been preparing an article for publication in the early 1860s defending Ukrainophilism against attacks from Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii and Russkii Vestnik, but never completed it. In the article he pointed out that unity of the state did not mean that a levelling of distinctive characteristics of the different peoples of the Empire should be promoted. Within the Russian Empire, there were many tribes and nationalities and provincial differences, even among the same peoples. He suggested that it would be wise policy to give state recognition to Ukrainian, just as it was given to the Finns in Helsinki, the Germans in Dorpat, and to the Poles in Warsaw. Despite the conditions of censorship that existed and his natural cautious nature, this comment clearly indicates that Antonovych was an advocate of cultural autonomy. See "Pro ukrainofiliv ta ukrainofilstvo (Vidpovid na napady Vestnika Iuznoi i Iu.-Z. Rossii), in V. Antonovych, Tvory, pp.131-39. See esp. pp. 136-37.

Russkii vestnik - Sovremennaia letopis.[85] The manifesto, signed by 21 members of the Kiev Hromada, was composed in the summer of 1862 at the home of Chubynsky. Its primary authors were Antonovych, Chubynsky and Zhytetsky.[86] The manifesto was not only a reply to the critics of the Ukrainian movement from the Russian nationalist right, but also a response to the extremist wing of the Russian revolutionary populist movement, specifically to those who supported the manifesto Molodaia Rossiia, written largely by P.G. Zaichnevsky in 1862. In addition, the reply was aimed at the conservative circles of the Polish szlachta. The manifesto is an important document of Ukrainian populism and deserves to be analyzed closely and

---

[85] See "Otzyv iz Kieva," Sovremennaia letopis, 1862, no. 46. Reprinted in D. Bahalii, ed., Materiialy dlia biohrafii V.B. Antonovycha (z pryvodu dvadtsiatoi richnytsi z dnia ioho smerty), Kiev, 1929, pp. 38-48.

[86] See I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada za 60-tykh rokiv," Ukraina, 1928, book 1, p. 98. The editors of Russkii vestnik sent the manifesto, entitled "Obshchestvennye voprosy" to Moscow's censors, who passed it on to the Main Censorship Committee in St. Petersburg. Before permission was given to print it, the manifesto was sent to the Kiev Governor-General Vasilchikov for his opinion. In his reply, Vasilchikov provided some background on the khlopomany, mentioned Antonovych as one of their leaders, and his troubles with the Polish szlachta, which led to his interrogation by a special investigating committee of the governor-general's office in early 1861. Further surveillance of Antonovych, Vasilchikov continued, turned up nothing new. He concluded that the accusations against Antonovych and the khlopomany originated from Polish circles. Yet, he was ambivalent about printing the manifesto. Vasilchikov's letter is cited in N.A. Liubimov, Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov i ego istoricheskaia zasluga, St. Petersburg, 1889. Reprinted in M. Drahomanov, "Do istorii ukrainskoi khlopomanii v 1860-ti rr.," Zhytie i slovo, 1895, book 3, pp. 345-47

cited at length. Antonovych was the first to sign the document, which clearly bears the strong imprint of his views.

Drahomanov regarded the "Otzyv iz Kieva" as an example of the Kiev Ukrainophiles' "apolitical democratism." According to him the manifesto served as the program of Ukrainophilism for a long time after it was published.[87] The historian I. Zhytetsky wrote that the "Otzyv iz Kieva" represented the Kiev Hromada's minimal program, which remained as the foundation of its activities, although it could not satisfy the demands of later periods. One also had to consider, he wrote, that the manifesto had to be composed with care, in order to pass the hurdle of the censors.[88] The Ukrainian historian D. Bahalii commented that in assessing the appearance of the document one has to keep in mind the difficult position of the Ukrainophiles. From the right they were accused of being both haidamaky-buntari (haidamaka rebels) and of being political separatists. The Kiev Hromada stood for organic, evolutionary work for national, socio-economic and spiritual rebirth and renewal. Their major field of work was, first of all, in education, for they believed that without an educated populace it was impossible for the people to understand the need for political freedom nor to demand it. The declaration also contained the Kiev Hromada's observations on the attitudes and

---

[87] M. Drahomanov, "Do istorii ukrainskoi khlopomanii," p. 344.

[88] I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 101.

beliefs the common folk held towards religion, property, the family, and towards nationality, which were essentially conservative. All this brought them into conflict with the political left, the more radical groups, specifically with those who supported revolutionary methods, such as those advocated by the authors of the manifesto Molodaia Rossiia, from which the bulk of the members of the Kiev Hromada conscientiously distanced themselves.[89]

In the opening paragraphs of the declaration, the signatories clearly identified themselves with liberals, whom they described as those critical of contemporary society, who were working to establish new norms to build on for the future. Yet, they distanced themselves from more radical groups, who also had been labelled as liberals, as their activities recently had provoked all of educated society to begin identifying all liberals as radicals. Because of these accusations levelled against them, they felt impelled to openly declare their views and ideals before "the court of society," so that all could see clearly the differences between themselves and the more radical movements, which they themselves condemned as well.

The cornerstone of the beliefs of those members of the Kiev Hromada who composed the "Otzyv iz Kieva" can be described as anarcho-democratic, anti-elitist and anti-Jacobin. No one, they declared, "no individual, nor circle,

---

[89] D. Bahalii, Materiialy, pp. 37-38.

nor group, not even all of the so-called educated sector of society, has the right to impose any theory, whatever it may be, on the overwhelming majority of the people, taking advantage of their underdevelopment and, consequently, of their silence."[90] In their view, the only obligation of educated society was to provide the necessary means for the people to gain an education so that they themselves could finally achieve "self-awareness, [to understand] their own needs, to know how to express them, in a word, by their internal development [to be able to] stand on the same level as that upon which they are entitled to by law." Until the day that the common folk reach that level it would be "vain to think up for them... without their participation, further paths towards progress; all theories, from the English parliamentary system to the most radical socialist trends, in our opinion, are but empty dreams, only vain, dead-end talk..." Accordingly, "real 'friends of the people'" had to work patiently to raise the cultural level of the people in order that the people themselves eventually would be able to understand and discuss subjects that they had no inkling about presently. Therefore, there was no need to discuss these political ideas at present.[91]

---

[90] "Otzyv iz Kieva," pp. 38-39.

[91] "Otzyv is Kieva," pp. 39-40. The principles expressed here were similar to those that Antonovych had expressed earlier in his "Moia ispoved." In a reply to one of Padalitsa's accusations, that he wished to impose his will upon the people, Antonovych replied that this was not his aim.

Having declared that their only aim was to help educate the common folk and work towards the raising of their cultural level, the authors continued that "the education of the people ought to be based on true national foundations..." and that those who wanted to participate in this work had to begin by "thoroughly studying the nation itself." One had to base the educational system and pedagogical approach on a firm understanding of the life of the common folk, and build on those foundations, applying their own educational experience and training to give the common folk, "to the best of our strength and ability, a correct, honest and humane direction.. "[92] The authors here were referring to their belief that in Ukraine education should be in Ukrainian and based on a thorough study of the land and its people in order to develop a scholarly approach towards popular education.

"I may try to the limits of my ability to learn and make known the people's needs, the extent of its development and its requirements. I may promote its education. I would never, however, venture to thrust upon it something I had invented a priori.... The point is that true friends of the people... should recognize that they have neither the right nor the power to lead it anywhere, and that their task is only to assist the people in education and the achievement of self-awareness, whereupon the people will create goals for itself... True friends of the people do not rack their brains over the distant future, but... work for popular education, for the improvement of the peasants' material life, and for the finding of better means for the attainment of specific goals. They would rather make a hundred public confessions that they have erred in their conclusions about some requirement of the people than force upon it something that it does not need nor does not want." "Moia Ispoved," pp. 105-06. These principles were also clearly expressed by Kostomarov in his leter to Hnylosyrov.

[92] "Otzyviz Kieva," pp. 40-41.

The authors then outlined their conclusions about the common folk and their beliefs, based upon their observations, and offered concrete suggestions on the foundations popular education should be based. First of all, the nation was deeply religious. Therefore, popular education, including moral upbringing, had to be based on Christian principles. Secondly, the people recognized the importance of private property in land, and understood that "without it, freedom itself is a soap bubble, a false word..." Therefore, it was important to advise them on how they could legally become property owners. Thirdly, the people held dear their customs and traditions, all that signified their national individuality. Therefore, they concluded, in popular education, one should "respect the peasantry's folkways, ethnographic peculiarities, language and nationality." Fourthly, in social affairs, the populace showed deep respect towards the family. Based on this principle the educational system had to work towards strengthening these ties and then work for extending the principle of respect for the family to respect for the hromada (community or commune).[93]

Having outlined their goals and means, the authors challenged their critics to make known their evidence, or take back their reproaches that had been brought against them. They then outlined the more important charges that had been brought against them specifically, or that were imputed. Of

---

[93] Ibid., p. 41.

these they considered most important the commonly held belief that all groups or circles of young people, including their own, sympathized with the manifesto Molodaia Rossiia. They pointed out that their ideals, goals and means, were opposed to those expressed in Molodaia Rossiia. They accused the authors of Molodaia Rossiia of "sectarian egoism" and of wanting to destroy the moral foundations of the nation. No less harmful were the revolutionary means advocated, which would result in bloodshed, create victims, and place obstacles in the path of those who wanted to do honest work to benefit the common folk. They concluded that the manifesto Molodaia Rossiia was more harmful even than other radical declarations, because "its positions, expressed in such an extreme way, oppose the good of the people, [their] development, and [show the] desire by sudden and bloody means to subject the people to terrorism on a whim, [based on] purely theoretical dreams."[94]

Another accusation that came from local landlords was that the Hromada members were interfering and preventing peasants from negotiating and signing the ustavnye gramoty,[95] and even agitating the peasants to rise up to slaughter the lords.[96] These accusations, the authors claimed, came from

---

[94] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[95] See n. 67 above.

[96] The charge that the khlopomany wanted to promote the slaughter of the lords was one that was often levelled against the Ukrainophiles. In his "Moia ispoved," Antonovych also

both the provincial Right- and Left-Bank nobility, who were generally backward-looking, uncultured, and had opposed the liberation of the serfs. They challenged these lords to bring forward solid evidence to back up their claims. Regarding the implementation of the ustavnye gramoty, the authors of the manifesto claimed that they were interested in the speedy conclusion of this process which they regarded as the first step of the peasantry on the road to full citizenship.[97]

The third accusation was that of separatism. Their accusers, the authors claimed, were "making an elephant out of a fly." They did make a distinction between state separatism, which was political, and national separatism. None of them were interested in politics, they claimed, as all political aspirations, considering the low level of society's development, were not serious and an expression of "juvenile naiveness." On the other hand, they did not deny that if the accusation of separatism meant that they wanted to develop the Ukrainian language and literature, then this indeed was the case. But, this was not a crime, and if other Slavic nationalities, like the Bulgarians, Croats, and Slovenes, were being supported in their attempts to develop their languages, should not the same principles be applied to Ukrainians? How

---

denied the accusations. The Ukrainophiles, he wrote, wanted to provide the common folk with "a conscience and learning", not weapons. "The Gonta of our time," Antonovych remarked, referring to the haidamaka leader, "will be armed with a pen or with rhetorical skills." See "Moia ispoved," p. 109.

[97] "Otzyv iz Kieva," pp. 43-44.

could it be that they alone were being accused of engaging in criminal activities whereas these same activities among the other mentioned nationalities were being praised?[98]

One had to acknowledge reality, they further declared, that the Ukrainian nationality did exist, and that educated people of that nationality, who had studied this question, had become convinced of that fact, and would produce the evidence to prove this to be the case if neeeded. Most importantly, popular education in the native language would be at least "three times quicker and more successful" than in a foreign one. They challenged their detractors to prove they were mistaken in their conclusions.

In the end, the authors acknowledged that their declaration would be unpopular to many. It would not appeal to the "extreme progressivists," who wanted society to make "galvanic leaps forward." They blamed these radicals for provoking the authorities to take measures that put obstacles in the way of their "organic work," in particular the closure of the Sunday schools. They also blamed the radicals for placing them in a situation where they felt forced to respond. On the other hand, the conservative landowners, among whom very few were enlightened, would also be unhappy.[99] Despite attempts by the Hromada members to deflect criticism from themselves and to convince the authorities of their loyalty

---

[98] "Otzyv iz Kieva," pp. 45-46.

[99] Ibid., pp. 47-48.

and their intention to work for the benefit of the people in only legal ways, which was one of the goals of the authors of the "Otzyv iz Kieva," it was becoming clear that administrative pressures and police measures would increase and continue to be used against the Ukrainophiles. The "Otzyv iz Kieva" could not save them from the heavy hand of the state, which was becoming more and more frightened of the seemingly strong growth of the liberal, democratic, radical, and national movements. Although the Polish movement and the most extreme of the radical currents were of greatest concern to the authorities, nevertheless, even the more moderate voices were singled out to be controlled or silenced. In January 1863, an order came from Prince Dolgorukov of the Third Section to Kiev Governor-General Vasilchikov, in which the Hromada's "Otzyv iz Kieva" was mentioned, "to use the necessary means to stop further actions of the mentioned society, which may have the most pernicious consequences, that later anymore will not be able to be corrected."[100]

Sometime in 1864 the Kiev Hromada became a shell of its former self and had virtually ceased all activities. Although it was not disbanded by force, the Hromada's activities, especially in the fields of popular education and the preparation and publication of popular literature, became increasingly circumscribed following the closure of the Sunday schools and the promulgation of the Valuev ukaz. Arrests of

---

[100] Cited by V.Miiakovsky, "Kyivska Hromada," p. 285.

some members and constant attacks by the conservative and reactionary Russian press certainly frightened and discouraged some of its members, which contributed to its inactivity. When Drahomanov returned to Kiev following summer holidays in the fall of 1863 he noted that the Hromada rarely met and soon ceased to meet altogether. Many members had become tied up with personal matters and were looking for work. In line with their populist beliefs, some looked for teaching positions at gymnasiums, while others moved to the country to become land mediators. Drahomanov himself admitted that he also became tied up in his own studies and work.[101]

The historian I. Zhytetsky noted that within the Kiev Hromada there were many members who were lazy and undisciplined, and whose level of national consciousness was low. The Hromada itself had no clearly worked out program. Many of its members completed their university studies by 1863-64 and over half left Kiev then. Remaining Hromada members, however, continued to work, but not on organizing or recruiting new members. Their meetings took on the character of gatherings of friends, although co-operation on various projects in Ukrainian studies were continued and undertaken, such as work on a Ukrainian dictionary, preparation of an almanac, and collecting folk tales.[102]

---

[101] M. Drahomanov, "Avstro-ruski spomyny," p. 160.

[102] I. Zhytetsky, "Kyivska Hromada za 60-tykh rokiv," pp. 124-25.

Antonovych certainly remained involved in the Hromada's activities during the slow years of the mid to latter 1860s, but he also had taken on new responsibilities that took up much of his time. He had married in 1863, and certainly had to plan for future family responsibilities. He had begun teaching Latin in 1860, shortly after being graduated from the university, and had also become a history teacher at the Kiev Cadet School in 1863. Most importantly for his future career as a historian, he had already begun serious work in the Kiev Archive of Old Acts, which was located at Kiev university, while still a student there. Around 1861 he was co-opted into the Kiev Archeographic Commission, an institution in which he worked for many years, eighteen as chief editor of its publications, a position he was appointed to in 1863. According to at least one scholar, his affiliation with this institution also helped shield him from government repression in the early 1860s and even later.[103]

---

[103] The Kiev Archeographic Commission was subordinated to the Kiev governor-general's office. For many years its chairman was M. Iuzefovich, a loyal servant of the Russian state, who had given evidence against Kostomarov back in 1847, when the Cyrillo-Methodian Society was disbanded and its leading members arrested. According to Vasyl Domanytsky, one of Antonovych's students, Iuzefovich was instrumental in hiring Antonovych and protected him from government persecution for six to seven years. See his "Volodymyr Antonovych. Z nahody 45-litnoho iuvyleiu naukovoi i hromadskoi diialnosti," Nova Hromada, 1906, no. 9, p. 38. Part of the mandate of the Archeographic Commission was to publish materials that would substantiate the "Russian character" of the south-west region (iugo-zapadny krai), which consisted of the gubernias of Kiev, Volhynia and Podillia, lands that had been part of the Polish state until late in the 18th century, and where Polish influence remained strong.

Antonovych, as one of a few trained historians, who had an anti-Polish axe to grind, was undoubtably seen as useful to the administration here. See Chapter Five on the Kiev Archeographic Commission.

CHAPTER FIVE

Volodymyr Antonovych's Populist Historiography

The young Ukrainophiles of the 1860s did not limit their cultural work to teaching or preparing and publishing educational materials, popular books and pamphlets for the peasantry. In addition to this work, which was regarded as obligatory, members of the Kiev Hromada decided to work in some other field that would also fit within the parameters of cultural work, broadly defined. It was natural that many of the young intellectuals were attracted to literary and scholarly work. Of his closest friends, Mykhalchuk recalled that Rylsky decided to study questions of socio-economic life,[1] Mykhalchuk himself studied philology,[2] Poznansky went to live in the country among the peasantry to act as their advisor,[3] while Antonovych turned to study history.[4]

---

[1] See the short biography of Rylsky by O. Mytsiuk, Tadei R. Rylsky, Lviv, 1933.

[2] No biography of Mykhalchuk has been written. Although he never completed a degree in philology, Mykhalchuk wrote about a dozen scholarly works, the most important of which concerned the status of the Ukrainian language. See Iu. Shevelov [Iu. Sherekh], Kost Mykhalchuk (21. 12. 1840 - 7. 4. 1914), Winnipeg, 1952. See also O. Tulub, "Nevidomyi avtobiohrafichnnyi lyst K. Mykhalchuka," Ukraina, 1927, book 5, pp. 59-69.

[3] No biography of Poznansky has been written. On his populist views and activities in the country as a scribe and advisor to the peasantry see V. Miiakovsky, "B.S. Poznansky (Narodnyk 60-kh rokiv)," Ukraina, 1926, no. 1, pp. 72-93.

[4] K. Mykhalchuk, "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," p. 222.

Antonovych expressed many of his early, national, social, and political views in two publicistic essays published in 1862: "Moia ispoved" and "Otzyv iz Kieva," the second of which he co-authored. These two essays revealed he was a talented writer and publicist, but it was not as a journalist that he made a career, but as an historian. Antonovych continued to outline and develop his views in historical writings, and it is here that one must search to find and understand them.

Antonovych did not write history to expressly develop or expound upon his national, socio-political and other views, even though many of his works contained them. Nevertheless, to avoid censorship, it was quite common for intellectuals in Russia to express opinions on various contemporary, especially social and political matters in scholarly or semi-scholarly essays published in thick journals, especially on literary topics. It is widely known that the Russian radicals N. Dobroliubov and N. Chernyshevsky wrote literary criticism in which they expressed their political views. Antonovych's historical writings should not be seen as political works disguised as history, nor should one assume that Antonovych's primary aim was to dress his views on society in historical garb. Nevertheless, historical writings provided an outlet for expression of his ideological views.

In addition to the standard censorship imposed on discussions of social and politically sensitive issues, writing on Ukrainian topics was fraught with even more

obstacles. The Valuev ukaz of 1863 directed censors to prohibit publication of religious and popular literature in the Ukrainian language. In addition, an intellectual writing on Ukrainian topics had to be cautious not to invite suspicions of disloyalty or of advocating separatism. Even in the realm of scholarship Antonovych, as a professional historian, could not write on Ukrainian history as such, but only on the history of Southern Russia (Iuzhnaia Rus' or Iuzhnaia Rossiia), or of the South-Western Region (Iugo-zapadnyi Krai). To a person with a highly developed civic consciousness like Antonovych, such repressive conditions, one can suspect, invited him to write history that was tied to contemporary concerns, including national ones.

In Ukrainian historiography, prior to the beginning of Antonovych's career, the historian M. Kostomarov certainly expressed his views quite forcefully in his writings, especially in his historico-publicistic essays. M. Hrushevsky, a student of Antonovych, called Kostomarov "the ideologue of Ukrainian rebirth and liberation..." Even in the context of Russian historiography, Kostomarov's historical writings, Bunt Stenki Razina, Nachalo Edinoderzhaviia, and Lichnost Ivana Groznago, served as "social-revolutionary agitation," which influenced a generation of revolutionary populist youth. Hrushevsky concluded that "his historical and

literary works were fully, from beginning to end, a socio-political action [hromadskoiu aktsiieiu]..."[5]

Antonovych was quite clear on the question of expressing one's convictions in historical writings: "Just as the general moral life of a past society, its beliefs, ethical and civic ideals, wishes, hopes and goals, are shown in literature, in historical writings, political, national and social convictions are especially manifested."[6] Hrushevsky wrote that Antonovych's highly developed socio-political interests had a significant impact on his scholarly work. His scholarly interests were not easily separable from his social, political and national interests, and were dependent on them. Antonovych, Hrushevsky wrote, received many of his impulses for scholarly work from them and in return much of the raw material for his convictions was based on his work as an historian. But he was not a fighter by nature, Hrushevsky concluded, and his views were not boldly illuminated but

---

[5] M. Hrushevsky, "Kostomarov i novitnia Ukraina," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, pp. 3-20, esp. pp. 3-5. Some of Antonovych's historical writings, one can presume, also served as ideological ammunition for Russian revolutionary populists. In searching the apartment of the terrorist revolutionary populist leader A. Zheliabov, the police found a copy of Antonovych's work on the haidamakas. See S.S. Volk, Narodnaia volia 1879-1882, Moscow, 1966, p. 221.

[6] V. Antonovych [P-sk], "Istorychni baiky p. Mariiana Dubetskoho (Z pryvodu pratsi pro pochatok Zaporizhzhia)," in V. Antonovych, Tvory, p. 211.

rather hinted at in his writings.[7] One can conclude that Antonovych felt it was natural for historians to write historical works in which the political, social and national sympathies of the author were evident, and that he did not see this as a problem in historiography. This attitude raises several concerns. If Antonovych believed that the writing of history could reflect contemporary political, social, economic and other beliefs, then one has to ask whether he considered such historiography as objective. One also has to ask the question of what Antonovych felt was the role of historiography in both contemporary as well as future life. One should also try to understand Antonovych's view of the role of the historian in society. Finally, it would be useful to see whether Antonovych defined what he meant by history.

Antonovych did not write on any of these questions in any detail, but he did make a few key comments in some of his

---

[7] M. Hrushevsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych, osnovni idei ioho tvorchosti i diialnosti," Zapysky Ukrainskoho Naukovoho Tovarystva v Kyivi, 1908, book 3. Reprinted in M. Hrushevsky, Volodymyr Bonifatiiovych Antonovych 1834-1908-1984, New York-Munich-Toronto, 1985, pp. 13-14. Who would have guessed, Hrushevsky wrote, that one of his historical essays, based on documents, was also a social satire on a clique that dominated Kiev's city government at the beginning of the 1880s? Ibid., p. 14. The essay referred to is "Kievskie voity Khodyki--epizod iz istorii gorodskago samoupravleniia v Kieve v XVI-XVII stoletiiakh," in V. Antonovych, Monografii po istorii Zapadnoi i Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, vol. 1 (Only volume published), Kiev, 1885, pp. 195-220. When Antonovych's first major study was published in 1863, aide-de-camp Mezentsov reported to Chief of Police Dolgorukov that the work contained hidden meanings ("mezhdustrochnyi smysl"). See F. Savchenko, Zaborona ukrainstva, pp 197-98. The work referred to was "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," AIuZR, part 3, vol. 1, pp. i-cxx.

published writings that provide some answers to the above concerns. In addition, in an unpublished lecture, apparently his inaugural lecture as professor of the chair of Russian history at Kiev university in 1878,[8] he dealt with some of these questions more substantially than just in passing.

In this lecture, Antonovych tied the study of history, especially one's national history, to "the development of the public consciousness of the people...."[9] In a different, published article he wrote: "The true historian knows that history is the [process of] the people achieving self-awareness, and that the more light, truth and scholarship are introduced, the higher, more moral and also the more powerful that nation will become. Spiritual strength develops not from the creation of fantastic tendentious portraits, but from a

---

[8] The notes of this lecture are found in TsNB, Fond I, no. 7895. The file was labelled "Vstupna lektsiia V. Antonovycha, vstupyvshy na kafedru ruskoi istorii." It is not clear when, if ever, Antonovych read this lecture, as I did not find any mention of it in memoiristic literature or in other documents. Antonovych became professor of Russian history at Kiev university in 1878 following the successful defence of his doctoral dissertation. It is also possible that these notes were written as his first university lecture given as a docent in 1870. However, this is not likely. In a memoiristic essay by one of Antonovych's students, in which he recalled Antonovych's first lecture as a docent in the fall of 1870, the description of the topic of the lecture was different. See V. Shcherbyna [Kolyshnii student], "Spomyny kolyshnoho studenta pro Kyivskyi universytet 70-kh rokiv," Nashe mynule, 1919, nos. 1-2, p. 64.

[9] V. Antonovych, "Vstupna lektsiia," TsNB, Fond I, no. 7895, pp. 3-4.

sober, and above all true understanding of one's own past [history]."[10]

Antonovych also discussed the question of the role of the historian and the question of objectivity in some detail in his inaugural lecture. The historian, he wrote, had to strive to maintain objectivity in his work, and that this was most difficult to achieve when writing on one's own nation. Lack of objectivity here would make it difficult to explain the development of the self-consciousness of the nation, which constituted the main task of historical scholarship. The historian of one's own nation was susceptible to becoming either overenthusiastic or oversympathetic, which could lead to "national bragging," or on the other extreme, "to the rejection of the root foundations of national life." The former led to "scholarly romanticism," the latter "to scepticism and alienation from all that which constitutes the achievements of the nation in the past and [which acts as a] deposit of its future life."[11] The historian, he wrote,

---

[10] V. Antonovych, "Kostomarov kak istorik," KS, 1885, vol. 12, book 5, p. xxxiii.

[11] V. Antonovych, "Vstupna lektsiia," pp. 4-5. In a review of the Polish writer Henryk Sienkiewicz's historical novel Ogniem i mieczem on the Cossack-Polish wars, Antonovych expounded on the harm that a writer could cause to his own nation by uncritically praising its past. In his review Antonovych took Sienkiewicz to task for his uncritical attitude toward Polish history. Summing up, Antonovych accused Sienkiewicz of pseudo-patriotism, of praising his nation simply because it was his own. This "false patriotism" rested on Sienkiewicz's refusal to accept criticism of his nation's past, his rejection of irrefutable facts and

should maintain a critical view of the past based on a deep study of the facts, apply in a sober way to the history of a particular nation the general laws of development common to mankind, and conscientiously take into consideration "particular conditions of that nation's life, under which these general laws operated and acted."[12]

Having emphasized the importance of objectivity in scholarship, Antonovych tried to square the circle between objectivity and an engaged attitude towards the subject matter. In his argument Antonovych distinguished between "impartiality and impassivity. To demand tameness from a historian," he continued, "the absence of personal convictions, indifference in relating to one's own nationality, would mean the degradation of scholarship, and together with this [would] demand [that which is] insufficient and impossible. In opposition to this, I am convinced that, remaining objective, rejecting a priori conceptions and passions, the historian not only does not repudiate his rights

---

justification of the ugly sides of Polish history. By taking such a position, Antonovych wrote, the writer harms his own society by placing impediments in the way of popular self-awareness, which could lead to the repetition of mistakes of the past as well as to stagnation, rather than progress. Sienkiewicz praised all of those historical ills, Antonovych continued, that were the cause of the political, social and cultural fall of Poland: national exclusiveness, arbitrariness of the szlachta, disdain towards the peasantry and the tendency to use brutal force to quell dissent. See V. Antonovych, "Polsko-russkie sootnosheniia XVII v. v sovremennoi polskoi prizme," in V. Antonovych, Tvory, p. 193.

[12] V. Antonovych, "Vstupna lektsiia," pp. 5-6.

to his personal convictions and sympathies, but, on the contrary, forges and fixes them on a solid factual background by way of strict scholarly analysis."[13]

Even strong patriotic feelings could be reconciled with objectivity, Antonovych continued, as long as these were based on conscious convictions and not passions: "If a calm relationship to the topic studied obliges the historian not to bypass, hide, and twist facts, if it compels him to carefully verify the conclusions and theses reached from facts, then it also prompts him - if the veracity of these [conclusions and theses] have become obvious to him - to relate to [these] past events with warm sympathy or with serious disapproval. In this way, in the study of the history of the fatherland, one who studies it not only may hold the natural feeling of love one has to his native land, but should expand it and base [it] on the solid foundation of criticism and knowledge. A historian should be a patriot, but his patriotism should not be [based on] a blind motive of natural feelings; it should be the conscious conviction of a mature man."[14]

Antonovych continued that retaining objectivity was even more difficult and more important when the history of one's nation was particularly dramatic. It was also difficult to remain objective when events studied were from the recent past. Here he made a distinction between Ukrainian and

---

[13] Ibid., p. 6.

[14] Ibid., p. 7.

Russian history. "Whereas a historian looking at the history of northeast Rus' [Russia] concentrates his attention on the centuries-long effort of the people to establish a strong state organism and a large territory that would serve as the lever for that organism, and can, calmly, step by step, search for the fulfillment of those efforts, in south-west Rus'[Ukraine], the main historical interest is concentrated on the stubborn three-centuries long struggle, by which the people defended the existence of all of the basic principles of their way of life. Studying Russian history in southern Russian lands [Ukraine], we cannot forget that we are standing on ground soaked with the blood of long lines of generations of families, who laid down their lives in desperate struggle for their national and social convictions. To forget this is made even more difficult because the last echoes of this struggle took place in the recent past."[15]

Antonovych now linked the study of the past with patriotic civic and moral activity in the present, binding the past with the present in an appeal to his students to continue the work of their forefathers. "This last circumstance," he continued, "if it hinders the researcher of the fatherland's history, then together with this it also points to a more useful and more direct benefit of the subject he is giving an account of. If the centuries-long struggle in our land has come to an end, in the strict factual sense, then it has by no

---

[15] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

means subsided in the moral and civic [spheres]. Each educated representative of the Russian nation in the southern Russian lands [Ukraine] will for a long time to come yet continue - through peaceful, civic activities - that struggle which his forefathers began with arms in their hands. This last episode of the people's struggle will end that much sooner and will be that much more successful the more each Russian citizen of that land will be filled with the conviction of the righteousness of his nation's cause, based on a conscientious study of the historical fate of his people."[16] For Antonovych then, the study and writing of history was inseparably linked to his convictions and served a useful purpose in the present as a guide to civic action.

Antonovych's early socio-political views were, in some part at least, a consequence of his own personal experiences, especially his firsthand observations of the unequal and unjust relations between the Polish szlachta and the Ukrainian peasantry.[17] One must also consider the effect of the literature of the French Enlightenment, from which he learned about democracy and other modern socio-political theories and concepts. This exposure to the literature of the French Enlightenment reinforced and refined the undeveloped democratic and justice-seeking feelings that were awakened in him as a child. Armed with modern and progressive ideas he

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[17] See his "Memuary," esp. pp. 38-39.

imbibed in Odessa, even before he entered university, Antonovych wrote that he had begun to consider how he could plant these democratic theories in the soil of his homeland. Antonovych concluded that the democratic element in the country was the peasantry, which was Ukrainian, and that one had to combine the ideas of democracy with knowledge about Ukraine and its people. This conviction led him to his ethnographic and fact-finding expeditions into the countryside as well as to the study of Ukrainian history. Antonovych wrote that scholarship, especially the study of history, confirmed these basic ideas.[18]

After he entered university, perhaps even before, Antonovych must have read the writings of the Polish romantic historian J. Lelewel.[19] There can be no doubt that Lelewel's ideas, as expressed in his historical works, influenced Antonovych's view of history. Lelewel promoted the development of democracy and social justice in his writings, which were, at least in part, aimed at stimulating the rebirth of national consciousness among the Polish intelligentsia.

In his historical writings Lelewel idealized the ancient Slavs, who, in his view, retained the principles of equality, freedom, and of communal democracy (gminowladztwo) longer than

---

[18] Ibid., p. 40.

[19] Ibid., p. 102. Antonovych told one of his students that Lelewel (1786-1861) was a very popular historian among Polish democratic youth. See A.V. Verzilov, "Vospominaniia o V.B. Antonoviche," Trudy Chernigovskoi Uchenoi Arkhivnoi Komisii, 1908, book 7, prilozheniia, p. 100.

Western European peoples. He especially idealized the Polish nation, who possessed a unique national spirit characterized by freedom, equality, brotherhood and citizenship. The carriers of these qualities were the Polish szlachta, who also, however, imbibed foreign ideas and were corrupted by them. These foreign elements included feudalism and Catholicism. This corruption was a factor in Poland's loss of independence. To regain it, Lelewel argued, the szlachta had to purge itself of foreign influences, return to the ancient principles of communal democracy that composed the Polish national spirit, and extend these ideals to the rest of Polish society, specifically the peasantry and townsfolk. Lelewel also wrote the first social history of Poland, which may have inspired Antonovych to pay attention to social history.[20]

The writings of the romantic Ukrainian ethnographer and historian M. Maksymovych also made their impact. In a speech delivered at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of Maksymovych's scholarly activity in 1871, Antonovych recognized Maksymovych as one of the founders of Ukrainian historiography and noted that younger historians, like

---

[20] See J.S. Skurnowicz, Romantic Nationalism and Liberalism: Joachim Lelewel and the Polish National Idea, Boulder, Co. 1981. See especially the chapter "Lelewel's Interpretation of Polish History." See also M. Hrushevsky, "Z sotsialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," Ukraina, book 5, 1928, pp. 9, 12, n. 1.

himself, looked to follow in his footsteps.[21] Maksymovych can be considered as one of the early Ukrainian natioanl awakeners; he was important as a symbol to the younger scholars. His contributions to Ukrainian historiography, although notable, were not among those that significantly influenced Antonovych's fundamental views on history in general, and on Ukrainian history in particular.[22]

Two other Ukrainian historians certainly influenced Antonovych's views signifantly. One of them was Mykola Ivanyshev, who was a professor of law at Kiev university; the other was Kostomarov.

It has already been mentioned that in the late 1850s and early 1860s Kostomarov's writings, especially those historico-publicistic essays published in Osnova in 1861-62, influenced greatly a whole generation of young Ukrainophiles of the

---

[21] See Iubilei Mykhaila Aleksandrovicha Maksimovicha (1821-1871), Kiev, 1871, p. 46. In notes prepared for his inaugural lecture, Antonovych called Maksymovych the Nestor of Ukrainian historiography. See "Vstupna lektsiia V.B. Antonovycha," TsNB, Fond I, no. 7895, p. 2. See also Antonovych's "N.I. Kostomarov kak istorik," KS, 1885, vol. 12, no. 5, p. 31. Maksymovych was a naturalist-botanist by training and more a philologist and literary historian than a professional historian. He wrote many short historical articles which showed his his talent as a critic, but did not write any monographs. See S. Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych. Ioho diialnist na poli istorychnoi nayky. (Z nahody iuvileiu)., Lviv, 1906, pp. 5-6. See also D. Doroshenko, A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography, pp. 119-23.

[22] Maksymovych's reviews of Antonovych's first published historical work on the origins of the Ukrainian Cossacks were one notable exception where his critiques caused Antonovych to revise his views somewhat on a question of importance. See n. 67 below.

1860s.[23] One historian wrote that, from the older generation of Ukrainian historians, the romantic historian Kostomarov influenced Antonovych most, especially the latter's principal views on history and major historical ideas.[24] Antonovych generally approved of Kostomarov's populist approach to writing history, which was based on a sympathetic portrayal of the common folk and a critical approach to rulers, leaders, the traditional upper classes and states.[25]

---

[23] See Chapter Four.

[24] S. Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 63.

[25] Antonovych did not write in any detail on his predecessors or contemporaries in Ukrainian historiography. The one exception was a lengthy obituary of Kostomarov. Antonovych commended Kostomarov for writing on previously untouched topics and for his almost exclusive reliance on primary sources, which, Antonovych generously claimed, Kostomarov subjected to strict criticism. Kostomarov, Antonovych wrote, believed in the spiritual strength of the people and often wrote on themes where the national spirit of the people was most clearly manifested. Antonovych praised Kostomarov as a historian who was not afraid of subjecting to criticism national heroes or sanctified interpretations, even when this was personally painful, if evidence warranted such criticism. He approved of Kostomarov's use of ethnographic materials, pointing out that Kostomarov recognized ethnography as an auxilliary discipline to history. Kostomarov's mistakes, Antonovych noted, were made in good faith, and he was ready to admit to them if proven wrong, or if he himself independently recognized them as mistaken. See his "Kostomarov kak istorik," KS, 1885, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. xxvi-xxxiv. Antonovych's comments on Kostomarov were laudatory and basically uncritical. It is generally acknowledged today that Kostomarov's studies suffered from lack of criticism in his selection and use of sources, in his somewhat superficial analyses, and romantic ideology, which coloured his writings. See S. Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 6. See also J. Iwanus, "Democracy, Federalism and Nationality: Ukraine's Medieval Heritage in the Thought of N.I. Kostomarov," Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1986, esp. pp. 99-101.

Kostomarov's emphases on the role of the medieval village and town assemblies of Kievan Rus' (viche), and consequently, of the importance of the idea of democracy and self-government in Kievan Rus', his interpretation of the federal nature of the Kievan Rus' state, his belief that Ukrainians were the true continuators of the Kievan Rus' heritage in the form of the Ukrainian Cossacks, and that there was continuity in the national ideals and socio-political organizations of Ukrainians from Kievan Rus' to the Cossack period, were all accepted by Antonovych as legitimate postulates.[26]

In his historical writings, Antonovych upheld the thesis that a people or nation stood for, embodied, or represented certain principles or a national ideal(s), and that the national character or spirit of a particular nation was based on these principles.[27] Antonovych basically accepted Kostomarov's hypotheses, as expressed in some detail in "Dve russkiia narodnosti," of the existence of national types that were formed back in prehistoric times. This is strikingly

---

[26] See the discussion of Kostomarov's historical views as they related to the medieval history of the East Slavs in J. Iwanus, "Democracy, Federalism and Nationality." See also D. Papazian, "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov," esp. pp. 309-415. The historian O. Hermaize wrote that the idea of the realization in the present or future of those ideals or goals that manifested themselves consistently throughout Ukrainian history were for the first time expressed by Kostomarov in his historico-publicistic writings. For Kostomarov then, history had a meaning that was useful for society and even political. See his "V.B. Antonovych v ukrainskii istoriohrafii," Ukraina, book 5, 1928, p 18.

[27] This is discussed in detail below, especially as it applies to Ukrainian history.

evident when comparing this essay of Kostomarov, published in 1861, with Antonovych's essay "Try natsionalni typy narodni," published much later in 1888.[28]

In his essay Antonovych tried to characterize and compare three national types: the Ukrainians, Russians and Poles.[29] He concluded that although the three nations were neighbours and Slavs, because of anthropological differences as well as the influence of geographic, historical, and other factors, they were now more different from one another than similar.[30] In the important area of political life, he concluded that Ukrainians were characterized by a love for truth, civic equality, and justice;[31] the Russians by respect for authority and the willingness to bend before it; the Poles by

---

[28] M. Kostomarov, "Dve russkiia narodnosti," Osnova, 1861, no. 2. Reprinted in Sobranie sochinenii, vol. 1, pp. 33-65. V. Antonovych [Nyzenko], "Try natsionalni typy narodni," Pravda, 1888, vyp. 3, pp. 157-69. Reprinted in Tvory, pp. 196-210. See also the unfinished essay of Antonovych, "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," Tvory, pp. 238-50, esp. pp. 240-46. S. Tomashivsky noted that Antonovych modified and expanded on, and in certain areas merely repeated Kostomarov's views in this essay. See his, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 58-59, 63. See also Drahomanov's critique in "Chudatski dumky pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu," LPP, vol. 2, Kiev, 1970, p. 352.

[29] In this essay Ukrainians were judged by Antonovych to have more admirable qualities than either the Russians or Poles.

[30] V. Antonovych, "Try natsionalni typy," p. 198.

[31] These ideals, Antonovych wrote, manifested themselves in the old medieval Slavic assembly (viche), in the Cossack assembly (rada), especially in the Zaporozhian Sich, where all its members were free and equal. V. Antonovych, "Try natsionalni typy," p. 205.

aristocratism.[32] Regarding ethics, which Antonovych viewed as particularly important, he was extremely laudatory of Ukrainians, for whom, he concluded, all that was ethical was equated to that which was just; Russians, on the other hand, regarded that which was strong as ethical; the Poles that which was pleasing.[33]

Despite the undoubtedly significant influence of Kostomarov on the development of Antonovych's views on history, the latter's basic populist convictions were arrived at independently of Kostomarov's writings, especially his views on Polish-Ukrainian relations, a theme Antonovych devoted most of his historical writings to. One can conclude that Kostomarov's writings reinforced and added to Antonovych's views. The two historians were, after all, contemporaries, although Kostomarov was from the preceding generation and began his career earlier; yet, many of Kostomarov's works were written after Antonovych had already begun his professional career as a historian, and had already formed and expressed his basic historical views.[34]

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 204-05.

[33] Ibid., pp. 209-10. Antonovych did not hold the view that national characters, or leading ideals of a nation, were immutable. A nation, and individuals themselves, he wrote, inherited certain features. But, characteristics were also formed, based on those inherited, in that nation's history, and in its cultural and historical upbringing. Ibid., p. 197.

[34] Extant published correspondence between Kostomarov and Antonovych is scant and brief. In one letter Kostomarov praised Antonovych as the only person in Russia who was capable of properly judging a historical work written on

One of the major differences between Antonovych and Kostomarov was that Antonovych concentrated his research and writing on the history of social groups and estates, whereas Kostomarov wrote on large part, political history. In Antonovych's view, history illustrated and clarified the development of social processes.[35] This interest in social history could have been first stimulated by Lelewel's works, but was more probably a result of Antonovych's work under the direction of the other Ukrainian historian who had a considerable influence upon his development as a scholar as well as on his historical views: Mykola Ivanyshev, who was a jurist by training, but a historian by calling.[36]

Ivanyshev, who was Antonovych's primary teacher and scholarly advisor to 1863, is much less well known than Kostomarov or Maksymovych, yet, nevertheless, can be considered, along with Maksymovych, as one of the founders of

---

Ukraine. See his letter to Antonovych of 7 March 1883 in S. Iefremov, "Z lystiv Kostomarova do Antonovycha," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, p. 78.

[35] O. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych v ukrainskii istoriohrafii," pp. 29-30.

[36] Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 64-65. One could postulate that Antonovych's interest in social history was also influenced by positivist theories, although Ivanyshev's influence here appears to be decisive. On Ivanyshev see A.V. Romanovich-Slavatinsky, Zhizn i deiatelnost N.D. Ivanisheva, St. Petersburg, 1876, esp. pp. 203-67. See also V.S. Ikonnikov, ed. and comp., Biograficheskii Slovar professorov i prepodavatelei Universiteta Sv. Vladimira (1834-1884), Kiev, 1884, pp. 207-24. The information on Ivanyshev in the text below is based largely on the latter two works.

modern Ukrainian historiography and archeology. In 1836 he was sent abroad by the Russian government to prepare for a law professorship at the newly-opened Kiev university. Ivanyshev's interest in Slavic studies, however, led him to Prague, where he became acquainted with the Czech scholars and national awakeners P. Safarik, J. Jungman, F. Palacky and V. Hanka. Here he studied Slavic antiquities, languages and law, under Palacky, but more intensely and closely under Hanka, who taught him paleography. Upon his return to Russia in 1838 Ivanyshev was appointed to the law faculty at Kiev university.[37]

However, Ivanyshev was more a historian than a jurist. His historical work was tied to his involvement with the Kiev Archeographic Commission, which he helped found, and where he worked for over 20 years: as editor of juridical documents, chief editor, and vice-chairman. The Archeographic Commission, attached to the Kiev Governor-General's office, was established in part for political purposes: to collect and publish documents that would show that Right-Bank lands were not Polish in character, but Russian.[38]

---

[37] Ivanyshev served as the dean of that faculty for many years, and also became the first elected rector of the university in 1862, a post he held for three years.

[38] On the history of the Kiev Archeographic Commission see O.I. Levytsky, Piatdesiatiletie Kievskoi Komissii dlia razbora drevnikh aktov (1843-1893 g.). Istoricheskaia zapiska o eia deiatelnosti, Kiev, 1893. See also "Svedeniia o deiatelnosti Kommissii dlia razbora drevnikh aktov," in Sbornik statei i materialov po istorii Iugo-zapadnoi Rossii, Kiev, 1911, vyp. 1, part 3, pp. 1-20. Despite the overtly

Ivanyshev became the driving force behind the Commission's work. He recognized that the Early Record Books (aktovi knyhy), which consisted largely of local court and municipal record books, were of inestimable value to the study of the history of Right-Bank Ukraine of the 15th through 18th centuries. Ivanyshev organized and participated in paleographic expeditions to collect these books as well as other documents, and was the driving force behind the establishment of the Kiev Central Archive of Old Record Books (Tsentralnyi arkhiv davnykh aktovykh knyh) at Kiev University in 1852, which became the repository of these documents.[39] In 1857-58, Ivanyshev devised a plan according to which the documents would be organized and published in eight (later seven) parts or series, each part on one general topic. A series could have an unlimited number of volumes, each dedicated to a narrower theme within the framework of the more general topic. Each volume of documents was to be preceded by a lengthy introduction that would describe and analyze the documents selected for publication. These introductions could by themselves stand as monographs.

Ivanyshev was the first to utilize the old record books in his own historical works, primarily on two topics:

---

political mandate of the Commission, it became an important vehicle for Ukrainian historical scholarship.

[39] On the Kiev Central Archive of Old Record Books, see the unpublished introductory essay by P.K. Grimsted for the forthcoming I.D.C. microfiche edition: Opis aktovoi knigi Kievskogo Tsentralnogo Arkhiva.

investigations of 15th to 17th century peasant communal public courts (kopni sudy), and the process of the Catholization and Polonization of the old Rus' nobility.[40] In his work on public courts, Ivanyshev concluded that these institutions were remnants of the peasant communal system of self-government, rooted in old viche traditions - traditions that were vigorously defended by the communes in the face of Polish efforts to destroy them. In his work on the old Rus' nobility, Ivanyshev showed that young Rus' noblemen, educated by the Jesuits, were prone to renounce their ancestral faith and their native language, and soon came to look upon those who had retained these attributes with scorn. He concluded that, as a result of of the defection of the Rus' nobility from their nationality, the internal moral ties that bound the them to the common folk were thus broken; all that remained, therefore, were the external, or legal ties. The Khmelnytsky revolt broke these last ties and showed that the people held no affection for those who had broken with their ancestral faith and foresworn their nationality.[41]

---

[40] The results of Ivanyshev's investigations on the peasant commune (obschchina in Russian; hromada in Ukrainian) were published as "O drevnikh selskikh obshchinakh v iugozapadnoi Rossii," Russkaia beseda, 1857, vol. 3, book 7, otd. 2, pp. 1-57. Ivanyshev's investigations on the Rus' nobility were published as "Svedeniia o nachale Unii," Russkaia beseda, 1858, vol. 3, book 11, otd. 2. pp. 1-61. Russkaia beseda was an organ of the Slavophiles.

[41] Ivanyshev's study on the nobility appeared as a monograph in 1860 and as the introductory essay "Soderzhanie postanovlenii dvorianskikh provintsialnikh seimov v Iugozapadnoi Rossii," AIuZR, part 2, vol. 1, Kiev, 1861, pp.

Under Ivanyshev's direction Antonovych became acquainted with the holdings of the Kiev Central Archive of Old Acts while he was still a student at the university.[42] One can assume that he taught Antonovych paleography. Ivanyshev, no doubt, was also instrumental in hiring Antonovych to work for the Kiev Archeographic Commission in 1862 as editor of part 3 of AIuZR, on the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks.[43] Shortly thereafter, in April 1863, Ivanyshev resigned as chief editor and Antonovych was chosen in his place, a position he held until 1880.

---

xv-lxiv. In this study Ivanyshev showed that in the resolutions of the provincial diets (seimiki), the western Rus' noblemen identified themselves as belonging to the Rus' nation, regardless of religion, but that greater numbers of Catholics soon began to call themselves Poles. He concluded that the Lublin Union of 1569 changed the character of the relationship among Poland, Lithuania and Rus', which had been a federal alliance. Now that Rus' was attached to Poland as a province, the Polonized element became stronger, and more Catholicized noblemen began to refer to themselves as Poles. Ivanyshev concluded that these Rus' noblemen thus cut their ties with the Rus' people and forfeited all rights to act as their representatives.

[42] I. Kamanin, who studied under Antonovych and who later worked in the Kiev Central Archive for many years, wrote that Antonovych began work there while a student in the late 1850s. See his "Trudy V.B. Antonovicha po istorii Kozachestva," Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora letopistsa, 1909, book 21, otd. 1, vyp. 1-2, p. 44.

[43] Antonovych received 75 rubles in March 1862 for editorial work on volume 1 of this series. See M. Tkachenko, "Arkheohrafichni studii Volodymyra Antonovycha," Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi zbirnyk, 1930, vol. 3, p. 332. See also A.V. Romanovich-Slavatinsky, Zhizn i deiatelnost N.D. Ivanisheva, p. 246.

Ivanyshev's influence then was especially evident in the direction that Antonovych's research work took, as well as in methodology, especially in the area of primary source materials with which he worked. Antonovych was also Ivanyshev's student, becoming a profesional historian under his direction. Finally, Ivanyshev's own historical writings, although few in number, clearly influenced some of Antonovych's conclusions, especially on the importance of the peasant commune and its traditions of self-government. This is especially evident in Antonovych's first scholarly publication in AIuZR. This volume, which contains documents on the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks from 1500-1648 and Antonovych's lengthy introduction, was published in 1863.[44]

Before turning to an examination of this work and other writings in which Antonovych expressed his views on the history of Ukraine, it would be useful to summarize his general conclusions on universal historical processes. Antonovych saw this process as the unfolding or development of certain primary or primordial forces, principles, or leading ideas. The process of the development of these forces included their interrelations, encounters and struggles with one another and the reworking of these ideas. According to Antonovych, each nation in its political life had its own leading idea, which was dependent in part on anthropological

---

[44] V. Antonovych, ed. and introduction, AIuZR, part 3, vol. 1, Kiev, 1863. The introduction was entitled "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648 god."

characteristics, in part on geographic conditions and other elements related to its territory, as well as on historical experiences, cultural developments and other factors. Once this idea had appeared on the historical stage it was subjected to various influences, impediments, at times it was thwarted, or it developed rapidly and flowered. The process of the fruition of this major idea is the historical process itself. Individuals could not act outside of the bounds of what was possible within a given historical epoch and were restricted by the leading idea, the carriers of which were not individuals but social groups. This was why social history - to Antonovych the study of social groups and their interrelations - was so important. The social life of a nation was dependent on the leading idea, but also on the consciousness of the people, their cultural level and education. Only when a high cultural level, including a well developed system of popular education was achieved, could the leading idea be realized; attempts to implement the idea when the cultural level of the population was still low inevitably led to failure.[45]

---

[45] O. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych v ukrainskii istoriohrafii," pp. 20-21. The fruition of the major idea can be interpreted as the process of the achievement of self-awareness or consciousness. According to one of Antonovych's students, M.V. Dovnar-Zapolsky, Antonovych's point of departure in his historical understanding was the actions in history of certain principles, some of which become imbedded in the national psyche and become a part of that nation's character. Other factors could influence the historical process and even change it profoundly, such as external factors, even geographical. The essence of the historical

Antonovych did not write any general surveys or syntheses of Ukrainian history. His more important writings were monographs on well-defined topics that were limited in their scope. Although he expressed views on particular aspects of Ukrainian history in many works, in two studies in particular, he described in some detail his conclusions on more long-term and universal historical processes.[46]

Many of Antonovych's writings fall into the very broad category of Polish-Ukrainian relations from the 16th to the 18th centuries. Hrushevsky wrote that all of Antonovych's historical writings, with some exceptions, were "an act of accusation of historical Poland, of its all-powerful rule of the szlachta estate and enslavement of the stateless peoples."

---

process consisted in the struggle of these principles, which created new forms of life, such as social and state structures. See his "Istoricheskie vzgliady V.B. Antonovicha," Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora-letopistsa, 1909, book 21, otd. 1, vyp. 1-2, pp. 31-32. See also V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, 3rd ed., Winnipeg-Dauphin, Manitoba, 1971, p. 1. Reprint of V. Antonovych, Besidy pro chasy kozatski na Ukraini, Chernivtsi, 1897. This survey of Cossack history is based on a course of private lectures Antonovych gave in 1895-96. The lectures were written down by his students and published without Antonovych's knowledge or permission and therefore, this source has to be treated with some caution. See D. Antonovych [D.A.], "Deshcho pro 'Vyklady pro kozatski chasy na Vkraini' ta pro istorychni pohliady prof. Antonovycha," in Ibid., p. xvi.

[46] The first was his study on the origins of the Cossacks: "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648 god." The second was his survey of Cossack history: Korotka istoriia kozachchyny. The two works represent Antonovych's views at two important periods of his life: at the outset of his career and towards the end of it. Although he modified some of his interpretations, the basic contours of his views expressed in both works remained fairly constant.

[47] Antonovych generally avoided the thorny problem of Russo-Ukrainian relations. Hrushevsky wrote that Antonovych was frightened of what he saw as typically representative of the Russian national spirit: its savage power, coarseness, cult of authoritarianism and violence. He was frightened of it in both everyday life as well as in its manifestations in history. Antonovych did not like to touch on the subject of Russo-Ukrainian relations because he could not express himself freely, nor did he wish to participate in expressing forced compliments.[48]

Most of the writings touching on Polish-Ukrainian relations concentrated on examining the Cossacks, townspeople, the peasantry, the szlachta, and religious problems. Antonovych also wrote on the period of Lithuanian rule in Ukraine, from the late 13th to the 16th century, as well as on the earlier Kievan Rus' period, although here he did not write any specialized monograph. Nevertheless he made his views known on all of these periods of Ukrainian history, on

---

[47] M. Hrushevsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych," p. 18.

[48] See Hrushevsky's "Z sotsiialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," p. 7. In those few works where he did express opinions on Russians, they were generally very unsympathetic. In addition to his unflattering portrayal of the Russian national type in his "Try natsionalni typy," in another article he summarized the negative, even racist views on Russian literature of the Spanish positivist philosopher and critic Pompeyo Gener. See his "Lyst podorozhnoho," Pravda, 1889, pp. 478-81. Reprinted in Tvory, pp. 228-31. See M. Drahomanov's critical comments on this article in "Chudatski dumky pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu," in pp. 313-14, 334.

relations among the three nations, and on relations between social groups. The summaries and analyses of Antonovych's views that follow will indicate his more general views on Ukrainian history, including his views on social groups and on relations among the Poles, Ukrainians and Lithuanians. His opinions on crucial events, on individuals who played a critical role in Ukrainian history as well as his views on the state will be addressed.

Antonovych's point of departure in his interpretation of Ukrainian history was his belief that the communal principle was the dominant or leading idea in Ukrainian history. According to Antonovych, the communal principle incorporated the ideas of wide-ranging, participatory democracy, equal political rights and equality of social status.[49] Ukrainians

---

[49] Fascination with and scholarly study of communal institutions in the old Slavic world, as well as its contemporary manifestations, were fairly widespread among Russian, Ukrainian and Polish intellectuals. Among Russians, both the conservative Slavophiles, like A. Khomiakov and K. Aksakov, as well as radicals like A. Herzen and N. Chernyshevsky, idealized the Russian peasant commune. Antonovych's praise of communal traditions in Ukraine can be viewed as falling within this broad spectrum. However, in Antonovych's view as well as in those of Kostomarov and other Ukrainian populists, the Ukrainian commune (hromada) differed greatly from the Russian commune (obshchina or mir).

According to Kostomarov, the Ukrainian commune was a voluntary association; each member within it was independent and a property owner. The Ukrainian commune existed for the purpose of upholding collective security and for the mutual benefit of its members. The Russian commune, on the other hand, was an instrument that imposed its general will upon all members, thereby becoming an instrument of authoritarian rule, and was collectivist in nature. The greatest difference between the two, according to Kostomarov, was that the Ukrainian owned his property as an individual, whereas in Russia, the commune, not individuals, owned the land.

were never able to fully realize this ideal, but always, if even instinctively, moved towards it. In the Kievan Rus' era this principle was manifested in the _viche_, in religious life by the election of church officials, and in the village communes by people's courts. This ideal was most clearly and vividly expressed in the Cossack period, especially in the Zaporozhian Sich and in the Cossack _rada_.[50]

Kostomarov remarked that as long as a man did not own the land he worked he was not a free man. See his "Dve russkiia narodnosti," pp. 60-62. This view on the Ukrainian peasantry's support of private landholdings is also expressed in the Kiev _Hromada_'s "Otzyv iz Kieva," p. 41. See also Antonovych's comparisons of Russian and Ukrainian voluntary associations in "Try natsionalni typy," p. 204. Russian radicals, by and large, stressed the collectivist features of the commune, interpreting it as the embryo around which a future native Russian socialist order could be built. This idea figured strongly in the ideology of Russian revolutionary populism. The conservative Moscow Slavophiles interpreted the collectivist nature of the Russian peasant commune as a manifestation of the social consciousness of the Russian people, but saw this as a positive feature from a conservative romantic point of view. Ukrainian intellectuals, like Kostomarov and Antonovych, stressed the democratic character, voluntary nature of the association, as well as the political powers and traditions of the communal assemblies. On the Moscow Slavophiles see A. Walicki, _The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth Century Russian Thought_, trans. by H. Andrews-Rusiecka, Oxford, 1975. On the Russian revolutionary populist movement see F. Venturi, _Roots of Revolution_. See especially I. Berlin's "Introduction," pp. vii-xxx. There is no monograph on the Ukrainian populist movement.

[50] V. Antonovych, _Korotka istoriia kozachchyny_, p. 3. Antonovych claimed that among Russians the principle of the authority of the state in the form of absolutism was so revered that Russians even sacrificed their own personal liberty for that ideal. This enabled them to build a great state and subordinate many nations to it, even those with opposing ideals. The ideal of the Poles was the principle of aristocracy, not in its classical form but as democratic aristocratism, or szlachta democracy. _Ibid._, pp. 2-3.

Antonovych believed that there were three forces or ideas within the body politic of Kievan Rus'that struggled among themselves to assert pre-eminence: the commune, the prince's retinue (druzhyna), and the prince himself. The dominant principle of national life was the communal, the commune representing the native Slavic element among the three groups. Its main features were: the recognition of the principle of equality of all of its members, the settling of both internal and external matters, including legal questions of a criminal or civil nature, at communal assemblies, where all members could attend, express their views and participate in decision-making. Before the princes arrived, Kievan Rus', he concluded, had been a society of communes, where cities and towns were centres of communal assemblies. The prince's retinue represented a diametrically opposed force to the commune (its antithesis), a foreign element, that based its strength and position on force of arms and personal service to the prince. It represented the power of the individual and his striving to rise above others. All powers that were appropriated by the druzhyna were at the expense of the commune and its rights. The struggle between these two groups and principles, in their various forms, constituted, according to Antonovych, the main theme of the history of Ukraine.[51]

---

[51] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648 god.," pp. 2-3, and his "Izsledovanie o gorodakh iugo-zapadnago kraia," in his Monografii, p. 136. See also M. Dovnar-Zapolsky, "Istoricheskie vzgliady V.B. Antonovicha," p. 26.

The prince, as the third power, stood between the commune and druzhyna, but, with time, the princes gave more rights and privileges to his retinue in order to gain their support to increase his revenues and powers. The retinue's members eventually became landed aristocrats (boiary). The communes, under attack, split into village and city communes, the latter retaining strong enough powers to be able to influence the prince and in some cases even to control him, whereas the village communes began falling under the control of the aristocrats, who exploited them. The aristocratic element was most firmly established in western Rus', especially in Galicia. The princes Roman and Danylo were temporarily able to check the rise in their power but, in 1340, the boiary allowed the Polish king, Kazimierz, to annex Galicia, thereby gaining the powerful rights of Polish noblemen, which in turn helped them deal a death blow to communal rights in Galicia.[52]

In the rest of Ukraine, Antonovych wrote, social development was frozen as a result of the Mongol conquest. The stronger and wealthier aristocrats fled the central Dnieper region to the north and west. Ukraine's "centre of life" was transferred to Galicia and Volhynia. With some exceptions, only the communes remained in the central regions; they slowly resettled formerly devastated areas and joined with what remained of city communal organizations. Although

---

[52] "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," pp. 3-9.

they paid a tribute to the Mongols, they retained their old communal forms of self-government.[53]

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 9-11. The transfer of the centre of Rus' political life to Galicia and the affirmation of the continuity of organized human activity and political life, and therefore of history, in the Kiev region following the Mongol devastation of Kiev of 1240, can be regarded as two central tenets of what can be called the Ukrainian interpretation of medieval history of the Eastern Slavs.

Antonovych contributed one significant work to a long-running historiographical debate between Ukrainian and Russian historians (then known as the debate between the northerners and the southerners), which still has not been settled to this day. The controversy concerned the question of which nationality lived in Kiev and the surrounding region before the Mongol invasion and the fate of the Kievan lands following the Mongol destruction of Kiev in 1240. A Russian historian, M. Pogodin, incorporating even linguistic arguments into his theses, proposed that pre-Mongol Kiev was ethnically Russian. According to his thesis, following the Mongol invasion Kiev and the surrounding lands were completely desolated and the local population fled north. The Kievan lands, it was claimed, were settled later by Ukrainians from the west. Thus, Kiev became Ukrainian only following this new colonization process. For Pogodin's side of the debate see N. Barsukov, Zhizn i trudy M.P. Pogodina, book 15, St. Petersburg, 1901, 366-92. The first reply from a "southerner" was from M. Maksymovych. See his "O mnimom zapustenii Ukrainy v nashestvie Batyevo i naselenii eia novoprishlom narodom," in Sobranie sochinenii M.A. Maksimovicha, vol. 1, Kiev 1876, pp. 131-45. See also his "Filologicheskiia pisma k M.P. Pogodinu," Ibid., vol. 3, Kiev, 1880, pp. 183-243; "Otvetnyia pisma M.P. Pogodinu," Ibid., pp.244-72; "Novyia pisma k M.P. Pogodinu," Ibid., pp. 273-311.

Antonovych called Pogodin's theory a "historical mirage." In his essay on the Kievan region from the mid-14th to the mid-16th centuries, Antonovych convincingly showed that the Kievan lands were not desolated, as claimed by Pogodin, but remained settled and continued to play a role in the cultural and political life of Rus'. Antonovych concluded that careful study of even those sources cited to support the theory of Kiev's desolation do not confirm it. Chroniclers, primarily from north-eastern Rus' principalities, Antonovych pointed out, made additions and changes to earlier chronicles, whereby, toward the end of the 17th century it did indeed appear that the Kievan Rus' lands had been totally devastated following the Mongol invasions. Later chroniclers and historians accepted these conclusions and, in their histories, went directly from discussing the history of the Kievan Rus'

In the XIV century most of Ukraine was conquered by Lithuania, which had adopted a feudal military-political structure in order to fight off the German crusaders. Continual pressure from the Germans forced the Lithuanian princes to seek new lands to give to vassals as fiefs in order to expand their armed forces. The stronger the pressure from the German knight-crusaders, Antonovych concluded, the stronger the Lithuanian drive into Rus' lands. Resistance to the Lithuanian invasion of Ukraine came only from the princes and aristocrats; the communes were either indifferent or welcomed the invaders. Those that remained of the already weakened aristocratic estate fled largely to the northeast, while the Mongols were largely eliminated from central Ukrainian lands as well.[54]

At first the Lithuanian state, he stressed, which contained such large territories and populations of western Rus', soon fell under its cultural influence, and even Lithuanian leaders recognized that their state would have to be based "only on the Rus' national principle."[55] Under

---

state to the principality of Vladimir and Muscovy. While Antonovych recognized that the Kievan principality lost its former political importance, he stressed the rise in prominence of the Galician-Volhynian principality in western Rus'. See V. Antonovych, "Kiev, ego sudba i znachenie s XIV po XVI stoletie (1362-1569)," KS 1882, book 1. Reprinted in his Monografii. See esp. pp. 224-27.

[54] "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," pp. 11-14.

[55] Antonovych concluded that by the end of the 14th century the lands of western Rus' were formally united under the rule of the Lithuanian grand prince. In reality, because

Lithuanian rule, Antonovych noted, established estates as well as the concept of the inheritance of estate rights and privileges did not exist, while social mobility was possible among social groups. Old Rus' traditions of equality were dominant and this ideal fit in well in the new Lithuanian order, which rewarded gifted individuals and state service. The principle of self-government existed within religious institutions as well, where the hierarchy was chosen at assemblies (sobory), where church laymen participated.[56]

Initially, the Lithuanians were primarily interested in the Rus'-Ukrainian lands and its population as a source of tribute to hire warriors, leaving the communes to govern themselves. Lithuanian knights were not considered a separate, privileged estate and did not try to expand their powers at the expense of the local population. Old Rus' aristocrats who did remain were now forced to perform services for the Lithuanian prince, retaining only personal freedom and landed property. The communes, Antonovych concluded, continued to govern themselves through their assemblies. In the towns this remained the case until the Magdeburg laws were

---

of the size of its population, its teritory and cultural achievments, this country could be called the great principality of Western Rus'. See his "Kiev, ego sudba i znachenie," p. 132.

[56] Ibid., pp. 229, 253-55, 261.

adopted.[57] In the villages, communes revived their old customs of calling assemblies or people's courts (kopni sudy). By paying tribute, the communes were able to retain ownership of their lands and rights of self-government, which were sanctioned by Lithuanian law. According to Antonovych, the beneficial nature of Lithuanian rule was evident in that there were no attempts to rebel against it and that the Ukrainian

---

[57] In his study "Izsledovanie o gorodakh," Antonovych showed the progressive decline of cities in Ukraine. He stressed the communal character of cities in Kievan Rus'. Under Lithuanian rule the primary theme was the struggle between the feudal and communal principles in the cities. The victory of the first signified the alienation of the city from the surrounding villages, and the division between townsmen and the szlachta. The granting of Magdeburg rights to the towns represented the victory of the feudal-military order over the communal. These rights, introduced with the intention to preserve some vestiges of self-rule, and protect trade and manufacture, could not do this as they were worked out in foreign lands, in different conditions and times, and could not be assimilated in Ukrainian cities, whose legal notions and historical traditions were different. Under Polish [illegible] the cities came under increasing military-administ[illegible]ressure from the szlachta-controlled state, and they [illegible]hey could not compete with the szlachta economy a[illegible] Jewish competition. Antonovych concluded that the a[illegible]lavic idea of the cities changed from being communal c[illegible] to that of fortified centres, ruled by the prince's representative, the starosta. They later evolved into manufacturing and trade centres, holding certain rights, and finally became little more than markets for goods produced in the countryside. See his "Izsledovanie o gorodakh," pp. 138, 165-66, 185. See also S. Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 32-33. In a separate study Antonovych concluded that all legal and social conditions were formed in such a way in Poland as to crush manufacturing in the cities. See his "O promyshlennosti Iugo-Zapadnago kraia v XVIII st.," in Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnago Otdela Imp. rus. geograf. Obshchestva, vol. 1, Kiev, 1873, pp. 179-91. See also S. Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 33-34.

population was able to develop their own organizational forms according to local traditions.[58]

The Lithuanian Rus' state quickly fell apart, however, because the two principles, whose carriers were the two primary nations - the Lithuanian and the Rus' - did not have enough time to be able to become reconciled with one another. Just as swiftly as the large Lithuanian Rus' state was formed, it weakened and began to disintegrate, and soon fell under the influence of a neighbouring power - Poland - which was materially weaker and foreign to it. The need to fight the state's enemies, especially the German knight-crusaders, focused the attention and energies of the state's most talented representatives on external matters, rather than on the internal life of the country.[59]

Although Antonovych treated Lithuanian rule as generally benevolent, the Lithuanian state was based on a military-feudal principle, which did come into conflict with the old communal order. The major conflict between the two sides was

---

[58] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," pp. 14-18.

[59] V. Antonovych, "Ocherk istorii velikago kniazhestva Litovskago do smerti V.K. Olgerda," in his Monografii, pp. 4-5. As noted by S. Tomashivsky, Antonovych never developed these ideas in the text of his monograph, for his account ended in the late 14th century with the death of the Lithuanian Grand Prince Olgerd, who had only just succeeded in uniting the western Rus' lands with Lithuania. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 21.

over land ownership.[60] These conflicts were accelerated by Lithuanian moves towards union with Poland. Antonovych concluded that the Lithuanian prince Iagailo's (Jagailo in Polish) acceptance of the Polish crown and his attempts to introduce the Polish political, religious and social order into Lithuania Rus' went contrary to its normal development and forced the Ukrainian population to waste its energies defending its "national spirit."[61]

In his analysis of Lithuania and Poland, Antonovych counterposed the two.[62] Although both states were formed on the basis of the interaction o the same two opposed principles - the Slavic commune and German feudalism - yet, because of differing internal conditions, the results of this interaction in each state were different. The Polish knights were not conquerors from outside Polish society, but evolved out of the old Slavic commune, and therefore accepted the idea of the equality of its members, but combined this with the Germanic aristocratic idea in its relations to the non-military estates, thus developing a hybrid form, which Polish

---

[60] V. Antonovych, "Izsledovanie o gorodakh," pp. 136-38.

[61] V. Antonovych, "Kiev, ego sudba i znachenie," p. 230. The major goals of this struggle of national self-defence went unchanged, Antonovych noted, but the social groups leading it did change. At first the struggle was led by the local princes, later the church, and finally by the masses themselves under the Cossack banner. Ibid., p. 231.

[62] O. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych," p. 25.

historians labelled szlachta democracy.[63] The basic characteristics of the Polish political and social order around the middle of the 16th century were: the equality of members of the szlachta estate, their control over monarchical power, and unconditional powers over the peasantry.[64]

The Lithuanian state, on the other hand, was formed largely as a result of the conquest of large portions of Rus' lands. The dominant principle behind its organization was German feudalism. In Lithuania, where the need for military manpower was paramount, complicated relations among numerous groups that provided military service arose. A noble estate was formed, but there were numerous gradations within it. Members of the nobility were not equal as in Poland, and distinctions between the lower orders of the nobility and the rest of society were not as rigidly cast as in Poland.[65]

There was a great difference in the position of the peasantry in both states as well. In Poland the process of enserfment had been realized by the early 16th century, although the peasantry had already fallen under the szlachta's control by the 12th century. In Lithuania, on the other hand, the peasantry remained, by and large, owners of land and free into the 16th century. The differences between the juridical

---

[63] V. Antonovych, "Predislovie," in AIuZR, part 6, vol. 2, Kiev, 1870, pp. 1-4. This conclusion certainly agrees with Lelewel's thesis.

[64] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[65] Ibid., pp. 8-10

and economic status of the peasantry of the two countries constituted one of the major differences between the two states prior to the Lublin political union of 1569.[66] The major attraction for the Lithuanian nobility in accepting political union was that they expected to gain the same control over the peasantry as their Polish counterparts. Indeed, peasant rights were sharply curtailed in Lithuania just prior to the union. With its promulgation, the peasantry, not able to represent its own interests and fight on the political level, protested by fleeing. Antonovych concluded that massive peasant flight constituted the main characteristic of the post-Lublin state, confirmed by the many complaints of the nobility as well as by legislation concerning this phenomenon.[67]

Antonovych emphasized differences between developments in western Ukraine and in central, Dnieper Ukraine. In western regions that came under Polish rule before the Union of Lublin, local Ukrainian aristocrats and Lithuanian knights received the rights of Polish noblemen. Here, the old

---

[66] Other differences that had to be reconciled were relations among members of the nobility toward one another, and relations between the nobles and royal power. Antonovych wrote that the Lithuanian magnates realized that if they accepted union with Poland they would have to recognize the legal equality of all members of the nobility. However, considering that they held the bulk of the economic power in their hands, they realized that this concession did not amount to much in practice. They also were attracted by the idea that they would gain legal rights of control over the monarch's powers. Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[67] Ibid., pp. 5-6, 11-18, 24-27.

communal order was destroyed and the common folk brought down to the level of the Polish peasantry and townspeople. On the other hand, in lands that remained under Lithuania, especially southern Podillia and territories east of Volhynia, the communes developed into strong organizations and became well-organized. Because of the constant dangers from Tatar raids, members took up arms and developed skills as warriors. Peasants from Volhynia and northern Podillia fled to these free lands to escape from the control of the aristocrats, thus strengthening the commmunes. The Lithuanian princes, who needed vassals for the military, made arrangements with these free communes for such services. Thus, in Dnieper Ukraine, the communes received lands and rights of self-government from the princes, who stood at the pinnacle of the political and social structure. The princes, in return, received tribute and had strong military forces on which they could rely. These free, partially militarized communes, Antonovych claimed, were the first Ukrainian Cossack communities.[68]

---

[68] Antonovych summed up his thesis on the origins of the Cossacks as follows: "The Cossacks are none other than that which remained of the old Slavic communes, which appear with military features, called forth by local conditions, with a new name, originating in those same military-like conditions." See his "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648 ," p. 117. Later, Antonovych modified his theory somewhat. In his earliest study Antonovych stressed continuity with the principles of the old Slavs. In addition, he credited local Lithuanian princes as being organizers of the first Cossack units. In his later studies the thesis that the princes organized the first Cossack detachments was dropped, and he now recognized the emergence of the Cossacks as the formation of a new estate, rather than simply the continuation of the old communal order. In Korotka i toriia kozachchyny,

The Cossacks eventually received broad powers of self-government, even to elect their own officers. This principle was expanded to the point where commanders themselves were chosen according to the principle of merit. Thus, even the Lithuanian princes were not necessarily chosen to lead the various Cossack detachments.[69]

If Antonovych speculated that the Lithuanian and Ukrainian principles could have become reconciled with one another, this certainly was not the case in regard to the Polish and Ukrainian leading ideas. The Union of Lublin

---

Antonovych concluded that the Cossacks were a local estate that had developed within and evolved out of the common estates. In Lithuanian Rus' it had been difficult for the local starosty (chief military leaders and civilian administrators of the counties for the Lithuanian central government) to get noblemen to settle lands in return for military service, especially in the steppe regions. Therefore, the starosty began distributing lands in return for military service to the communes, which, as a result, retained their autonomy. Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 17-18.

In another study he wrote that the emergence of the Cossacks represented the formation of a new social estate composed largely of free men, most of them homeless, who were seeking an occupation and a place to live. The Lithuanian starosty encouraged the colonization of free peoples in the southern borderlands, which resulted in the establishment of free Cossack settlements. By the end of the 15th century, Antonovych concluded, a new military landed estate was being formed on the basis of equality of its members and according to the old assembly traditions. V. Antonovych, "Kiev, ego sudba i znachenie," pp. 251-52. Antonovych's revision on the origins of the Cossacks was in part an acknowledgement of M. Maksymovych's critique of his initial theory. See M. Maksymovych's review published as five letters: "Istoricheskiia pisma o kozakakh pridneprovskikh. (K M.V. Iuzefovichu)," in M. Maksymovych, Sobranie sochinenii M.A. Maksimovicha, vol. 1, Kiev, 1876, pp. 277-316.

[69] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," pp. 28-29.

marked a turning point in Polish-Ukrainian relations, he concluded, for with the incorporation of Lithuanian-Ukrainian lands into Poland and the introduction of Polish law, social structures that had developed in Ukraine were threatened. The Cossack estate was not recognized, as it did not exist in Poland, which forced the Cossacks into immediate opposition. In Lithuania serfdom did not exist; most of the peasantry were free. Now, noblemen began to enserf peasants, which stimulated their flight to the free southern steppes. Communes lost the right of self-government when their members became enserfed. Tensions increased further as a result of the Polish crown giving lands to the szlachta in Ukraine that were already settled by Cossacks and peasants, which caused the Cossacks to begin to defend themselves as well as the peasantry. Antonovych concluded that the Cossack estate identified with the peasantry, defended freedom, the freedom of labour, the right to lands, and the communal electoral system in both socio-political life as well as in church life.[70]

Tensions increased following the Union of Brest of 1596, which added a religious element to the struggle between the Cossack and szlachta estates.[71] Antonovych believed that prior to the Union of Brest the Orthodox church was synodal,

---

[70] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 23-29, 38, 40-43.

[71] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," pp. 37-38.

free, and not subordinated to any authority. Priests were directly elected by the people, while the higher orders were chosen at church synods. The union, on the other hand, introduced the idea of the authority of one person - the pope. The hierarchy was now appointed, not elected. The union was, therefore, contrary to the traditional democratic structure of the church.[72] The Ukrainian people opposed the union because it changed the structure of the church from one controlled by the community to one that was autocratic. They hated it for its "hierarchical absolutism" and because it was forcibly introduced.[73]

At first the Rus' nobility resisted the imposition of the union, but were attracted to the Polish camp by the unlimited rights of the Polish nobility and by skillful Jesuit proselytizing. The abandonment of their nationality and faith by the Ukrainian nobility became widespread following the death of Prince Konstantyn Ostrozky in 1608. The Hetman of the Cossacks, P. Konashevych-Sahaidachny, understood the importance and moral value of religion for the people. By tying the Cossack struggle with the religious one, he turned the Cossacks into a vanguard force of the whole nation. In general, Konashevych-Sahaidachny worked to strengthen all of

---

[72] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 37.

[73] Ibid., p. 41. See also his "Ocherk sostoianiia pravoslavnoi tserkvi v Iugo-zapadnoi Rossii s poloviny XVII do kontsa XVIII stoletiia," in his Monografii, p. 282.

Cossackdom by making it represent not just Cossack interests, but those of the entire nation.[74]

The Ukrainian nation, Antonovych concluded, saw the fullfillment of their ideals in Cossackdom, especially in the Zaporozhian Sich, where the old traditions were most closely kept and where the Ukrainian people believed that the ideal social and political order existed. People there could put into practice "their ancient viche instincts: here all were free, equal in rights, [and] here there were no other estates than the Cossack [estate]. All positions, both secular and religious, were held by elected people and all matters were decided by the will of the assembly - the Cossack rada or the village commune."[75]

Antonovych viewed the struggle between the Ukrainian Cossacks and the Polish szlachta as one between the democratic-communal and aristocratic principles. Initially Cossack resistance was spontaneous and anarchic, and had the character of social banditry, but it grew in force and turned

---

[74] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648," pp. 85-86.

[75] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 45. Antonovych claimed that the elected leader of the Zaporozhian Cossacks (otaman) recognized that he was a representative of public opinion and submitted to it, and that he treated the Cossacks as his friends and equals. In return the Cossacks exhibited full confidence in their leader. This close relationship, Antonovych claimed, showed that those chosen really did represent public opinion, which was unthinkable in other contemporary European societies. See his "Proizvedeniia Shevchenka, soderzhanie kotorykh sostavliaet istoricheskie sobytiia," in Tvory, pp. 155-56.

into a real national uprising which, after a struggle of about 60 years, ended in liberation from Poland and the victory of the communal-Cossack order over the aristocratic Polish szlachta.[76] Cossack risings of the late 16th and first half of the 17th century before Khmelnytsky were unsuccessful because they were fought for Cossack rights only, and ignored the interests of the serfs, that is, the masses. Success came with Khmelnytsky because the Cossacks were forced at that time to call the peasants to arms, promise them Cossack status and to chase the landowners out of Ukraine forever.[77]

Antonovych idealized the Cossacks and in general statements portrayed them as defenders of the interests of all the people. But he also recognized in his later writings that they were a separate estate that also had their own narrower interests. He especially saw these estate interests manifest themselves among the officers. Just as the princely retinue was foreign to Kievan Rus', and represented a foreign principle, so he explained the estate interests of the Cossack

---

[76] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakah 1500-1648," pp. 38-39, 45-6. See also his Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 62.

[77] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoi storone Dnepra (1679-1716)," AIuZR, part 3, vol. 2, pp. 23-24. The historian Hermaize wrote that, in Antonovych's interpretation, the Cossacks, who represented a continuation of the old communal order, were supported in their struggle by the peasants and townspeople, who recognized them as carriers of the national ideal. Therefore, the Cossack-Polish wars represented a deep historical and national conflict as a struggle between two national principles. See his "V.B. Antonovych," p. 26.

officers as a consequence of the influence of Polish culture, which Cossack officers had assimilated. They wanted to destroy the Polish szlachta, but aimed to take their place. This group, Antonovych concluded, could not stand with the people because it could not imagine a state where all its members were equal, where estates did not exist. On the other hand, the people did not want a society of estates, but their cultural level was not well enough developed to formulate their goals concretely.[78]

The masses of the peasants did answer Khmelnytsky's call to revolt in 1648, but following the Bilotserkva and Zboriv agreements with the Poles, the people, Antonovych wrote, realized that they had been used by the Cossacks to achieve their own narrow social goals. The common folk became suspicious of the Cossack officers, who, they believed, wanted to become a new szlachta, based on the Polish model. The people, Antonovych concluded, hated the szlachta, whether they were of their own nationality or foreign.[79]

Antonovych's views on the role of the individual in history was made evident in his analysis of Khmelnytsky. Antonovych recognized that Khmelnytsky was a talented organizer and military leader and that his activities represented a turning point in Ukrainian history.

---

[78] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 112-14.

[79] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoi storone Dnepra," pp. 24-25.

Khmelnytsky, Antonovych concluded, embodied both the positive and negative qualities, the ideals, and political and social aspirations of the masses, and he was able to formulate these much more clearly than any of his contemporaries. Nevertheless, the success of his endeavours depended ultimately not on his own talents, but upon his relations with the masses of the people. All of Khmelnytsky's talents, Antonovych wrote, could only aid the process, to help insure its success, but could not in itself create the efforts and sacrifices by the masses which were required to achieve victory over Poland.[80]

According to Antonovych, the ideals of the masses in the 17th century consisted of the following: the equality of all citizens before the law and rejection of the division of society into estates; opposition to serfdom and, within limits, economic equality by way of the equal division of landed property. These ideals were formulated in the slogan that all should be allowed to become Cossacks. The people also demanded the right of free intellectual and spiritual development, which at that time was concentrated in religion: in the organization of the church and the spreading of its cutural institutions (the freedom to choose one's faith, self-government within the church, and the development of church

---

[80] V. Antonovych, "Kharakteristika deiatelnosti Bogdana Khmelnitskago," Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa, 1899, vol. 13, otd. 1, pp. 100-02. See also his Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 97.

brotherhoods and schools). Khmelnytsky supported these aspirations, Antonovych claimed, and they were the most powerful levers by which he was able to move the masses.[81]

One could not blame Khmelnytsky, Antonovych wrote, for not carrying forward the instinctive urges of the masses by establishing institutions and laws in line with the people's aspirations. One had to, Antonovych claimed, bear in mind the conditions of the epoch, as well as the low cultural development of the masses and their representatives.[82] In addition to his own personal weaknesses, Khmelnytsky, Antonovych concluded, was only a man of his time, a product of the low general cultural level of the people. The people were not ready for political life, did not know how to clearly formulate the principles they were fighting for, did not as yet understand what they were capable of building in place of the old system, and therefore were not able to gain their rights or implement their ideals. When they fought the Poles this was done on instinct, as a campaign against their oppressors. One could not criticize Khmelnytsky for not knowing the full sum of the wishes of his nation, nor for not

---

[81] V. Antonovych, "Kharakteristika deiiatelnosti Bogdana Khmelnitskago," p. 103. Khmelnytsky, near Bila Tserkva, issued a universal (general proclamation) to all of the Ukrainian peasants, offering them Cossack status. This became the banner of the uprising, helping ensure its success. V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 98.

[82] V. Antonovych, "Kharakteristika deiatelnosti Bogdana Khmelnitskago," pp. 103-04.

knowing how to advocate these ideals clearly. He raised the banner of rebellion at the time the people were ready to throw off their chains, but did not know what to do afterwards.[83] If one looked at the activities of Khmelnytsky from this point of view, Antonovych continued, then one could also understand why at critical moments he may have been indecisive, and why he failed to establish an independent state.[84]

Antonovych did blame Khmelnytsky, however, for not taking advantage of his military victories and demanding more severe terms from the Polish king in the Zboriv Treaty. He believed that Khmelnytsky simply did not know what to do here.[85] Furthermore, Antonovych strongly criticized Khmelnytsky for agreeing that the unregistered Cossacks should return to their previous dependent status in relation to the nobility as not merely a political mistake, "but an outright injustice [instituted] on his people."[86]

---

[83] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 109-11, 120-21. See the critique by M. Korduba [M.K.], who claims that Antonovych based his views on Khmelnytsky on Kostomarov's writings, which in turn had been based on second-rate sources: memoirs, chronicles and brochures, Ibid., pp. 111-15, n. 1.

[84] V. Antonovych, "Kharakteristika deiatelnosti Bogdana Khmelnitskago," p. 102.

[85] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 122. See M. Korduba's [M.K.] critique, Ibid., pp. 122-124, n. 3.

[86] Ibid., p. 124. Antonovych saw the absence of high culture as the underlying reason why "individual egoism" took precedence over the general communal cause among the Cossacks. Cossack officers desired to obtain szlachta privileges, government administrators tried to seize lands for themselves,

Antonovych also blamed Khmelnytsky and the Cossack leadership for their lack of wisdom, sloppiness and haste in preparing the Pereiaslav agreement with Russia in 1654.[87] The document left many significant areas of jurisdiction unclear and open to interpretation, which allowed the Muscovite side to erode the rights of the Ukrainian side. Antonovych concluded: "When we look at how much power Khmelnytsky received from the people and how he made use of his position, we have to concur [as to] his complete incompetence in political matters."[88]

In general comments on the aftermath and failures of the Khmelnytsky period, Antonovych concluded that physical power was not as important as moral strength and the formulation of a clear ideal, without which the people themselves would give in to their enemies. In addition, Antonovych admitted, if the proper cultural level had not been attained for an independent life, then nothing could be achieved in any event. This was

---

and attempts were made to force ordinary Cossacks into the commoners' estate in order to enserf them. Ibid., p. 6.

[87] In a comment on the Pereiaslav agreement, Antonovych wrote that the fanaticism of Polish Catholicism and of the szlachta estate promoted the political union of Ukraine with Muscovy. See his "Ocherk sostoiania pravoslavnoi tserkvi," p. 286.

[88] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 136. See M. Korduba's [M.K.] comments on this assesment. Ibid., pp. 136-37, n.1.

particularly evident from the examination of the post-Khmelnytsky period known as "The Ruin."[89]

"The Ruin", Antonovych concluded, was the result of the low level of culture among the Ukrainian masses. They had sufficient energy to liberate themselves from the szlachta, but no clearly formulated ideals and no clear conception how to build that which was required to replace the old order. The people moved forward only instinctively, without a clearly expressed ideal.[90]

This was made clear soon after Khmelnytsky's death when two parties appeared in Ukraine representing two diametrically opposed principles. The first wanted to build a society on the Polish model, form a privileged estate like the szlachta from the officers, and join a reconstituted Polish federal state. The people understood that this order was injurious to their interests, but did know how to articulate nor implement their own goals. Their leaders were, like the masses themselves, unable to formulate their ideals, and soon decided to emulate the first group, but based their support on the

---

[89] Ibid., pp. 136-37. Antonovych buttressed his conclusion with the following comparison. Between 1640 and 1657, revolutionary movements broke out in Italy, Ukraine and England. Only in England was the revolution successful, while the Neapolitan and Ukrainian revolutions failed. Antonovych attributed this to the higher cultural development in England, claiming that only those nations that were culturally developed could anticipate success. Without political conviction and political wisdom, the people would accomplish nothing. Ibid., pp. 137-38.

[90] Ibid., pp. 139-40.

Muscovite state. The battles waged between the two groups were not fought on the basis of any principles, but for or against individuals and their interests. These types of struggles were typical, Antonovych concluded, of the low level of cultural development, where "egoistic forces take precedence over matters of common [concern]."[91]

Antonovych claimed that Petro Doroshenko was the most talented, intelligent and patriotic Cossack hetman of the period. His political strategy of allying with the Turkish sultanate failed, however, because he was not supported by the people. Antonovych noted here that the lower the level of culture among the people, the more their actions were guided by tradition. For about two hundred years the Cossacks had been fighting the Muslim world and could not comprehend that now they had to rely on it for aid.[92] During "The Ruin" Cossack officers began to form into a noble estate. Antonovych saw this as a negative phenomenon, emphasizing the dishonest and rapacious nature of the process, whereby officers seized lands from rank and file Cossacks and peasant

---

[91] Ibid., pp. 140-41. In the politics of Cossack Ukraine the reputation of the Zaporozhians was very high among the common people, although the Zaporozhians themselves were not politically developed. An example of this was when I. Briukhovetsky, having become hetman through the backing of the Zaporozhians, turned his back on the people and began enriching himself and his closest followers. Following this, Antonovych claimed, the authority of the Zaporozhians dropped considerably among the people, and the Sich's influence on political life in Ukraine waned also. Ibid., pp. 212-14.

[92] Ibid., pp. 147-49.

villages and then had these confiscations confirmed by the government.[93] The Left-Bank Cossack nobility, he concluded, neglected to defend the autonomy of the country, the democratic wishes of the people and cared only for their own personal interests. This led to their demoralization: They "seized lands, wherever and as many as possible, and robbed the people with all types of truths and untruths."[94]

It is evident from the examination of Antonovych's views on Khmelnytsky and of the period of "The Ruin" that he stressed the cultural factor in history, using cultural standards of measurement to judge events and the actions of great men. In emphasizing the role of culture, however, he was not necessarily pointing to a primary cause of events or activities. The cultural level of a people or its leaders then may not be the prime factor in seeking to understand the historical events or actions in question. The level of culture achieved by the Ukrainian people and its leading figures was itself a result of peculiarities in Ukrainian history. Antonovych recognized that the tragedy of Ukrainian history was that the Ukrainian nation was never able to build a solid civilization, nor acquire the self-discipline necessary to realize their goals. At the same time he saw

---

[93] Ibid., pp. 152-53.

[94] Ibid., pp. 155-56.

these problems reflected in the actions of leaders who themselves lacked the necessary level of culture.[95]

In his harsh assessment it appears that Antonovych ignored the geographical factor, which was very important in Ukrainian history. One has to give much weight to the centuries-long struggle of Ukrainians with the steppe nomads from the southeast, especially with the Pechenegs and the Cumans, and of the Mongol destruction of the Rus' state in the 13th century. In addition, the consequences of centuries spent thereafter fighting off Tatar raids from the south required that energies of Ukrainians be spent in defence and constant rebuilding. In the geographical space of the steppe frontier, cultural development necessarily could not have been steady nor spectacular.

In one study Antonovych compared two Ukrainian leaders of the late 17th and early 18th centuries - Semen Palii and Ivan Mazepa -assessing each according to their attitudes towards the masses.[96] Antonovych was ambivalent about his assessment of Hetman Mazepa, a representative of the Cossack elite. He recognized that Mazepa was a sincere patriot and a talented man, the most educated of the Ukrainian leaders of that time, and a true politician. However, Antonovych noted, Mazepa was educated in Poland, where his social and political ideals were

---

[95] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[96] See V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoi storone Dnepra."

formed. Thus, in trying to defend Ukrainian autonomy, he chose the wrong means. Mazepa ignored completely the democratic ideals of the people, stood directly opposed to the historically developed goals of the masses of his own people, and did not even try to gain their loyalty, but attempted instead to attract the officers, aided the process of the establishment of a privileged estate of the nobility, which he relied on for his base of support in his struggles with the Muscovite government.[97]

Mazepa's policies caused many peasants and ordinary Cossacks to flee to vacated Right-Bank territories, where independent Cossack regiments were established, the most well-known of these being under the leadership of colonel Palii. Antonovych regarded this colonization process as democratic, as the regiments there were organized on democratic principles and there were no noblemen nor serfs. The leaders of the regiments here, Antonovych noted, "had as their goal not the enrichment of themselves, but the people."[98] According to Antonovych, Palii was the last leader of those Cossacks who understood and solidarized with the people and their social and political goals, and was honoured by the people as a

---

[97] Ibid., pp. 69-70. See also his Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 156, 158-59.

[98] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 161-62.

popular hero. Whereas Palii was called "Cossack father" by the people, Mazepa was hated.[99]

Following the suppression of the organized Cossack movement in Right-Bank Ukraine, popular armed resistance to Polish rule continued in the form of the haidamaka movement, which Antonovych viewed as the continuation of the Cossack movement in a different form.[100] The haidamaka movement was a response to the Polish szlachta's attempts to re-impose serfdom in parts of Right-Bank Ukraine following that land's colonization. At first the haidamaka uprisings were popular reactions typical of uneducated people, who instinctively reacted to their grievances through jacqueries. On first glance haidamaka activities looked like those of typical brigands. By the second half of the 18th century, however, this movement grew to the point where these armed bands became small armies. As more dissatisfied elements joined the movement it began to transform itself, becoming closer to a movement with political, social and national goals. Now the haidamakas began to independently organize the land they controlled according to their own traditions. Following the victory at Uman in 1768, the haidamaka movement turned into a

---

[99] V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoi storone Dnepra," pp. 61, 72.

[100] V. Antonovych, "Izsledovanie o gaidamachestve po aktam 1700-1768 g.," AIuZR, part 3, vol. 3, Kiev, 1876, p. 2.

political revolution, for the victorious haidamakas began to form regiments according to Cossack practice.[101]

Antonovych delineated two separate streams in the movement: the political, social and religious struggle, which he saw as the continuation of the ancient struggle between the two antagonistic communal and aristocratic principles and their interests; the second was the desire for personal satisfaction and revenge through arbitrary and violent acts and was a consequence of the low cultural level of the people. The uprisings, Antonovych wrote, were a negative phenomenon; they were destructive, and their participants did not know what to build in place of what they destroyed. But, one could not expect more from the masses as this second tendency was a reflection of the low cultural level within Polish szlachta society itself. Because of the absence of elementary order in the country, arbitrary acts were commonly committed by both sides.[102]

Antonovych placed the blame for the uprisings on the shoulders of the szlachta. He accused them of a complete lack of political tact and inability to judge or understand historical laws. They were captives of their own narrow

---

[101] Ibid., pp. 4-5. See also his Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 196-98, 206. Antonovych compared this movement to similar uprisings by other Slavic peoples, such as the haiduk movement of the Serbs, or the uskoky movement of the Croats. Ibid., p. 197.

[102] V. Antonovych, "Izsledovanie o gaidamachestve," pp. 2-5. See also S. Tomashivsky, Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 29.

estate, religious and national interests. The szlachta, he concluded, were, by cultural measures, too little developed; they were too egoistic and shortsighted to reach out to the masses, to make concessions, to open the door to progress in Poland. By requiring unconditional obedience to their dictates, the denial of all human and civic rights to the masses, the szlachta brought upon themselves a great tragedy.[103]

The source of the tragedy, Antonovych insisted, was to be found in the abnormal structure of Polish society. The peasant masses were enserfed, deprived of land and all elementary rights of citizenship, and exposed daily to unlimited abuses by the szlachta. In addition, the Polish state persecuted their religion, and did not bother to provide for any type of elementary education whatsoever. In such conditions, Antonovych noted, the masses were ready to explode at any time, and this explosion, in the absence of civic development and a humane education, had to express itself in extreme cruelty and bloody acts. The repressive measures taken against the rebellious peasantry by the szlachta were less excusable, Antonovych concluded, because these acts were committed by an educated estate that was well off. These measures could not be characterized as an outburst or an exaggerated response, but as "a systematic, cold-blooded [act

---

[103] V. Antonovych, "Izsledovanie o gaidamachestve," pp. 1-2. See also his "Proizvedeniia Shevchenka," p. 157.

of] revenge." All this indicated, according to Antonovych, that the cultural level of the szlachta estate was on a much lower level than would be indicated by the powers and rights they possessed. Every response to peasant rebellion, therefore, ended in revenge, which was expressed with particular cruelty.[104]

In its general policies towards Ukraine, Antonovych noted, the Polish state adopted policies typical of undeveloped governments. In particular, the Polish government saw itself as the representative of only one estate - the szlachta. A government, he noted, had to represent all nations and estates contained within the country; if it represented one sector and ignored others, this led first to apathy among its subjects and then enmity. An undeveloped government, Antonovych continued, did not usually adjust its policies by compromising, taking into consideration the protests of its subjects, but rather attempted to gain obedience through punitive actions, which usually provoked even stronger protests. In such conditions, Antonovych concluded, dissident forces eventually grew and gained enough strength, whereby following a long struggle, the government either made concessions or the entire populace revolted and destroyed the hated order.[105]

---

[104] V. Antonovych, "Otvet g. Korzonu," in his Tvory, pp. 234-35.

[105] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, pp. 67-68.

Polish historical literature, with some exceptions, Antonovych generalized, was statist, that is, it tried to justify the policies of the Polish state, ignored or denied the mistakes it had made, and blamed the downfall of the Polish state on the avariciousness of its neighbours, rather than on the development of internal factors, especially abnormal social relations.[106] In his review of H. Sienkiewicz's historical novel, Antonovych wrote that most Polish writers, in their interpretation of Ukrainian-Polish relations, followed this statist tradition. They believed that the Polish state, supported by the szlachta, had a great cultural mission in Ukraine: to civilize - that is to mold in its own image - the Rus' regions that fell within the borders of the Polish state.[107]

It did not matter to Sienkiewicz, Antonovych wrote, that the Polish state did not recognize the equality of its citizens, as long as it pursued its mission of turning one national type into another, and of obtaining by force the absolute submission of the people to a privileged class, rejecting totally compromise with those who resisted both social and national policies. This attitude, Antonovych

---

[106] V. Antonovych, "Istorychni baiky p. Mariiana Dubetskoho," in his Tvory, p. 211.

[107] V. Antonovych, "Polsko-russkie sootnosheniia XVII v.," p. 162. The depiction of the Polish-Ukrainian struggle in Sienkiewicz's novel, Antonovych wrote, undoubtedly reflected the contemporary historical consciousness of the Polish intelligentsia. Ibid., p. 160.

charged, was more suitable to Nero's minions, or to the companions of Genghis Khan, rather than to a contemporary thinker or artist.[108] In this respect, Antonovych concluded, the Polish szlachta "did not represent culture and order, but sooner backwardness and the cultural aberration of Polish society itself."[109] In another review, Antonovych wrote that Polish historiography was backward and mired in the norms of the 18th century because it had not incorporated the fruits of European progressive thought and had not been critical of its own past.[110] Antonovych's views on the state are clearly critical, falling within the framework of populist historiography. Yet, he can not be viewed as anti-statist or a-statist as the historian S. Tomashivsky wrote.[111] Hrushevsky wrote that Antonovych held a negative attitude towards even the idea of the state. This attitiude was based on the following: historical Ukrainian opposition to domination by foreign states; assimilation of the traditional

---

[108] Ibid., pp. 164-65.

[109] Ibid., p. 176. S. Tomashivsky called Antonovych's critique of Sienkiewicz's novel "a pearl in the history of our criticism...." In his review, Tomashivsky wrote, Antonovych exposed the barbarism of Sienkiewicz's world view and showed that the numerous bloody scenes portrayed by the author were not attempts to objectively portray the mood of the era but rather products of the author's own political views, which were based not on facts but on his subjective beliefs. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 46.

[110] V. Antonovych, "Istorychni baiky p. Mariiana Dubetskoho," p. 212.

[111] See his Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 58.

distrust of the Polish szlachta towards a strong state power; opposition to the authoritarian Russian state that was shared by many liberals and radicals of the Russian intelligentsia; the ideas of the Ukrainian Slavophiles - the Cyrillo-Methodians - as well as of the Russian Slavophiles - through Kostomarov and Ivanyshev - especially their idea of the opposition of the state and society.[112]

Hrushevsky's explanation of the roots of Antonovych's views on the state are sound, but his conclusion is too rigid, as it appears that Antonovych's attitiude towards the state was more complicated than simply negative; it was perhaps ambivalent, expressing alienation sooner than outright opposition. In his review of Sienkiewicz, Antonovych wrote that the state did represent one of the higher forms of public life of mankind, and that support for the state would be stronger among cultured individuals if they were able to relate to the principles the state stood for. Contemporary European states, he argued, were institutions that guaranteed not only the material safety of society, but higher moral requirements as well, such as freedom of conscience and full intellectual development. State power, he wrote, should be viewed in light of the presence of just and impartial relations towards all of its subjects, without regard to social group, nationality, or an individual's position in

---

[112] M. Hrushevsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych," pp. 18-19.

society. The idea of the state, he concluded, should be equally dear to all of its citizens.[113]

In a polemical essay that remained unpublished until 1928, Antonovych distinguished between the concept of nation and state, yet also recognized the possibility of the existence of a federal, multi-national state under certain conditions. A nation, he wrote, is formed by nature, not by the laws of the state. Yet, many different nationalities could not only live together within one state, but also support it equally, provided the laws of that state guaranteed universal rights and defended all equally. Discord and the weakening of such a state, he wrote, occurred only when the dominant nationality took on the role of conqueror, proprietor, or slaveowner towards others, and tried to realize the utopian goal of forcibly remaking the different peoples within that state into something different. If such transformations were possible, Antonovych wrote, they could only take place through peaceful co-existence and mutual cultural contacts.[114]

The question of Antonovych's attitude towards the formation of an independent Ukrainian state was equally ambivalent. Hrushevsky wrote that Antonovych, having negative views on the state, found it easier to accept the

---

[113] See his "Polsko-russkie sootnosheniia XVII v.," p. 164.

[114] V. Antonovych, "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," in his Tvory, p. 248.

statelessness of the Ukrainian nation in the past as well as in the present as a positive trait. Ukrainians, were, in his view, not interested in forming a state of their own. This anti-statist position, Hrushevsky wrote, ran through all of Antonovych's writings, in which he counterposed a free, vibrant and creative society to state institutions, which strangled and oppressed society.[115] Another historian wrote that Antonovych believed that the Ukrainian people were anarchic by nature.[116]

One can conclude that Antonovych did not believe the question of the formation of a Ukrainian state important in the past. In an essay on Khmelnytsky, Antonovych explained the inability of Ukrainians to form an independent state as based on their particular national character. In order to form a state, he claimed, a people had to be self-disciplined, be willing to sacrifice even some part of their own personal liberties and individual goals, in order to submit to a power that would be guided by state-building interests. The Ukrainian people never had these characteristics and recognized this, he wrote. Even the efforts of Ukraine's most talented representatives who wanted to build a state, such as Prince Danylo of the Galician-Volhynian principality, or Hetman Mazepa, were ultimately unsuccessful because they did not have the support of the masses. Ukrainians, Antonovych

---

[115] M. Hrushevsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych," p. 19.

[116] O. Mytsiuk, Ukrainski khlopomany, p. 58.

concluded, were, however, always willing to join an already-existing state, and support its authority. But, Antonovych stressed, although Ukrainians did not desire to establish their own state, within these foreign state structures Ukrainians always defended their way of life and their autonomy.[117]

Antonovych indeed did not regard the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state as a paramount task of the Ukrainian movement, or of the Ukrainian historical process. Questions of cultural standards and of cultural tasks were of far greater importance to him. But it is unfair to characterize his views on the question of the state as consistently negative, nor did he openly exclude the possibility of Ukrainians attaining statehood, or express himself negatively on this question. He did view the state critically, but also expressed the desirability of it playing a positive role in history. He supported the idea of a

---

[117] V. Antonovych, "Kharakteristika deiatelnosti Bogdana Khmelnitskago," pp. 102-03. In another essay he wrote that, unlike the Great Russians, who expended their energies on building a strong state, Ukrainians never concerned themselves with this question nor was political independence their goal. However, although apathetic towards the idea of founding their own state, Ukrainians always defended their socio-political ideals in the formation of the internal structure of the state they found themselves within. See "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," pp. 245-46. S. Tomashivsky charged that Antonovych's position was contradictory. How was it possible, he asked, using Antonovych's theory on national principles, to defend the principles of one's own national life in a foreign state founded on opposing principles? Without a doubt, he added, the greatest historical tragedy of Ukraine was that there always appeared ready-made foreign states which Ukrainians could become a part of. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, p. 58.

federal state, but only if that state was a just one, which guaranteed equal rights for all of its citizens, including, in his view, national rights as well. One therefore cannot view Antonovych as anti-statist, but only as a severe critic of the state, which is clearly compatible with his uncompromising views on elites and their role in history as well as in contemporary society.

Antonovych was consistent in applying these uncompromising standards to those who attempted to build a Ukrainian state in the past. Hrushevsky wrote that Antonovych praised the Cossacks as defenders of the national rights of Ukraine as long as they also defended the principle of the equality of its members and encouraged the liberation of the peasant masses from serfdom. However, from the moment that the Cossacks, especially their leaders, the officers, began to build a new social order and state based on the social and economic prerogatives of the Cossack officers, he turned from being an apologist of the Cossacks to their critic.[118] According to Hrushevsky, Antonovych clearly opposed the attempts of Ukrainian leaders to form a state if this meant the oppression and exploitation of the masses. As an antithesis to the idea of the state he proposed the idea of the commune (hromada) and the ideals it stood for in Ukrainian

---

[118] M. Hrushevsky, "Z sotsialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," pp. 13-14.

history. This idea also became for Antonovych and other Ukrainian populists the ideal of their movement.[119]

One must agree with Hrushevsky's assessment that the inspiration and source of Antonovych's scholarly work lay in his sincere love of the Ukrainian people, whose revolutionary, albeit still instinctive and elemental uprisings against feudalism and privilege he sympathized with. He idealized

---

[119] Ibid., p. 8. In a fascinating commentary on the attitude of the Kiev Hromada members to the state, Hrushevsky recalled the opposing reactions of Antonovych and Drahomanov to the publication of his article [M. Serhiienko], "Hromadskyi rukh na Ukraini v polovyni XII v.," ZNTSh, 1892, vol. 1, pp. 1-28. In this essay Hrushevsky described the aftermath of the destruction of the Kievan Rus' state in 1240 by the Mongols. The people, freed from the control of the aristocrats and prince, re-established their old communal order and entered into direct relations with the Mongols, to whom they agreed to pay tribute. In return, the Mongols were to protect the communes from the return of the prince and his retinue to power. Prince Danylo of the Galician-Volhynian principality had been attempting, by force, to re-impose his control over them. In his essay, Hrushevsky portrayed the communal movement with sympathy, and emphasized its similarity with the later Cossack movement, both of which moved from statehood to communal autonomy. Hrushevsky's views, he recalled, were formed under the influences of "the strict traditions of radical Ukrainian populism," which firmly held that in conflicts between the people and the authorities, the blame always lay with the latter, and that whenever the working people felt oppressed by even their own state they were well within their rights to rebel. Antonovych, he recalled, approved of the article and commented that Prince Danylo was, in a sense, a forerunner of Khmelnytsky, as he went against the masses, and lost in the end. Drahomanov, on the other hand, disapproved of Hrushevsky's position. See M. Hrushevsky, "Ukrainska partiia sotsialistiv-revoliutsioneriv ta ikh zavdannia," Boritesia-Poborete, 1920, no. 1, pp. 10-12. See also M. Stakhiv, "Materiialy pro svitohliad Hrushevskoho," Mykhailo Hrushevsky u 110-ti rokovyny narodzhennia 1876-1976 (sic!), ZNTSh, vol. 197, 1978, pp. 221-26; O. Pritsak, "Istoriosofiia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho," in M. Hrushevsky, Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy, vol. 1, reprint edition, Kiev, 1991, pp. liii-liv.

what he saw as their high cultural and social instincts, their humane character and refined ethical principles, and consistent struggle for the establishment of a just society. He was so captivated by these enviable characteristics that he was ready to forgive this nation their less admirable characteristics, both in the present as well as in the past, which he saw as caused by the low level of consciousness, culture, and political education. All of the historical defeats suffered by the Ukrainian people he also attributed to their lack of cultural and political education.[120]

Antonovych can be clearly classified as a Ukrainian populist historian in a broader East European populist school of historiography: in Polish historiography it was represented by Lelewel; in Russian historiography by Afanasii Shchapov and Vasilii Semevsky; in Ukrainian historiography, by his predecessor and contemporary, Kostomarov, as well as by his contemporary Oleksander Lazarevsky.[121]

In Ukrainian populist historiography Antonovych can be seen as a transitional figure. His early works were clearly rooted in the ideas of romantic populism, whereas in his later

---

[120] M. Hrushevsky, "Volodymyr Antonovych," p. 17. See also his "Z sotsialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," p. 8.

[121] On Lazarevsky see V. Sarbei, Istorychni pohliady O.M. Lazarevskoho, Kiev, 1961. One of the major differences between Antonovych's and Lazarevych's writings was that in Antonovych's works, the Ukrainian historical idea is present throughout; a second is that Antonovych consciously identified himself with his predecessors. See O. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych," p. 31.

works, especially those written in the 1870s and 1880s, Antonovych was more careful about proposing sweeping conclusions found in earlier studies.[122] Nevertheless, he never completely shed his romantic views. On the other hand, the historian Hermaize wrote that Antonovych and Lazarevsky represented a new generation of historians, reared on rationalism and positivism, who used statistics, paid attention to economic developments and based their work on strict documentation. Hermaize called them realistic populists, because their works were characterized by practical attention to the needs of the common folk.[123]

According to Hermaize, within the framework of Russian historiography, Antonovych was a regional historian. However, in Ukrainian historiography he is known, above all, as the creator of a democratic-national conception of Ukrainian history, and this was his major accomplishment. In

---

[122] M. Hrushevsky, "Z sotsialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," p. 12.

[123] O, Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych," pp. 27, 30-31. Hrushevsky recalled that Antonovych was pleased when someone labelled him a consistent positivist. See his "Z sotsialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," p. 6. S. Tomashivsky wrote that one could label Antonovych a positivist, but that he was not influenced as much by A. Comte as by his predecessors, such as Condorcet, who already in the late 18th century had indicated the need for historians to turn their attention away from the study of individuals to larger social groups. Antonovych's views were largely formed on the basis of ideas worked out in the first half of the 19th century as well as by those of the French Enlightenment. His emphases on ethical factors in history were also stressed by Herder, Hegel and Fichte, as well as by Condorcet and Saint-Simon. See his Volodymyr Antonovych, pp. 55-56.

Antonovych's philosophy of history, the historical process was seen largely as a struggle among ideas, in which nations, largely through social groups, are the main carriers of these ideas. Throughout many of his historical works Antonovych tried to show that the Ukrainian people had their own independent national ideal for which they fought throughout their history.[124] The Ukrainian historical process therefore was an organic one of centuries-long duration, centered around a leading ideal.[125]

---

[124] O. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych," pp. 21-22, 29. M. Dovnar-Zapolsky called Antonovych an eclectic in relation to the dominant schools of Russian historiography of the 1860s. He sympathized with Slavophile theories on the importance of the commune, but forged a separate path within this movement. Although the Slavophiles brought into highlight the idea of communality in Russian history, they also denied the common folk, who embodied this idea, a role in its evolution. Kostomarov, who was also partly under the influence of the Slavophiles, recognized the importance of the popular masses in history, but did not attempt to theoretically explain the essence of the historical process. Antonovych could only rely on his predecessors in the sense that they recognized the idea of the importance of the popular masses in history, while he developed the idea of the struggle among principles, whose carriers were different groups of society, as well as developing the idea of the struggle of these different elements, out of which a nationality was born. According to Dovnar-Zapolsky, the introduction of these concepts represented a significant step forward, even a turning point in Russian historiography. See M.V. Dovnar Zapolsky, "Istoricheskie vzgliady V.B. Antonovicha," pp. 33-35.

[125] Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych," pp. 30-31. Beginning with the old viche and proceeding to the Cossack rada, in the public courts, in the structure of the Zaporozhian commune, in municipal governments and in the church brotherhoods, the basic outlines of the ideals of the people were shown to be: the equality of all before the law, the absence of social differentiation, the management of daily affairs through assemblies, support of the elective principle in government, and freedom of conscience in religious matters. V.

In line with this, Antonovych saw that his major goal as well as that of his contemporaries in the Kiev Hromada was to work towards the realization of these ideals. At the very least he saw that his practical work as a historian lay in their clear formulation. Antonovych, as a leader of the newly-emerging Ukrainan populist intelligentsia, saw that his primary task and that of his contemporaries in this historical process was to provide aid and participate in the struggle to realize this ideal.

Antonovych believed that the Ukrainian national ideal came close to the universal ideal, and that it was precisely this ideal among all others that was most difficult to realize. To succeed it was necessary that the masses reach a high level of culture and become convinced of the righteousness of that ideal. It was also necessary for great sacrifices to be made from all sectors of society in order for the idea to succeed. At a low level of culture, personal and estate interests were stronger than communal ones, and the democratic principle therefore could not be realized.[126] Obviously, this view meshed well with his belief in the need to concentrate his efforts on cultural work.

Antonovych, "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," p. 246.

[126] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 4.

Finally, Antonovych did not view the contemporary historical processes in Ukraine in isolation, but saw them in the context of international historical processes. In his private lectures given in the mid-1890s, he summarized his views on the Ukrainian national rebirth, a process in which he was participating.

Antonovych believed that the characteristic trait of 18th-century world history was the rebirth of stateless, ethnographic nations. Following the French Revolution, slow but steady progress was made towards constitutional rule. Recognition of the rights of man was accompanied by recognition of the rights of nationalities, which had been oppressed by the great powers. Despite attempts of the great powers to freeze these processes at the Viennna Congress of 1815, they had to make concessions to emerging and maturing nations.[127]

The process of rebirth, Antonovych believed, took place in a way that was universally valid, the first step being the demand for cultural rights, to protect the emerging nation's culture by law. The first nationality to begin this process among the Slavs were the Czechs, from whom the movement for cultural rights spread to other Slavs.[128]

---

[127] Ibid., p. 228. See also his "Istorychni baiky," p. 212

[128] V. Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, p. 230.

In Ukraine, the Cyrillo-Methodians were the first to combine cultural tasks with political goals, although weakly and unclearly stated. With the introduction of a constitutional regime in Austrian Ukraine, Ukrainians there gained the opportunity to fight legally for their national rights. Antonovych predicted that the winning of national rights in Russian Ukraine would come later, but that the national movement would spread among the masses and cultural rights would be won. Self interest, he noted, was forcing the great powers to make concessions to the emerging nationalities whenever they raised demands grounded in contemporary, universally valid, progressive principles.[129]

---

[129] Ibid., pp. 230-31. See also his "Istorychni baiky," p. 212.

Conclusions

The personal decision of Voldymyr Antonovych to reject his Polish nationality in favour of the Ukrainian, as well as to become a Ukrainian populist activist and historian, should not be viewed in isolation from the political, social, economic and cultural developments that had occurred in Right-Bank Ukraine as well as in the Russian Empire and Europe in the 1830s through early 1860s. In the political sphere, national, liberal and socialist ideologies were being formulated. In continental Europe political movements, whose aims were national unification or national liberation, as well as movements aimed at establishing representative parliamentary institutions, were challenging the old imperial and authoritarian regimes. In 1848 the old order of Europe was shaken to its foundations and collapsed briefly under the impact of these political forces.

In addition to the rise of the new political movements, social changes, tied to economic transformations associated with capitalist development, had been taking place. Social, economic and political domination by the nobility, the traditional privileged elite and ruling estate, was being successfully challenged by the middle class and its allies. In central Europe, as a result of the 1848 revolutions, the legal estate privileges of the nobility were dealt a mortal blow. The romantic movement, which became dominant in intellectual and artistic circles beginning in the late 18th

and early 19th centuries, made a profound impact in the cultural life of the non-historical, stateless nationalities of central and eastern Europe. Interest in the past was awakened that found expression in literature as well as in serious scholarship, especially linguistics, ethnography and history, which contributed much to the beginnings of the establishment of modern national cultures among the stateless peoples.

In different states and regions of Europe these processes were not identical, nor did they take place contemporaneously. In central and eastern Europe they occurred later and manifested themselves differently than in the west. Furthermore, conditions within separate states and regions were not identical, which led to variations of the processes and developments mentioned. The multinational Russian Empire was a military great power on par with its western European counterparts, but it was also an economic backwater with a correspondingly archaic social structure. In addition, Russia was a politically reactionary state, headed by an all-powerful autocrat, Nicholas I, who was determined to keep his realm free of certain ideas coming from western Europe, especially concepts associated with democracy, self rule and national liberation.

In the western territories of the Russian Empire, annexed from the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the late 18th century, the idea of national liberation, in the form of

resurrecting the old commonwealth, was strong. The traditional carriers of this idea were the Polish szlachta. In November 1830 in connection with the outbreak of revolutions in France and Belgium earlier that year and the decision of Nicholas I to mobilize troops to mount a military campaign against the revolutionaries, an insurrection broke out to re-establish Polish independence.

Volodymyr Antonovych was born a few years following the failed 1830-31 insurrection into a family of the numerically large stratum of impoverished and landless Polish nobility in Right-Bank Ukraine. The traditions of the Polish struggle to re-establish state independence was strongly entrenched among the szlachta there and these traditions were a significant factor in the formation of his views. Nevertheless, the Right-Bank szlachta was, on the whole, a conservative, backward-looking estate. When he moved to live with his legal father just before leaving to attend secondary school in Odessa, Antonovych became acquainted with a more liberal, freer group of young, somewhat non-conformist, noblemen. These young men oftentimes met in the evenings to read aloud and it was in this quasi-Ukrainophile company that he was introduced to the romantic Cossackophile literature of M. Czajkowski, which stimulated his interest in the Ukrainian Cossack past.[1]

Antonovych's experiences in Odessa, a free-wheeling and

---

[1] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 30-31.

cosmopolitan port city, were critical in the formation of his views. Here, largely due to the encouragement of his biological father, J. Dzsidai, Antonovych read widely from the authors of the French Enlightenment. In addition, he received an excellent secondary school education from humane and enlightened teachers, which made a profound impact on him.[2]

Whereas in Odessa, Antonovych was largely free of the influences of the szlachta, now, at Kiev unversity, he once again found himself within a Polish milieu. However, the atmosphere among Polish students at the university was not the stifling one of the provincial szlachta-dominated Right-Bank towns and country estates. Despite Kiev Governor-General D. Bibikov's strict regime, the ideals and traditions of the radical-democratic wing of the Polish national movement, led by émigrés and their agents in the Russian Empire, were continued at Kiev university in the 1850s; this became especially evident by the second half of the decade. It is clear that Antonovych was among those who sympathized with this tradition.[3]

The popularity of radical-democratic ideas at Kiev university can be explained in part by the fact that many of

---

[2] V. Antonovych, "Dodatok do 'Memuariv,'" pp. 62-63.

[3] When his sister's home was searched by Tsarist authorities in late 1860, among Antonovych's possessions found were portraits of: Konarski in chains, the historian Lelewel and J. Bem, who fought in both the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 as well as in the ranks of the Hungarian army in their war for independnce in 1848-49. See Chapter Two, p. 29, esp. n. 70.

the Polish university students were sons of the petty, impoverished szlachta, who were more inclined as a social group to accept radical-democratic ideas.[4] In part it can be explained by the repressive policies taken against Poles in the Right-Bank territories following the failure of the 1830-31 insurrection.[5] Antonovych became active in this radical-democratic patriotic Polish student movement at the university and eventually a leader of a Ukrainophile group within this movement - the khlopomany. The radical-democratic tradition in the Polish national liberation movement following the failed 1830-31 insurrection has been labelled as Polish revolutionary populism by the historian Peter Brock;[6] the Polish khlopomany movement can be seen as falling within this tradition.

For the greater part of the 19th century the Polish national movement can be described as that of a historical nation, led by its traditional elite - the nobility; the aim of the movement was to re-establish recently lost statehood in

---

[4] In his memoirs, Antonovych noted that the vast majority of Polish university students at Kiev university came from the impoverished nobility. See his "Memuary," p. 33. See also R. Serbyn, "Les étudiants de l'Université de Kiev d'après les registres académiques, 1858-1863," Studia Ucrainica 2, 1984, pp. 220-21.

[5] D. Beauvois, Polacy na Ukrainie, pp. 220-21

[6] See P. Brock, Polish Revolutionary Populism. Brock's brief study concentrates on the Polish émigrés. See also his essay "The Political Programme of the Polish Democratic Society," in P. Brock, Nationalism and Populism in Partitioned Poland: Selected Essays, London, 1973, pp. 59-101.

its historical frontiers. Concurrently, in the first half of the 19th century, a Ukrainian national movement was being born. In contrast to the Polish movement, the Ukrainian movement was that of a non-historical nation, led by a new social force, the intelligentsia.[7] It was not until the mid 1840s that a group of young Ukrainian intellectuals established the first political organization - the Cyrillo-Methodian society - which, in its program, advocated both social and national liberation. As the Polish movement was the more advanced and stronger of the two, it served as a model for the Ukrainians to emulate. On the other hand, as the Polish movement aimed to re-establish a Polish state incorporating Right-Bank Ukraine and Galicia, Ukrainian intellectuals in Russia had to oppose it and, in the process, developed further their own ideology, which was populist.[8]

In the first half of the 19th century, some Polish noblemen and cultural figures in Right-Bank Ukraine developed an affection for and allegiance to the land they lived in, including its Ukrainian peculiarities, which can be called

---

[7] See I.L. Rudnytsky, "Observations on the Problem of 'Historical' and 'Non-historical' Nations," in his Essays in Modern Ukrainian History, Edmonton, 1987, pp. 37-48, esp. pp. 43-44. Most members of the intelligentsia came from the petty and impoverished gentry, while a smaller number came from the clergy and other social groups.

[8] See I.L. Rudnytsky's interpretive essay on the Ukrainian national movement and its periodization: "The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine," In I.L. Rudnytsky, Essays in Modern Ukrainian History, Edmonton, 1987, pp. 123-41.

Polish Ukrainophilism. In political terms, this can be seen as a form of territorial patriotism (Landespatriotismus), which was an attempt to reconcile dual loyalties: some from of allegiance towards the smaller region was manifested, while primary loyalty was reserved for the larger, all-encompassing homeland: the Polish state in its historical frontiers.[9] The movement of the khlopomany represented the furthest and most radical development in this trend. In their social program the khlopomany advocated the defence of the social interests of the Ukrainian peasantry against those of the szlachta and, on national issues, cultural rights for Ukrainians.

Antonovych was unaware of the existence of a Ukrainian movement and of the more important scholarly and literary works on Ukraine until after he entered Kiev university. According to his memoirs, despite this lack of knowledge, soon after he returned from Odessa, Antonovych had already pondered over the question of how the universal democratic theories he had imbibed recently and believed in could be applied in local conditions. He concluded that the local democratic element was the peasantry and that their nationality was an important factor in his calculations.[10] The origins of Antonovych's

---

[9] For an example of territorial patriotism (Polish Ukrainophilism) in the first half and mid-19th century period that had political and military repercussions see I.L. Rudnytsky, "Michal Czajkowski's Cossack Project During the Crimean War: An Analysis of Ideas," in his Essays in Modern Ukrainian History, Edmonton, 1987, pp. 173-86. See esp. pp. 173-75, where he discusses Polish Ukrainophilism.

[10] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 40.

Ukrainophile and pro-peasant views therefore were rooted in his knowledge and belief in European democratic theories as they were to be applied in Ukraine. This orientation towards the peasantry - that is, the common folk - as potential or actual carriers of democratic values, can be considered a populist concept.

At Kiev university Antonovych began to become acquainted with Ukrainian students as well as with Ukrainian history and literature. He was able to begin work in the Archive of Old ts at the university, which gave him access to documents on the history of Right-Bank Ukraine from the 15th through the 18th centuries. Antonovych studied under the direction of M. Ivanyshev, a romantic Slavophile, who was a pioneeer of Ukrainian archeography and historiography. These studies confirmed to Antonovych that his earlier conclusions concerning the relationship between nationality and democracy in Ukraine were correct.[11] He further gained firsthand knowledge of the Ukrainian peasantry through his excursions in the countryside, thus reducing to a degree the alienation from the common folk that was typical of the intelligentsia. At the same time he became convinced of the high ethical and moral standards of the peasantry.[12] This idealization of the peasantry was common among later populist ideologists in

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] See the descriptions of his excursions in ibid., pp. 40-44.

Russia. The excursions of the khlopomany into the countryside predated the "going to the people" movement, which became a massive phenomenon among idealistic and radical Russian and Ukrainian students in the early 1870s, especially in 1873-75, in European Russia.

It is not known when Antonovych made the decision that he should go over to the Ukrainian nationality. By 1859 he was advocating a radical social and pro-Ukrainian position among the khlopomany. In his memoirs, K. Mykhalchuk implied that Antonovych and some other khlopomany were already conscious Ukrainians in 1859, but remained in the Polish movement as long as they did in order to try to bring over to the Ukrainian side as many students as possible.[13] The rise in militancy of the Polish movement in the late 1850s and at the turn of the decade and, in particular, serious preparations for the insurrection, forced those khlopomany, who were trying to reconcile their dual loyalties to choose between Poland and Ukraine. Although only a relatively small number of them went over to the Ukrainian side along with Antonovych, it is clear that this phenomenon was not an anomaly but represented the logical culmination of a historical process.[14]

The anomaly in the situation in Right-Bank Ukraine was

---

[13] K. Mykhalchuk, "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," p. 220. See also Chapter Three.

[14] This is the conclusion of V. Lypynsky, a Right-Bank Polish nobleman who also went over to the Ukrainian nationality at the turn of the 20th century. See his Szlachta na Ukrainie, p. 64. See also Chapter Two.

that there were two movements and ideologies of national liberation competing for the same territory and for the allegiance of the young Right-Bank elite. The Ukrainian movement was the weaker of the two and most of the potential young Right-Bank elite were of Polish cultural background. Therefore, it was logical and understandable that in those circumstances most of the Ukrainophile Poles chose Poland. Nevertheless, it seems probable that, as B. Poznansky pointed out in his memoirs, had it not been for the Polish insurrection, many more of the students would have eventually gone over to the Ukrainian side.[15]

Antonovych made his decision based on moral and ethical values as well as on an evaluation of the history of Right-Bank Ukraine and of European history. In his statements given to the Polish nobility at the szlachta court held in May 1860, he stated that the Poles, as the minority in Right-Bank Ukraine, should recognize the rights of the majority, who were Ukrainian, and that the Poles should play the same role there as the pro-Finnish Swedes in the duchy of Finland.[16] In his first conversation with Mykhalchuk in 1959, Antonovych was optimistic in his assessmant of the future of the growth of Ukrainian national consciousness among the populace. He

---

[15] B. Poznansky, "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 2, pp. 17, 19.

[16] V. Antonovych, "Memuary," p. 49. On the role of Finns who were culturally Swedish in promoting the Finnish culture and national movement, see F. Singleton, A Short History of Finland, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 72-84.

pointed to the rebirth of the Czechs, who had seemed Germanized, as well as to the recent successes of the Italian movement for unification.[17] Through his study of Ukrainian history and during his excursions throughout the Ukrainian countryside, Antonovych confirmed in his mind that the Polish movement in Right-Bank Ukraine was foreign to the peasantry and that the peasantry would not support the Poles in their attempt to rebuild the Polish state on these lands, regardless of the promises of social liberation given by the Polish side. In addition, he saw clearly the weight that the conservative szlachta still carried in Polish society as well as in the national movement and opposed this. The szlachta, on their part, saw Antonovych as a danger to their interests and took measures to discipline him; when this did not result in his obedience, they used the Russian administration to persecute him. In the meantime, the drawing together of the radical and conservative wings of the Polish movement was proceeding in preparation for the insurrection.

The rise in activity of the Polish movement was only one of the consequences of the more liberal policies of Alexander II, who began his reign by easing censorship and relaxing authoritarian police-administrative controls over society. This liberalization allowed previously suppressed national, intellectual and social grievances as well as ideas to be

---

[17] See K. Mykhalchuk, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo," UZh, 1914, no. 8-10, pp. 84-85.

discussed in the press and journals. The government's commitment to embark on a series of fundamental reforms to facilitate modernization of the country, the most important of which was the abolition of serfdom, fuelled debates and discussions within society over the depth and breadth of proposed reforms. Intellectual ferment and discontent, the formation of radical conspiratorial societies among students, intellectuals and even military officers, an increase in peasant unrest in the late 1850s and early 1860s, has led Soviet historians to classify this period as one in which a "revolutionary situation" existed.[18] It is in this period that it can be said that the Russian populist movement and ideology came into being. It was also in this peiod that the Ukrainian populist ideology and movement were reborn following the long interruption caused by the arrests of the Cyrillo-Methodians.

Among the intellectuals, political activists and participants of secret societies who returned to European Russia following periods of exile under Nicholas I were the former Cyrillo-Methodians. Some of them went to St. Petersburg, where they began, once again, to engage in Ukrainophile activities, which included the formation of a

---

[18] Whether this really was a point when a revolutionary situation existed is open to debate. Many studies have been written on this period by Soviet historians. See especially the series of documents and essays edited by M.V. Nechkina, Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg., 7 vols., Moscow, 1960-78.

hromada and the establishment of a Ukrainian populist organ, the journal Osnova. It was natural that this group would re-assemble and serve as a catalyst for the formation of other hromady in Ukraine.

It was also logical that the leadership of the Ukrainian movement would pass to a new, younger generation and that the centre of gravity of the Ukrainian movement move to Ukraine from the imperial capital. Kiev, Rus'-Ukraine's traditional, historical capital, an important city with a university, located on the border between Left- and Right-Bank Ukraine, became this new centre. Yet, Kiev was a city where Polish influences were strong; many Poles attended the university, which was a centre of activity of Polish patriotic youth. It was natural then that the Polish movement at the university would affect strongly the non-Poles there, which would lead to a response, especially from Ukrainians, whose historical consciousness was formed in large part on the legacy and traditions of the anti-Polish struggles of the Ukrainian Cossacks and peasantry of the 16th and 17th centuries. Whereas sympathy for the Polish movement existed at the universities in Moscow and St. Petersburg among Russian students, at Kiev university, Polish claims to Right-Bank Ukraine - which included agitation among Polish students that Kiev university should be Polish - caused a reaction among Ukrainian students, turned the university into a battleground, stimulated the formation of Ukrainian national consciousness

and the organization of a hromada there.

Antonovych was a key figure in these activities. He and his followers withdrew from the Polish camp, went over to the Ukrainian side and played a crucial role in the formation of the Kiev Hromada, the establishment of which can be considered as a symbolic union of the young Right- and Left-Bank intelligentsia.[19] Antonovych justified his "conversion" in a brilliant manifesto, written as a polemical reply to a Polish publicist. This manifesto - "Moia ispoved" - can be considered as one of the most important documents of Ukrainian populism. Antonovych was also a major co-author of another important populist manifesto - "Otzyv iz Kieva" - which outlined the principles and objectives of the newly-formed Kiev Hromada.

In addition to its personal revelations, the first document was clearly anti-Polish; it explained to both the conservative szlachta as well as the Polish populists - the khlopomany - why their pretensions to Right-Bank Ukraine were anti-democratic and likely to fail. It also indicated that reconciliation between Poles and Ukrainians was impossible until the Poles abandoned their idea of resurrecting Poland in its historical frontiers.

The latter document was not anti-Russian but explained to Russian society the goals of the Kiev Ukrainophiles. However,

---

[19] The importance of this act of union is recognized by I.L. Rudnytsky in "The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine," p. 129.

in their explanation, the authors did attack those principles espoused by Russian radicals who printed the manifesto "Molodaia Rossiia," thus distancing themselves from the Russian radicals or revolutionary populists. The Ukrainian manifesto therefore should not only be regarded as a manifesto espousing moderation, as opposed to the revolutionary methods espoused in "Molodaia Rossiia," but also as one of the first critiques of Russian revolutionary populism by Ukrainian populists.[20]

Antonovych's major contributions in developing a Ukrainian populist ideology, however, were continued largely in his historical works, as he wrote relatively little as a publicist. In his historical writings, Antonovych continued the populist trend that had been firmly established by M. Kostomarov. However, whereas Kostomarov remained a romantic historian and wrote much on personalities, Antonovych's writings contained a mixture of romantic and positivist notions and he wrote more on social groups.

In Antonovych's conception of Ukrainian history, the Ukrainian spirit was represented by the hromady, which from

---

[20] Disagreements, both on the question of recognition of Ukrainian national rights as well as on political questions, primarily the turn to terrorism by Russian populists, came to a head in the late 1870s and early 1880s among Ukrainian and Russian emigre populists in Geneva. The politics, attitudes and activities of Russian populists, especially those that concerned Ukraine from the 1860s to the 1880s, were brilliantly critiqued by the radical Ukrainian populist M. Drahomanov in "Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikorusskaia demokratiia," in his, Sobranie politicheskikih sochinenii, vol. 1, Paris, 1905, pp. 1-268.

the beginnings of the organization of the Kievan Rus' state were locked in a continuous dialectical struggle with first one, then another opposing force. The hromady fought a losing battle with the prince's retinue during the Kievan Rus' era, but revived following the Mongol invasion, more or less held their own under Lithuanian rule, and were transformed into the Cossack movement in the early modern era, while Ukraine was still largely under the rule of the Lithuanian princes. The Ukrainian Cossacks, especially the Zaporozhians, represented, in his view, the highest development of the democratic-communal or hromada principle in Ukrainian history. Other forms of this ideal were to be found in the Orthdox church brotherhoods of the early modern era and in the traditions of self-government and elections of clergy in the Orthodox church. Antonovych viewed the Polish-Ukrainian struggle of the 16th-17th centuries as one between the the democratic-communal principle, represented by the Cossacks and the aristocratic, which was represented by the Poles. In his view, although he did not develop it fully, the Russians represented authoritarianism.[21]

It is logical that, in Antonovych's conception and in the view of other Ukrainian populists, the hromada movement of the intelligentsia represented a continuation of the democratic-

---

[21] One can argue that Antonovych did not develop many of his concepts fully or thoroughly in his writings. See M. Drahomanov's critique in "Chudatski dumky pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu," p. 346.

communal struggle for self-rule, social justice, national self-realization and eventually national liberation. In his study of Ukrainian history, Antonovych had concluded that, in the past, Ukrainians had failed to realize their nationalideal because their cultural development stood at a low level. Therefore, it was logical that the hromada members consider their primary task as cultural. The raising of the cultural level of the common folk, they reasoned, would lead to the development of social and national consciousness, which was a precondition of national and social liberation, that is, the realization of the Ukrainian national ideal.

Although Antonovych's interpretations of Ukrainian history cannot be regarded as good historiography today, they did play a crucial role in forming mainstream Ukrainian populist ideology, which was based in large measure on an idealization of the history of Ukraine, especially of the Cossacks, most particularly of the Zaporozhians. Antonovych showed that there was continuity in Ukrainian history, in the struggle of Ukrainians to achieve democratic-communal self-rule. These interpretations and constructs may not have reflected historical realities accurately, but they did serve as powerful historical myths of national and social liberation, which showed the Ukrainian historical process as being a struggle to implement anarcho-democratic principles against the Poles, who represented aristocratic principles, as well as against the Russians, who represented

authoritarianism.[22]

In his capital work on Russian populism, F. Venturi clearly attempts to tie Russian populism to European socialism. Russian populist ideologies and movements, therefore, were variants of European socialist theories and movements. Ukrainian populism can also be seen in this context. Clearly, the historical constructs of Antonovych can be seen as a Ukrainian variant of a socialist interpretation of Ukrainian history. The movement of Ukrainian intellectuals associated with the hromady also represents, to a degree, the formation of early Ukrainian liberal and socialist circles, pre-cursors of the neo-populist Ukrainian socialist and liberal parties of the early 20th century.

The Ukrainian populist movement and ideology were also national in character and therefore should be linked to European national movements and ideologies of the 19th century

---

[22] The expression of these ideas in a political document, which is clearly a manifesto of radical Ukrainian populism, or Ukrainian socialism, is "Perednie slovo do 'Hromady,'" whose authorship has been attributed to Drahomanov. See "Perednie slovo do 'Hromady,'" in M. Drahomanov, Vybrani tvory: Zbirka politychnykh tvoriv z prymitkamy, vol. 1, Prague-New York, 1937, pp. 93-147. See especially pp. 95-99. Recently, one Ukrainian scholar has written that "Perednie slovo do 'Hromady,'" was written collectively, and that its principle author was Fedir Vovk. Drahomanov signed it because the other authors wished to continue to maintain contacts with Ukrainians in Russia. See O. Franko, "Vzhe i zapriahly konei...," Ukraina, 1989, no. 52, p. 14. The thesis that Kostomarov's interpretation of Ukraine's medieval history created a myth, which served as an important contribution to the formation of a Ukrainian national ideology, is well-illustrated in J. Iwanus, "Democracy, Federalism and Nationality," MA Thesis, University of Alberta, 1986.

that had, as their ultimate goal, the establishment of autonomous or independent states. In particular, the Polish movement and ideologies of national liberation played a significant role in the formation of the Ukrainian national movement and its ideology; they not only served as sources to emulate, but also as catalytic agents that called forth a reaction. Antonovych, who came to the Ukrainian movement from the Polish side, brought the more progressive of these traditions and experiences with him. He was also instrumental in founding the Kiev Hromada, which was in large part due to an anti-Polish reaction among Ukrainian Kiev university students, as well as in the formulation of an ideology of national liberation that was tied to his views on Ukrainian history, which were strongly, at least on the surface, anti-Polish.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

TsDIA-K (Tsentralnyi Derzhavnyi Istorychnyi Arkhiv Ukrainy v Kyievi [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kiev]), Fond 442 (Papers of the Kiev Governor-General's Office).

TsNB (Tsentralna Naukova Biblioteka Akademii Nauk Ukrainy v Kyievi. Rukopysnyi viddil. [Central Scientific Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev. Manuscript Division]), Fond I.

Primary Sources

Antonovych, Volodymyr [Antonovich, Vladimir] [V.], "Chto ob etom dumat?," in V. Antonovych, Tvory, Kateryna Melnyk-Antonovych, ed., vol. 1 (only volume published), Kiev, 1932, pp. 93-99.

_____,"Do biohrafii A.P. Svydnytskoho," Zoria, 1886, no. 11, p. 195.

_____, "Dodatok do 'Memuariv,'" in Tvory, pp. 62-65.

_____, "Istorychni baiky p. Mariiana Dubetskoho (Z pryvodu pratsi pro pochatok Zaporizhzhia), in Tvory, pp. 211-27.

_____,"Izsledovanie o gaidamachestve po aktam 1700-1768 g.," in AIuZR, part 3, vol. 3, Kiev, 1876, pp. 1-128.

_____, "Izsledovanie o gorodakh iugo-zapadnago kraia," in Monografii po istorii Zaoadnoi i Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii V.B. Antonovovicha vol. 1 (only volume published), Kiev, 1885, pp. 133-94.

_____, "Kharakteristika deiatelnosti Bogdana Khmelnitskago," Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa, 1899, book 13, otd. 1, pp. 100-04.

_____, "Kiev, ego sudba i znachenie s XIV po XVI stoletie (1362-1569)," in Monografii, pp. 223-64.

_____, "Kievskie voity Khodyki -- epizod iz istorii gorodskago samoupravleniia v Kieve v XVI-XVII stolettiakh," in V. Antonovych Monografii, pp. 195-220.

_____, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, Winnipeg-Dauphin, 1971. Third edition. Originally published as Besidy pro chasy kozatskykh na Ukraini, Chernivtsi, 1897.

_____, "Kostomarov kak istorik," KS, 1885, book 12, no. 5, pp. xxvi-xxxiv.

_____, "Lyst podorozhnoho," in Tvory, pp. 228-31.

_____, "Memuary," in Tvory, Kiev, 1932, pp. 3-61.

_____, "Moia ispoved," in Tvory, Kiev, 1932, pp. 100-15.

_____, "O promyshlennosti Iugo-Zapadnago kraia v XVIII st.," in Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnago Otdela Imp. rus. geogr. Obshchestva, vol. 1, Kiev, 1873, pp. 179-91.

_____, "Ocherk istorii velikago kniazhestva Litovskago do smerti Olgerda," in Monografii, pp. 3-132.

_____, "Ocherk sostoianiia pravoslavnoi tserkvi v Iugo-zapadnoi Rossii s poloviny XVII do kontsa XVIII stoletiia, in Monografii, pp. 281-342.

_____, "Otvet g. Korzonu," in Tvory, 232-37.

_____, "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," in Tvory, pp. 238-50.

_____, "Poiasnennia na naklep I. Ohryzka," in Tvory, pp. 125-130.

_____, "Polsko-russkie sootnosheniia XVII v. v sovremennoi polskoi prizme," in Tvory, pp. 159-95.

_____, "Predislovie," in AIuZR, part 6, vol. 2, Kiev, 1870, pp. 1-64.

_____, "Proizvedeniia Shevchenka, soderzhanie kotorykh sostavliiaet istoricheskie sobytiia, in Tvory, pp. 153-58.

_____, "Pro ukrainofiliv ta ukrainofilstvo (Vidpovid na napady 'Vestnika Iuzhnoi i Iu.-Z. Rossii,'" in Tvory, pp. 131-39.

_____, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoi storone Dnepra (1679-1716)," in AIuZR, part 3, vol. 2, Kiev, 1868, pp. 1-197.

_____, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh 1500-1648 god." in AIuZR, 1863, part 3, vol. 1, pp. i-cxx.

_____, "Try natsionalni typy narodni," in Tvory, pp. 196-210.

Antonovych, Volodymyr et al., "Otzyv iz Kieva," in Materiialy dlia biohrafii V.B. Antonovycha (z pryvodu dvadtsiatoi richnytsi z dnia ioho smerty), Dmytro Bahalii, ed., Kiev, 1929, pp. 38-48.

Ballin, N.P., "50 let moei zhizni," in Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg., M.V Nechkina et al, eds., vol. 5, Moscow, 1970, pp. 322-37.

Bobrowski, Tadeusz, Pamietnik mojego zycia (Reprint edition), vol. 2, Warsaw, 1979.

Chykalenko, Ievhen, Spohady (1861-1907) (Reprint edition), New York, 1955.

Drahomanov, M.P. [Dragomanov, M.P.], "Avtobiograficheskaia zametka," in M.P. Drahomanov, LPP, O.I.Dei, ed., vol. 1, Kiev, 1970, pp. 39-68.

_____, "Avstro-ruski spomyny (1867-1877)," in M.P. Drahomanov, LPP, vol. 2, O.Ia. Lysenko, ed., Kiev, 1970, pp. 151-288.

_____, "Chudatski dumky pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu," in LPP, vol. 2, pp. 312-367.

_____, "Do istorii ukrainskoi khlopomanii v 1860-ti rr.," Zhytie i slovo, 1895, book 3, pp. 344-48.

_____, "Evrei i poliaki v iugo-zapadnom kraie," Politicheskie sochineniia M.P. Dragomanova, vol. 1 (only volume published), Tsentr i Okrainy, I. Grevs and B. Kistiakovsky, eds., Moscow, 1908, pp. 217-67.

_____, "Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikorusskaia demokratiia," in Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii M.P. Dragomanova, vol. 1, [Petr Struve], ed., Paris, 1905, pp. 1-268.

_____, Nedilni shkoly na Ukraini, Geneva, 1877.

_____, "Perednie slovo do 'Hromady,'" in Mykhailo Drahomanov, Vybrani tvory: Zbirka politychnykh tvoriv z prymitkamy, vol. 1, Prague-New York, 1937, pp. 93-147.

Dubiecki, Marian, Mlodziez Polska w uniwersytecie Kijowskom przed 1863, Kiev, 1909.

Gogel, N.V., Iosafat Ogryzko i peterburgskii revoliutsionnyi rzhond v dele poslednego miatezh, Vilnius, 1866.

[Hattsuk, Oleksander], "Chto takoe khlopomaniia i kto takie khlopomany?" Vestnik Iugo-Zapanoi i Zapadnoi Rossii, 1862, no. 11, pp. 139-56.

Hrushevsky, Mykhailo [M. Serhiienko] [M.H.], "Hromadskyi rukh na Ukraini v polovyni XII v.," ZNTSh, 1892, vol. 1, pp. 1-28.

_____, "Try lysty Volod. Antonovycha do Antoniia Miodushevskoho," ZNTSh, 1909, vol. 89, pp. 144-51.

_____, "Ukrainska partiia sotsialistiv-revoliutsioneriv ta ikh zavdannia," Boritesia-Poborete, 1920, no. 1, pp. 1-51.

Iefremov, Serhii, "Z lystiv Kostomarova do Antonovycha," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, pp. 77-78.

Iefymenko, Petro [P.E.], "Iz epokhy krestianskoi reformy na iuge Rossii (narodnye slukhi i tolki o vole i zemle)," KS, 1886, no. 1, pp. 91-110.

Iuzefovich, B.M., ed., Tridsat let [illegible]mu na[illegible], St. Petersburg, 1896.

Ivanyshev, Mykola [Ivanishev, Nikolai], "O drevnikh selskikh obshchinakh v iugozapadnoi Rossii," Russkaia beseda, 1857, vol. 3, book 7, otd., 2, pp. 1-57.

_____, "Soderzhanie postanovlenii dvorianskikh provintsialnikh seimov v Iugozapadnoi Rossii," AIuZR, vol. 1, part 2, Kiev, 1861, pp. xv-lxiv.

_____, "Svedeniia o nachale Unii," Russkaia beseda, 1858, vol. 3, book 11, otd. 2, pp. 1-61.

Katkov, Mikhail, 1863 god. Sobranie statei po polskomu voprosu pomeshchavshchikhsia v Moskovskikh Vedomostiakh, Russkom Vestnike i Sovremennoi letopisi, vol. 1, Moscow, 1887.

Kieniewicz, Stefan, ed., Zeznania sledcze o powstaniu styczniowym, Wroclaw, 1956.

Kieniewicz, Stefan and Miller I., eds., Pokazaniia i zapiski o polskom vosstanii 1863 goda Oskara Avaide, Moscow, 1961.

Kostomarov, Mykola [Kostomarov, Nikolai], "Cherty narodnoi iuzhnorusskoi is[illegible]rii," in Sobranie sochinenii N.I. Kostomarova, book 1, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1903-04, pp. 67-158.

_____, "Dve russkiia narodnosti," in Sobranie sochinenii, book 1, vol. 1, St.Petersburg, 1903-04, pp. 31-65.

_____, "Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi," in Sobranie sochinenii, book 1, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1903-04, pp. 1-30.

_____, "O kozachestve. Otvet 'Vilenskomu vestniku,'" in NPP, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, ed., Kiev, 1928, pp. 57-68.

_____, "Otvet g. Padalitse," in NPP, pp. 68-74.

_____, "Otvet na vykhodki gazety (Krakovskoi) 'Czas' i zhurnala 'Revue contempaire,'" in NPP, pp. 75-84.

_____, "Pravda Moskvicham o Rusi," in NPP, pp. 102-10.

_____, "Pravda Poliakam o Rusi," in NPP, pp. 94-101.

_____, "Ukraina," in Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii M.P. Dragomanova, [Petr Struve, ed.] vol. 2, Paris, 1906, pp 746-55.

Lasocki, Wacław, Wspomnienia z mojego zycia, vol. 1, W kraju, Cracow, 1933.

Lavrov, Petr, Historical Letters, Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1967.

Levytsky, Orest, "Storinka z zhyttia Volodymyra Antonovycha," LNV, 1913, vol. 62, book 4, pp. 19-27.

Maksymovych, M.O. [Maksimovich, M.A.], "Filologicheskiia pisma k M.P. Pogodinu," in Sobranie sochinenii M.A. Maksimovicha, vol. 3, Kiev, 1880, pp. 183-243.

_____, "Istoricheskiia pisma o kozakakh pridniprovskikh. (K M.V. Iuzefovichu)," in Sobranie sochinenii, vol. 1, Kiev, 1876, pp. 277-316.

_____, Novyia pisma k M.P. Pogodinu," Sobranie sochinenii, vol. 3, pp. 273-311.

_____, "O mnimom zapustenii Ukrainy v nashestvie Batyevo i naselenii eia novoprishlom narodom, in Sobranie sochinenii, vol. 1, pp. 131-45.

_____, "Otvetnyia pisma M.P. Pogodinu," Sobranie sochinenii, vol. 3, pp. 244-72.

Marakhov, H.I. [Marakhov, G.I.], et al., eds., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1856-1862 rr., vol. 1, Kiev, 1963.

_____, Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1863-1864 rr., vol. 2, Kiev, 1964.

Melnyk-Antonovych, Kateryna, "Dodatkovi prymitky ta vidomosti do 'Memuariv,'" in V. Antonovych, Tvory, pp. 66-92.

Miiakovsky, Volodymyr [Mijakovs'kyj, Volodymyr], "Pomyinytsia," Nashe mynule, 1919, nos. 1-2, pp. 73-122.

_____, "Revoliutsiini vidozvy do ukrainskoho narodu, 1850-1870 rr.," in Volodymyr Miiakovsky, UFW, Marko Antonovych, ed., N[illegible], 1984, pp. 227-63.

Miller, I.S., ed., Ru[illegible]o-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazy, vol. 1, Moscow, 1963.

Mykhalchuk, Kost, "Avtobiohrafichna zapyska," in Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukraintsiv XIX-ho stolittia, George Luckyj, ed., New York, 1989, pp. 219-24.

_____, "Iz ukrainskago bylogo. K vospominaniiam B.S. Poznanskskogo," UZh, 1914, nos. 5-6, pp. 13-20; nos. 8-10, pp. 70-85.

Padalitsa, Tadeusz [Zenon Fisz], "Pan Padalytsia do pana Vladymyra Antonovycha," in Materiialy dlia biohrafii V.B. Antonovycha, D. Bahalii, ed., Kiev, 1929, pp. 19-23.

Panteleev, L.F., Vospominaniia, Moscow, 1958.

Pirogov, N.I., "O voskresnykh shkolakh," in Sochineniia, vol. 1, Kiev, 1910, pp. 280-91.

Poznansky, Borys [Boris], "Vospominaniia," UZh, 1913, no. 1, pp. 25-44; no. 2, pp. 10-26; no. 3, pp. 15-24; no. 4, pp. 23-33; no. 5, pp. 41-51.

_____, "Vospominaniia o polskom vosstanii v Ukraine 1863 goda," KS, 1885, book 11, pp. 436-65; book 12, pp. 571-611.

Rennenkampf, N.K., "Kievskaia universitetskaia starina," Russkaia starina, 1899, vol. 99, no. 7, pp. 31-49.

Rolle, Michal, In illo tempore, Brody, 1914.

Rylsky, Tadei [Chorny, Maksym], "S pravago berega Dnepra," Osnova, 1361, no. 2, pp. 239-44.

Shcherbyna, Volodymyr, [Kolyshnii student], "Spomyny kolyshnoho studenta pro Kyivskyi universytet 70-kh rokiv," Nashe mynule, 1919, nos. 1-2, pp. 64-69.

Skalkokovsky, A., Istoriia Novoi Sechi ili poslednego Kosha Zaporozhskogo iz sobstvennogo zaporozhskogo arkhiva A. Skalkovskim, Odessa, 1841.

_____, Naezdy gaidamakov na Zapaduiu Ukrainu v XVIII st. 1733-1768 gg., Odessa, 1845.

Starytsky, Mykhailo, Tvory v shesty tomakh, vol. 6, Kiev, 1990.

Syroczynski, Leon, Z przed 50 lat, Lviv, 1914.

Verzilov, A.V., "Vospominannia o V.B. Antonoviche," Trudy Chernigovskoi Uchenoi Arkhivnoi Komisii, 1908, book 7, addenda, pp. 86-103.

Vozniak, Mykhailo, "Drahomanov u vidnovlenii 'Pravdi,'" Za sto lit, 1930, book 6, pp 229-330.

Zhukov, I., "Iz vospominanii shestidesiatnika," Revoliutsionnai situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg., [vol. 2] Moscow, 1962, pp. 545-72.

Zhytetsky, Ihnat, "Z lystuvannia Kostomarova. Lystuvannia Kostomarova z kharkivskymy hromadianamy pro vydannia narodnikh knyzhok," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, pp. 69-72.

Zhytetsky, Pavlo [Zhitetsky, P.], "Russkii patriotizm," Osnova, 1862, no. 3, pp. 1-21.

_____, "Z istorii kyivskoi hromady," ZNTSh, 1913, vol. 116, book 4, pp. 177-89.

Secondary Sources

Antonovych, Dmytro, [D.A.], "Deshcho pro 'Vyklady pro kozatski chasy na Ukraini' ta pro istorychni pohliady prof. Antonovycha," in Volodymyr Antonovych, Korotka istoriia kozachchyny, Winnipeg-Dauphin, 1971, pp. xvi-xxi.

Antonovych, Marko, "Koly postaly hromady," in Zbirnyk na poshanu prof. d-ra Oleksandra Ohloblyna, O.Baran et al, eds., New York, 1977, pp. 75-93.

Antonovych, Marko, "Nedrukovani lysty V.B. Antonovycha do F.K. Vovka," Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1989, no. 1-3, pp. 92-105.

Bahalii, Dmytro, "Perednie slovo," in Materiialy dlia biohrafii V.B. Antonovycha (Z pryvody dvadtsiatoi richnytsi z dnia ioho smerty), Dmytro Bahalii, ed., Kiev, 1929, pp. 3-14.

Baraboi, A.Z., "Popytka ukrainskikh revoliutsionerov organizovat pomoshch polskomu vosstaniiu 1863," Voprosy istorii, 1957, no. 1, pp. 109-16.

Baron, Samuel H., Plekhanov: The Father of Russian Marxism, Stanford, 1963.

Barsukov, Nikolai, Zhizn i trudy M.P. Pogodina, book 15, St. Petersburg, 1901.

Beauvois, Daniel, Polacy na Ukrainie 1831-1863. Szlachta Polska na Wolyniu Podoliu i Kijowszczyznie, Paris, 1987. Translated from the French by Ewa and Krzystof Rutkowski.

Bernshtein, M.D., Zhurnal "Osnova" i ukrainskyi literaturnyi protse kintsia 50-kh -- 60-kh rokiv XIX st., Kiev, 1959.

Berlin, Isaiah, "Introduction" in Franco Venturi, Russian Populism, Chicago-London, 1983, pp. vii-xxx.

Bilan, V., "Merezha nedilnykh shkil na Ukraini (1859-1862)," Arkhivy Ukrainy, 1966, no. 5, pp. 31-40.

Billington, James H., Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism, Oxford, 1958.

Borysenko, V.I., Borotba demokratychnykh syl za narodnu osvitu na Ukraini v 60-kh -- 90-kh rokakh XIX st., Kiev, 1980.

Braichevsky, Mykhailo, "Ievropeiets ridnoi istorii," Ukraina, 1989, no. 44 (October), pp. 8-9; no. 45 (November), p. 15.

Brock, Peter, Polish Revolutionary Populism: a study in agrarian socialist thought from the 1830s to the 1850s, Toronto-Buffalo, 1977.

_____, "The Political Programme of the Polish Democratic Society," in Peter Brock, Nationalism and Populism in Partitioned Poland: Selected Essays, London, 1973, pp. 59-101.

Canovan, Margaret, Populism, New York-London, 1981.

Carr, E.H., Michael Bakunin, London, 1937.

Dei, O.I., et al., Istoriia ukrainskoi dozhovtnevoi zhurnalistyky, Lviv, 1983.

Deiateli revoliutsionnogo dvizheniia Rossii: Bio-bibliograficheskii slovar. Ot predshestvennikov dekabristov do padeniia tsarizma, 5 vols., Moscow, 1927-34. Series completed to vol. 3, part 2.

Diuk, Nadia M., "M.P. Drahomanov and the Evolution of Ukrainian Cultural and Political Theory," Ph.D. Dissertation, St.Anthony's College, University of Oxford, 1986.

Dmytryshyn, Basil, "Introduction," in Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 r. (Reprint edition), Munich, 1970, pp. xv-xxix.

Domanytsky, V., "Volodymyr Antonovych. Z nahody 45-litnoho iuvileiu naukovoi i hromadskoi diialnosti," Nova hromada, 1906, no. 9, pp. 27-46.

Doroshenko, Dmytro, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography " in The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1957, vol. 5-6, no. 4; 1-2, pp. 13-304.

_____, Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov, Leipzig, 1930.

_____, Volodymyr Antonovych: Ioho zhyttia i naukova ta hromadska diialnist, Prague, 1942.

Dovnar-Zapolsky, M.V., "Istoricheskie vzgliady V.B. Antonovicha," in Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestvo Nestora-letopistsa, 1909, book 21, part 1, nos. 1-2, pp. 22-37.

Franko, Ivan [I. Fr.], "Pisni Anatoliia Svydnytskoho," LNV, 1901, book 4, p. 43.

Franko, Oksana, "Vzhe i zapriahly konei...," Ukraina, 1989, no. 52, pp. 13-15.

Grabowicz, George Gregory, "The History and Myth of the Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1975.

Grimsted, Patricia K., Unpublished introductory essay to forthcoming I.D.C. microfiche edition of Opis aktovoi knigi Kievskogo Tsentralnogo Arkhiva.

Hardy, Deborah, Petr Tkachev, the Critic as Jacobin, Seattle-London, 1977.

Herlihy, Patricia, Odessa: A History 1794-1914, Cambridge, Mass., 1986.

Hermaize, Osyp, "V.B. Antonovych v ukrainskii istoriohrafii," Ukraina, 1928, book 5, pp. 17-32.

Himka, John-Paul, Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890), Cambridge, 1982.

Hlushko, S., "Drahomanov i nedilni shkoly na Ukraini," Ukraina, 1924, book 4, pp. 35-42.

Hnatiuk, Volodymyr, "Iarmarkove unkrainofilstvo v zhyttia ta literaturi (balahulshchyna)," in Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademyka Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevskoho z nahody shistdesiatoi richnytsi zhyttia ta sorokovykh rokakh naukovoi diialnosti, vol. 2, Kiev, 1928, pp. 272-89.

Hnip, M., Poltavska Hromada, Poltava, 1930.

Hornowa, Elzabeta, Ocena dzialnosti Michala Dragomanowa w Historiografii ukrainskiej, rosiiskiej i polskiej, Opole, 1967.

Hrakhovetsky,D., "Pershi nedilni shkoly na Poltavshchyni ta ikh diiachi (1861-1862 rr.)," Ukraina, 1928, book 4, pp. 51-72.

Hrushevsky, Mykhailo, "Kostomarov i Novitnia Ukraina," Ukraina, 1925, book 3, pp. 3-20.

_____, "Volodymyr Antonovych, osnovni idei ioho tvorchosti i diialnosti," in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Voldodymyr Boifatiiovych Antonovych 1834-1908-1988, Liubomyr Vynar, ed., New-York-Munich-Toronto, 1985, pp. 13-19.

_____, Z pochyniv ukrainskoho sotsiialistychnoho rukhu: Mykhailo Drahomanov i Zhenevskyi sotsiialistychnyi hurtok, Vienna, 1923.

_____, "Z publitsystychnykh pysan Kostomarova," in NPP, Kiev, 1928, pp. iii-xxi.

_____, "Z sotsialno-natsionalnykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," Ukraina, book 5, 1928, pp. 3-16.

Iastrebov, F., Revoliutsionnye demokraty na Ukraine vtoraia polovina 50-kh -- nachalo 60-kh godov XIX veka, Kiev, 1960.

Iavorsky, M., Narysy z istorii revoliutsiinoi borotby na Ukraini, 2 vols., Kharkiv, 1927-28.

Ikonnikov, V.S., ed. and comp., Biograficheskii slovar professorov i prepodavatelei Universiteta Sv. Vladimira (1834-1884), Kiev, 1884.

Ionescu, Ghita and Gellner, Ernest, eds., Populism: Its Meaning and National Characteristics, London, 1969.

Iubilei Mikhaila Aleksandrovicha Maksimovicha (1821-1871), Kiev, 1871.

Ivancevich, Anthony, "The Ukrainian National Movement and Russification." Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976.

Ivanova, R.P., Mykhailo Drahomanov u suspilnomu rusi Rosii ta Ukrainy, Kiev, 1971.

_____, "Obiednavcha diialnist 'Zemli i voli' na Ukraini u 60-kh rr. XIX st." UIZh, 1988, no. 9, pp. 60-70.

_____, "Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie na Ukraine i polskoe vosstanie 1863 goda," Sovetskoe slavianovedenie, 1978, no. 3, pp. 47-58.

_____, "Ukrainsko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazi kontsa 50-kh -- nachalo 60-kh godov XIX veka," Voprosy istorii, 1979, no. 3, pp. 32-42.

Iwanus, Jaroslaw, "Democracy, Federalism, and Nationality: Ukraine's Medieval Heritage in the Thought of N.I. Kostomarov," M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1986.

Kamanin, Ivan, "Trudy V.B. Antonovicha po istorii kozachestva," Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora-letopistsa, 1909, book 21, otd. 1, vyp. 1-2, pp. 44-52.

Katz, Martin, Mikhail N. Katkov: A Political Biography 1818-1887, The Hague, 1966.

Kieniewicz, Stepan, Powstanie styczniowe, Warsaw, 1972.

Kistiakovsky, Bohdan [Khatchenko, A.], "Po povodu vospominanii B.S. Poznanskago," UZh, 1913, no. 10, pp. 50-56.

Kohut, Zenon, "Myths Old and New: The Haidamak Movement and the Koliivshchyna (1768) in Recent Historiography," Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 1977, vol. 1, no. 3.

Koroliuk, V.D., and Marakhov, H.I., "Vstup," in Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini v 1856-1862 rr., H.I Marakhov et al., eds., Kiev, 1963, pp. xxii-xxxvii.

Kozak, Stefan, Ukrainscy Spiskowcy i Mesjanisci Bractwo Cyryla i Metodego, Warsaw, 1990.

Krevetsky, Ivan [N. Fabrikant], "Kratkii ocherk iz istorii otnoshenii russkikh tsenzurnikh zakonov k ukrainskoi literatury," Russkaia mysl, 1905, book 3, pp. 127-46.

Kyian, O.I., "Zhyttievyi ta tvorchyi shliakh V.B. Antonovycha," UIZh, 1991, no. 2, pp. 64-76.

Lenin, V.I., What Is To Be Done?, Oxford, 1963. Translated by S.V. and Patricia Utechin.

Levytsky, O.I., [Levitsky, O.I.], Piatdesiatiletie Kievskoi Komissii dlia razbora drevnikh akto (1843-1893 g). Istoricheskaia zapiska o eia deiatelnosti, Kiev, 1893.

_____, "Svedeniia o deiatelnosti Kommissii dlia razbora drevnikh aktov," in Sbornik statei i materialov po istorii Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, Kiev, 1911, vyp. 1, part 3, pp. 1-20.

Liaskoronsky, V.G., "V.B. Antonovich (nekrolog)," Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniia, 1908, New Series, part 15, pp. 51-75.

Lopuszanski, Boleslaw, Stowaryszenie Ludu Polskiego (1835-1841): Geneza i dzieje, Cracow, 1975.

Luckyj, George S.N., Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times, New York, 1983.

_____, Young Ukraine: The Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, 1845-1847, Ottawa-Paris, 1991.

Leikina-Svirskaia, V.R. and Shidlovskaia, V.S., "Polskaia voiennaia revoliutsionnaia organizatsiia v Peterbuge (1858-1864 gg.)," in Russko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazy 60-kh godov i vosstanie 1863 goda, V.A. Diakov et al, eds., Moscow, 1962, pp. 7-48.

Luciw, Wasyl, Ukrainians and the Polish Revolt of 1863 (A Contribution to the History of Ukrainian-Polish Relations), New Haven 1961.

Lypynsky, Viacheslav [Lipinski, Waclaw], Szlachta na Ukrainie, Cracow, 1909.

Malia, Martin, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, Cambridge, Mass., 1961.

Marakhov, H.I. [Marakhov, G.I.], Andrii Krasovsky -- borets proty kriposnytstva i samderzhavstva, Kiev, 1961.

_____, Kievskii universitet v revoliutsionno-demokraticheskom dvizhenii, Kiev, 1984.

_____, Polskoe vosstanie 1863 g. na pravoberezhnoi Ukraine, Kiev, 1967.

_____, Sotsialno-politicheskaia borba na Ukraine v 50-60-e gody XIX veka, Kiev, 1981.

Melnyk, L.H., Torzhestvo istorychnoi pravdy (Krytyka burzhuazno-natsionalistychnykh falsyfikatsiiistorii Ukrainy), Kiev, 1987.

Miiakovsky, Volodymyr [Mijakovs'kyj], "B.S. Poznansky (Narodnyk 60-kh rokiv)," Ukraina, 1926, book 1, pp. 72-93.

_____, "Batko Lesi Ukrainky," in UFW, pp. 372-77.

_____, "Istoriia zaslannia P. Chubynskoho," Arkhivna sprava, 1927, book 4, pp. 6-13.

_____, "Kyivska Hromada (Z istorii ukrainskoho hromadskoho rukhu 60-ykh rokiv," in UFW, pp. 264-86.

_____, "V.B. Antonovych. Pered slidchoiu komisiieiu," in UFW, pp. 310-34.

_____, "Volodymyr Antonovych," in UFW, pp. 322-34.

_____, "Z molodykh lit K. Mykhalchuka," Ukraina, 1924, book 4, pp. 98-107.

Mlynarsky, Z., and Slish, A., Andrii Potebnia -- borets za spilnu spravu bratnikh narodiv, Kiev, 1957.

Mylovodov, L., "Nedilni shkoly na Chernihivshchyni v 1860-kh rr.," in Chernihiv i pivnichne Livoberezhzhia, Kiev, 1928, pp. 431-42.

Mytsiuk, O., Tadei R. Rylsky (1840-1902) iak khlopoman i ekonomist, Chernivtsi, 1933.

_____, Ukrainski Khlopomany, Chernivtsi, 1933.

_____, Ukrainskyi ekonomist-hromadivets S.A. Podolinsky, Lviv, 1933.

Nechkina, M.V., et al., eds., Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg., 7 vols. Moscow, 1960-78.

Papazian, Dennis, "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov: Russian Historian, Ukrainian Nationalist, Slavic Federalist," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966.

Pashchuk, A.I., Sotsiolohichni ta suspilno-politychni pohliady S.A. Podolynskoho, Lviv, 1965.

Pavelko, V.U., "Uchast ukraintsiv vu povstannii 1863," UIZh, 1963, no. 1, pp. 31-41.

Pershina, Z.V., Ocherk istorii revoliutsionnogo dvizheniia na Ukraine, Kiev-Odessa, 1975.

Pipes, Richard, "Russian Marxism and Its Populist Background: The Late Nineteenth Century," The Russian Review, 1960, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 316-37.

Plachynda, V.P., Pavlo Hnatovych Zhytetsky, Kiev, 1987.

Pomper, Philip, Petr Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Revolutionary Movement, Chicago-London, 1972.

Pritsak, Omeljan [Omelian], "Istoriosofiia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho," in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy v odynadtiaty tomakh, dvanadtsiaty knyhakh, vol. 1, Do pochatku XI vika, Kiev, 1991, pp. xl-lxxiii

Pryima, F.Ia., "Shevchenko i nedilni shkoly na Ukraini," in Zbirnyk prats chotyrnadtsiatoi naukovoi Shevchenkivskoi konferentsii, Ie.P. Kyryliuk, ed., Kiev 1966, pp. 170-94.

_____, "Shevchenko i studentskyi rukh periodu revoliutsiinoi sytuatsii v Rossii 1859-1861 rokiv," in Zbirnyk prats deviatoi naukovoi Shevchenkivskoi konferentsii, Ie.P. Kyryliuk, ed., Kiev, 1961, pp. 127-60.

Prymak, Thomas M., Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture, Toronto, 1987.

Pypin, A.N., Istoriia russkoi etnografii, vol. 3, Etnografiia malorusskaia, St. Petersburg, 1891.

Radzykevych, Volodymyr, Pavlyn Svientsitsky. Publitsystychna, naukova ta literaturna ioho diialnist, Lviv, 1911.

Rawita-Gawronski, Francisek, Rok 1863 na Rusi. Ukraina, Wolyn, Podole, Lviv, 1903.

_____, Wlodzimierz Antonowicz. Zarys jego dzialnosci spoleczno-politycznej i historycznej, Lviv, 1912.

Rogosin, Boris, "The Politics of M.P. Dragomanov: Ukrainian Federalism and the Question of Political Freedom in Russia," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1967.

Romanchenko, I.S., and Zaslavsky, D., Mykhailo Drahomanov: Zhyttiai literaturno-doslidnytska dialnist, Kiev, 1964.

Romanovich-Slavatinsky, A.V., Zhizn i deiatelnost N.D. Ivanisheva, St. Petersburg, 1876.

Rudko, M., "Dokumenty z istorii hromadsko-politychnoho rukhu 60-kh rokiv na Ukraini," Arkhivy Ukrainy, 1965, no. 5, pp. 73-76.

Rudnytsky, Ivan L., "The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine," in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, Essays in Modern Ukrainian History, Peter L. Rudnytsky, ed., Edmonton, 1987, pp. 123-42.

_____, "Michal Czajkowski's Cossack Project during the Crimean War: An Analysis of Ideas," in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, Essays, pp. 173-86.

_____, "Observations on the Problem of 'Historical' and 'Nono-historical' Nations," in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, Essays, pp. 37-48.

_____, "Trends in Ukrainian Political Thought," in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, Essays, pp. 91-122.

Rusova, S., "Shevchenko i ukrainskoe obshchestvo 60-kh godov," UZh, 1913, no. 2, pp. 35-53.

Rychka, V.M., and Smolii, V.A., "V.B. Antonovych iak istoryk ukrainskoho kozatstva," UIZh, 1990, no. 9, pp. 109-15.

Sarbei, V.H., Istorychni pohliady O.M. Lazarevskoho, Kiev, 1961.

Savchenko, Fedir, Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 r. (Reprint edition), Munich, 1979.

Serbyn, Roman, "La 'Société politique secrète' de Kharkiv (Ukraine), 1856-1860," Historical Papers, 1973, pp. 159-77.

_____, "Les étudiants de l'Université de Kiev d'après les registres académiques, 1858-1863," Studia Ucrainica 2, Ottawa, 1984, pp. 197-212.

_____, "The Sion-Osnova Controversy of 1861-1862," in Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective, Howard Aster and Peter Potichnyi, eds., Edmonton, 1990, pp. 65-110. Second edition.

Serczyk, Wladyslaw, Haidamacy, Cracow, 1972.

_____, The Haidamak Uprisings, Edmonton, forthcoming.

Serhienko, H.Ia., Suspilno-politychnyi rukh na Ukraini pislia povstannia dekabrystiv, Kiev, 1971.

Shchurat, Vasyl, "Osnovy Shevchenkovykh zviazkiv z poliakamy," ZNTSh, vols. 119-20, pp. 217-347.

Shevelov, Iurii [Iurii Sherekh], Kost Mykhalchuk (21. 12. 1840 -- 7. 4. 1914), Winnipeg, 1952.

Ship, N.A., Intelligentsiia na Ukraine (XIX v.): Istoriko-sotsiologicheskii ocherk, Kiev, 1991.

Simonov, S.S., "Studencheskoe dvizhenie v Kievskom universitete v period revoliutionnoi situatsii 1859-1861 gg.," Uchenye zapiski Dagestanskogo Gos. universiteta, 1960, vol. 4, pp. 158-89.

Singleton, Fred, A Short History of Finland, Cambridge, 1989.

Skurnowicz, Joan S., Romantic Nationalism and Liberalism: Joachim Lelewel and the Polish National Idea, Boulder, 1981.

Snytko, T., "Studencheskoe dvizhenie v russkikh universitetakh v nachale 60-kh godov i vosstanie 1863 g.," in Vosstanie 1863 g. i russko-polskie revoliutsionnye sviazy 60-kh godov, Moscow, 1960, pp. 176-322.

Stakhiv, Matvii, "Materiialy pro svitohliad Hrushevskoho," in Mykhailo Hrushevsky u 110 rokovyny narodzhennia 1876-1976: Statti, spohady, dokumenty i komentari, ZNTSh, 1978, vol. 197, pp. 221-236.

Stanley, J.T., "The Birth of a Nation: The January Insurrection and the Belorussian National Movement," in The Crucial Decade: East Central European Society and National Defense, 1859-1870, Bela K. Kiraly, ed., New York, 1984, pp. pp. 185-202.

Steshenko, Ivan, "Ukrainski shestydesiatnyky," Zapysky ukrainskoho naukovoho tovarystva, 1908, vol. 2, pp. 29-83.

Strunina, L., "Pervyia voskresnyia shkoly v Kieve," KS, 1898, no. 5, pp. 287-307.

Studynsky, Kyrylo, "Epizody borotby za ukrainstvo 1863 r.," in Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademyka Mykhaila Serhiiievycha Hrushevskoho z nahody shistdesiatoi richnytsi zhyttia ta sorokovykh rokakh naukovoi diialnosti, vol. 2, Kiev, 1928, pp. 498-523.

Suny, R.G., The Making of the Georgian Nation, Bloomington-Indianapolis-Stanford, 1988.

Syvachenko, M.Ie., Anatolii Svydnytsky i zarodzhennia sotsialnoho romanu v ukrainski literaturi, Kiev, 1962.

_____, and Deko, O., Leonid Hlibov: Doslidzhennia i materialy, Kiev 1969.

Tabis, Jan, Polacy na Uniwersitecie Kijowskim 1834-1863, Cracow, 1974.

Takarevevsky, M., "K istorii vozniknoveniia 'Vospominanii' B.S. Poznanskago," UZh, 1914, no. 3, pp. 58-68.

Tkachenko, Mykola, "Arkheohrafichni studii Volodymyra Antonovycha," Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi zbirnyk, 1930, vol. 3, pp. 325-46.

Tomashivsky, Stepan, Volodymyr Antonovych. Ioho diialnist na poli istorychnoi nauky. (Z nahody iuvileiu), Lviv, 1906.

Tulub, O., "Nevidomyi avtobiohrafichnyi lyst K. Mykhalchuka (Z arkhivu Ivana Shteshenka)," Ukraina, 1927, book 5, pp. 59-69.

Ulam, Adam, In the Name of the People: Prophets and Conspirators in Pre-revolutionary Russia, New York, 1977.

Vasylenko, Mykola [Nyk.], "Akademyk Bohdan Oleksandrovych Kistiakovsky. (16/29 kvitnia 1920 roky)," Zapysky Sotsiialno-Ekonomichnoho Viddilu UAN, vol. 1, Kiev, 1923, pp. viii-xl.

_____, "Oleksander Matviievych Lazarevsky (1834-1902) (Materiialy dlia ioho biohrafii)," Ukraina, 1927, book 4, pp. 18-82.

Venturi, Franco, Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth-Century Russia (Reprint edition, Chicago-London, 1983. Translated from the Italian by Francis Haskell.

Volk, S.S., Narodnaia volia 1879-1882, Moscow, 1966.

Walicki, Andrzei, The Controversy Over Capitalism: Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists, Oxford, 1969.

_____, The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth Century Russian Thought, Oxford, 1975. Translated by Hilda Andrews Rusiecka.

Wandycz, Piotr S., The Lands of Partitioned Poland, 1795-1918, Seattle-London, 1974.

Wierzejski, Witold K., Fragmenty z dziejow polskiej mlodziezy akademickiej u Kijowie 1834-1920, Warsaw, 1939.

Woerhlin, William F., Chernishevskii: The Man and the Journalist, Cambridge, Mass., 1971.

Zaionchkovsky, P.A., Kirillo-Mefodievskoe obshchestvo (1846-1847), Moscow, 1959.

Zaslavsky, D., Mikhail Petrovich Dragomanov: Kritiko-biograficheskii ocherk, Kiev, 1924.

_____, M.P. Dragomanov: K istorii ukrainskogo natsionalizma, Kiev, 1934.

Zelnik, R.E., "The Sunday-School Movement in Russia," Journal of Modern History, 1965, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 151-70.

Zhytetsky, Ihnat, "Kyivska Hromada za 60-tykh rokiv," Ukraina, 1928, book 1, pp. 91-125.

Zinkivsky, Trokhym, "Natsionalne pytannia v Rossii," in Pysannia Trokhyma Zinkivskoho, Borys Hrinchenko [Vasyl Chaichenko], ed., book 2, Lviv, 1896, pp. 3-37.