Kyiv's Intellectual Environment on the Eve of the Valuev Directive

Valentyna Shandra
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Translated by Vitaly Chernetsky, Olena Ivanenko; emendated by Ksenia Maryniak

Abstract: The article discusses the conditions which galvanized the intellectual community in Kyiv prior to the 1863 January Uprising (aka Polish Insurrection of 1863-64). It analyzes local press coverage of the language debate, and delves into the worldviews of its participants, including Mykhailo Maksymovych, Mykhailo Iuzefovych, Mykola Kostomarov, Ksenofont Hovors'kyi, and others. It identifies how and why the results of this debate influenced the issuance of the 1863 Valuev Directive, which banned the use of the Ukrainian language in print.

Keywords: language debate, Kyiv intellectual community, Valuev Directive.

On 29 June 1862, the Imperial Russian War Minister Dmitrii Miliutin wrote to the Chief of Gendarmes Vasilii Dolgorukov: "I consider it necessary to convey to Your Excellency the secret information about the events in Kyiv shared with me by the Governor General of the Court of His Imperial Majesty, Count Sievers, adding that I personally read the attached note to His Majesty the Emperor" (Savchenko 183).

What was it that impressed the count so much in Kyiv, which he visited in early 1862 as a representative of the War Ministry, observing military installations and the moods of the peasantry—leading to his report being shared not only with key members of the cabinet but also with Tsar Alexander II himself? In the streets of Kyiv he saw many young people, mostly students, in "Little Russian" dress. After gathering some information privately and consulting a report by the governor of Kyiv gubernia, Lieutenant General P. I. Hesse, Major General B. F. Sievers reached the conclusion that a society of so-called "*khlopomany*" (peasant sympathizers) existed in Kyiv, its members undoubtedly pursuing a secret goal of regaining independence for "Little Russia" (Ukraine), using the peasants' intense dissatisfaction with the reforms of 1861, on the one hand, and Taras Shevchenko's poetry, on the other. His interpretation of the potential danger prompted further inquiries about the Ryl's'kyi brothers and Volodymyr

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956
Volume IV, No. 2 (2017) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T2192H

Antonovych, as well as Pavlo Chubyns'kyi; however, the evidence turned out to be not too threatening to the crown of the Russian Empire.[1] Still, it led Ukrainophiles in Kyiv to send a collective letter (signed by 21 persons) to Katkov's journal *Sovremennaia letopis'* (Contemporary Chronicle), explaining their position. Chiefly it consisted in the conviction that education should be the means of improving the social conditions of the broadest spectrum of society, overcoming the illiteracy from which it suffered, and which urgently needed addressing after the abolition of serfdom.[2]

By contrast, exactly a year later the report submitted to the Imperial Minister of the Interior by Orest Novyts'kyi, head of the Kyiv Censorship Committee, was followed swiftly by drastic measures, for by then much more serious matters were at stake. It was reported that the Ukrainian language ("*malorusskoe narechie*" [Little Russian dialect]) was being "forcibly" introduced in Kyiv schools, and that its right to exist was being widely discussed in the local press—although angered readers sought to prove that "no particular Little Russian language had ever existed in the past, existed at present, and could ever exist at all" (see Michael Moser's study in this volume).[3] Novyts'kyi shared the concern of his subordinate, the censor Alexei A. Lazov; as a professor of philosophy at Kyiv's St. Vladimir University with little experience in censorship himself, Novyts'kyi relied on this man with a thirty-year bureaucratic career and the rank of State Councillor, as well as on his own long-term communication with D. G. Bibikov, governor general and, since 1847, overseer of the Kyiv School District. It was from Bibikov that he learned how to judge the local situation with state affairs in

[1] N. N. Annenkov, Governor General of Kyiv gubernia, informed V. A. Dolgorukov, who also headed the Third Department [secret police] of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery, that they had failed to establish "the intentions of this society, or even whether such a society exists at all" (Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in the City of Kyiv [henceforth: TsDIAK Ukrainy], f. 442, op. 813, spr., 45, ark. 2, 14).

[2] The article was originally entitled "Obshchestvennye voprosy" ("Societal Issues"), but then received a new title, "Otzyv iz Kieva" ("A Reply from Kyiv") (published in *Sovremennaia letopis',* vol. 66, 1862, p. 5) (Zhytets'kyi 98).

[3] A quote from the original: "They quite justifiably prove that no separate Little Russian language has ever existed, it does not exist, nor can it ever exist, and the dialect used by the common folk is the very same Russian language, only contaminated by Polish influence; also that the all-Russian language is just as comprehensible to the local people as it is to Great Russians, and even more comprehensible than the so-called Ukrainian language presently fabricated for them by certain Little Russians, and especially Poles. The people in that little circle which is striving to prove the opposite are accused by most Little Russians themselves of some kind of separatist plan—which is hostile to Russia and would be disastrous for Little Russia" (Russian State Historical Archive (henceforth: RGIA), f. 775, op. 1, d. 188, l. 1 v).

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

mind and the Empire's interests at heart.[4] Whom, then, did Lazov mean as "the majority of Little Russians" whose convictions he shared? As a censor, he could not help noticing the appearance of a significant amount of literature in Ukrainian; while, from the point of its content, it did not include anything disallowed, according to the then-current censorship regulations, yet he believed its goals were to be denounced unequivocally. Afraid to take responsibility upon himself, the censor sought guidance from his superior as to the proper way to react to manuscripts and books that distinguished a "separate" Ukrainian language and could lead the local populace to manage without the dominant Russian ("*obshcherusskii*") language. Relaying Lazov's thoughts, Novyts'kyi added his own remark that the Poles were also supporting such publications in order to convince the whole world that "Rus' [Ruthenia, or Ukraine, probably along with Belarus'] is not Moscow" (RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, spr. 188, ark. 3).

The reaction of the Interior Minister was swift and culminated in the Valuev Directive of 18 July 1863. P. A. Valuev took only three weeks to clarify the situation, and with the goal of preventing the loss of a unified (Russian) literary and intellectual space, he halted any and all Ukrainian publications.[5] What could explain this concern of the minister, who had just taken over the Russian Empire's censorship committees from the Ministry of Public Education?

By the 1860s, Kyiv was no longer a city of limited consequence, thanks

[4] According to Lazov's record at the Kyiv Censorship Committee (1857), his career experience was quite beyond that of the stereotypical Weberian bureaucrat. Lazov had a higher education, received at the Kyiv Higher Gymnasium, and in 1832 defended a thesis for the title of graduate ("*deistvitel'nyi student*") at Kharkiv University. He was broadly competent in the civil service, serving before the censor position in various agencies, including the Comptroller's Chamber of Volhynia gubernia, and on temporary duty in the General Staff of the First Russian Army. In 1835 he commenced as an accountant at St. Vladimir University, moved later into the office of the Kyiv School District trustee, and only in 1859 obtained the position with the censorship committee. Although Lazov was of hereditary noble lineage, he had no property, and the civil service provided his only income (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 293, op. 1, spr., 458, ark. 1-2; spr. 459, ark. 2).

[5] Besides the Kyiv Censorship Committee, the directive banning Ukrainian publications was sent to the Head of the Third Department of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery, to the Chief Prosecutor of the [Russian Orthodox Church's] Holy Synod, and to the censorship committees in Moscow, Vilnius, Riga, and St. Petersburg, as well as to selected censors in Kazan and Dorpat (RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, spr. 188, ark. 12–15). It was around this time that Valuev noted in his diary: "Not without reason, history gradually merged the Lithuanian, Polish, and Little Russian tribes with the Great Russian one, and not without reason it obliterated the old borders with blood" (Valuev 99).

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

largely to the efforts of the supreme powers of the Russian Empire, which had long sought a local centre for the lands it had acquired from dismantling the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in Right-Bank Ukraine. Kyiv became a hub of sorts, where the empire found it convenient to manage military-political, economic, and socio-cultural matters of state administration. The city's long history and advantageous location served well for establishing imperial Russian authority in its western borderlands. In 1796, Kyiv became the centre of a new gubernia comprising former lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that came under Russian rule (*PSZ* No. 17594); the following year its division into counties (*povity*; Russian: *uezdy*) was finalized (*PSZ* No. 18117).

The Polish uprising of July 1830 demonstrated to the imperial leadership that mere territorial administration was insufficient for achieving political stability in these lands. In 1832 Kyiv became the residence of a governor general, who was granted broad powers to fulfill the mandate of integrating all of Right-Bank Ukraine, including the Kyiv, Podillia, and Volhynia gubernias. The Kyiv School District, created in 1832, likewise encompassed these three gubernias and, after 1839, two additional ones in Left-Bank Ukraine (Chernihiv and Poltava). Kyiv was transformed into an important regional administrative centre, and enjoyed an active civic, intellectual, and cultural life, concentrated around St. Vladimir University and other scholarly institutions—which were, in turn, called upon to help the empire's interests, especially legitimizing its right to rule over these territories. These institutions included the Ad Hoc Committee to Search for Artifacts, the Ad Hoc Commission to Study Ancient Acts, the Kyiv School District's Gubernial Survey Commission, and the Kyiv Archive of Ancient Acts; they also catered to the interests of local intellectuals, practically all of whom congregated around the Commission to Study Ancient Acts (charged with proving through historical documents that these lands belonged to Russia). However, its activity did not proceed entirely smoothly: in 1853 the Kyiv Censorship Committee did not approve a few passages from Hrab''ianka's Chronicle, motivating its decision by the unwillingness to let appear a text about the advantages of love for one's native land over duty to country (Stebnitskii 32). Nevertheless, in describing the political situation in the area in 1859-60 for the Russian Tsar Alexander II, I. Vasil'chikov noted that the texts of official acts issued by gentry assemblies proved that under Polish rule, the gentry of western Rus' lands (today's Ukraine and, probably, Belarus') considered themselves part of the Rus' nation and sought to preserve their native Rus' language and Orthodox faith, regarding the Poles as foreigners. Their adoption of the Polish nationality came comparatively late (*Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie* 126). Kyiv also attracted many who were drawn to the study of indigenous history through archaeological digs and ethnographic expeditions, pursuing creative plans and patriotic

feelings; among them were Shevchenko and Mykola Rigel'man. At first, their interests coincided with those of the empire.

Not many people in the Kyiv milieu were capable of actively generating intellectual ideas. In the early 1860s, when Russian authorities sought to maintain a united front against Polish influence, it highly valued the intellectual capabilities of anyone who appeared in the city's public arena. Mykhailo Maksymovych was undoubtedly the most prominent person, and the imperial authorities entrusted him with heading the university in Kyiv, with the intention of providing aristocratic youth an education that was Russian in content. Maksymovych loved Kyiv antiquities and was pleased that the imperial powers-that-be paid attention to Kyiv and its historical, architectural, and literary monuments, along with their old language. He did much to advance the study of the literary heritage of Kyivan Rus'. He was probably quite satisfied with Russia's desire to de-Polonize the Right-Bank lands, since Poland was an old adversary of the Hetmanate. In 1840, corresponding with Denys Zubryts'kyi, Maksymovych praised him for writing his letter not in Polish but in Russian, and mused that in the Russian Empire the Rus' ("*rus'ka*") language evolved into the Great Russian language, and therefore writing in Little Russian (Ukrainian) meant artificially supporting a regional vernacular.[6]

Similar views were expressed by Mykhailo Iuzefovych, who in terms of both his state appointments and his intellectual abilities strongly contributed to shaping the Kyiv intellectual environment. He regularly published in all the Kyiv periodicals and accepted an invitation from Vasyl' Bilozers'kyi, editor of the journal *Osnova* (*The Foundation*), to regularly submit brief reports on the activities of the Ad Hoc Commission to Study Ancient Acts. His personal version of an all-Russian worldview can be gleaned from his 1860 correspondence with Bilozers'kyi and Hryhorii Galagan; with the former he was quite friendly, despite the difference in their ages (see below).

Galagan is an example of a Ukrainian aristocrat who, although loyal to the supreme imperial powers, never broke with his ethnic background. Explaining his identification with the Ukrainian people to Iuzefovych, he declared that he could not betray his love for his own native "tribe" ("*plem''ia*") and felt alienated vis-à-vis "the Muscovites" (Russians).

[6] Moreover, Maksymovych was convinced that in Little Russia there could not be "a literature in the South Russian language and could be only isolated works in it, by [Ivan] Kotliarevs'kyi, [Hryhorii] Kvitka-Osnov''ianenko, [Ievhen] Hrebinka, and others. The South Russian language here is an artifact that can only serve to enrich the Great Russian language, or the Russian one that prevails here. Ukrainian folk songs and proverbs are also only pretty embellishments for Russian literature" (Maksymovych 119).

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

However, the threat of Polish domination forced him to align with the Muscovites and acknowledge the Pereiaslav Treaty. Nevertheless, Galagan was convinced that in struggling against the Poles "on our behalf," they suppressed all Ukrainians—even though only 20-30 young people amidst the broad mass stood out. Congregating around the *Kievskii telegraf* (*Kyivan Telegraph*) newspaper, they would still be capable of reviving the Ukrainian discourse, although this new generation was heedless, in his opinion, being too influenced by the West. Galagan also felt that the St. Petersburg-based *Osnova* should more energetically proclaim the Rus' identity of these lands. He approved of the measures proposed by Iuzefovych and Rigel'man to the government to counteract Polish influences in Right-Bank Ukraine, and he added his own—notably, mobilizing the Ukrainian gentry, and especially its younger generation, to assert their own Rus' identity against the Poles. But he did not support the authorities' measures allowing Polish-language education, while the Ukrainians, who constituted as big a segment as the Poles, were if not persecuted then definitely not supported. Galagan's example of the censor's attitude was the fact that it took over seven months to receive permission for the publication of a popular edition of the works of even a tame writer like Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnov''ianenko. He suggested that not only should the Russian presence in these lands increase, but that raising the profile of the Ukrainians would likewise assist the authorities in eliminating Polish influence. The literacy society could take on this task, and in order to mollify the Polish landlords, the educational initiatives could be linked to the Orthodox church; Galagan also suggested using Panteleimon Kulish's primer *Hramatka* (A Primer) (a box of which was stored at his house in Kyiv) to help fulfill the program (Savchenko 355-56; see also Moser's study in this volume). Iuzefovych, like Galagan, also proposed assisting the swift development of public education, especially by training teachers of peasant origin. If future village schoolteachers were exempted from conscription, and local communities were allowed to employ them, the problem of finding teachers for elementary schools could be solved fairly quickly. Moreover, incentives could be applied—for instance, declaring that young men who weren't literate by the age of twenty would be immediately conscripted.

Neither was the dispute between Bilozers'kyi and Iuzefovych a sparring between adversaries. Regarding the cardinal question of the basis for kinship between Kyivan Rus' and Muscovy (Russia [Moskovs'ka Rus']), Iuzefovych concluded that the lack of natural borders and a shared geography "promoted the formation of state unity." As for the historical origins, he believed that Muscovy started from Kyiv and was strengthened by Kyiv's educational tradition, and that Kyiv sacrificed itself for the creation of a single fatherland ("*edinoe otechestvo*"), which led to the spiritual national unification of the two peoples. Therefore, Iuzefovych disagreed

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

with the theory tracing the historical continuity between Kyivan Rus' and Cossack Ukraine.[7] In this case, he believed, Kyiv would have lost claim to the Rus' land it had had a hand in establishing. He thought that the Ukrainian story of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, for all its heroic nature, was merely an insignificant episode in a common history. As for distinguishing features between the two ethnicities, Iuzefovych identified the commune ("*obshchina*") among the northerners and an individualist streak among "our tribe," which led to pervasive conservatism in Russia and to liberalism in Ukraine, respectively. The goal was to complement and join these two features, which could be done through a common language. Here, Iuzefovych made a clear distinction between a "folk" and a "general" language. The folk language, even if it required legitimate and useful refinements, could fully serve elementary schools and guarantee success in public education. As for the general language, it already existed, and thus it was not worth rejecting it to convert to the folk one, because such a transition could lead to "intellectual backwardness." He further argued that neither Nikolai Gogol' nor Sir Walter Scott nor Sir Thomas More had taken such a path, believing that it could be dangerous.[8] Bilozers'kyi, on the other hand, disagreed with Iuzefovych's denial of Ukrainians' historical independence and their relegation to a secondary role in the formation of the Russian nation.

Following the abolition of serfdom, the need to elevate the peasantry was universally recognized. What remained was to clarify which language—Church Slavonic, Russian, or Ukrainian—should be used for their education, and who should serve as their teachers in the public schools—priests, or graduates of institutions run by the Ministry of Public Education. This question soon overtook all others and acquired strong political overtones. In 1862, Kyiv-based educators belonging to the Hromada cultural society discussed a report by the Poltava scholars Dmytro Pyl'chykov and Viktor Loboda that had been sent to the St. Petersburg Literacy Committee (which had just emerged as part of the Free Economic Society and energetically set out to spread education by way of publishing school textbooks and training teachers for elementary schools). It seemed to them that the committee was capable of handling this simple appeal, namely: since the peasantry, which constituted the vast majority of the local populace, spoke a language distinct from bookish Russian, their education ought to be conducted in their natural language. To support their appeal, they cited examples when the local authorities had to translate into Ukrainian the 19 February 1861 Manifesto

[7] This idea was used by Iuzefovych to argue against the scholarly opinion of Mykola Kostomarov about the separate development of Ukrainian and Russian history, as set forth in his essay "Mysli ob istorii Malorossii" ("Thoughts on the History of Little Russia") (see Pinchuk 345).

[8] Kyiv letter dated November 22, 1860 (Savchenko 355-56).

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

(concerning the abolition of serfdom), and when the governor of Kyiv gubernia delivered a speech to volost elders in Ukrainian. If the authorities truly cared about the education of peasant children, they would not force them to learn Russian but rather allow instruction directly in their native language. This would be much more economical for the state, and also would obviate the socially destructive phenomenon of education causing misunderstanding between parents and children because the generations spoke two different languages. Once they learned Russian, even the village scribes behaved condescendingly toward their fellow peasants. After all, Russian was the language of the masters and of the gentry; as a foreign tongue that was not mutually comprehensible, it would not be used by the peasantry in everyday communication (see also Moser's study in this volume).

In Kyiv, this petition was augmented with another argument: that Polish propaganda should be overcome by strengthening local culture—especially the Ukrainian language, which is distinct from the Russian both in syntax and in content. On the other hand, it was also asserted that literacy would promote social antagonism, since those who acquired it would seek self-realization in areas far removed from farm labour (Sheveliv 11-15). In fact, the Ministry of Public Education initially held a similar position; thus, the 1863 draft regulation about public schools stipulated the use of local languages and dialects in elementary instruction, only later switching to Russian.[9] Ultimately, however, the proposal by the governor general of Vilnius gubernia, B. Nazimov, to support the local peasantry through education was rejected by the governor general of Kyiv gubernia, Vasil'chikov, since this would, in his opinion, divide the two related "tribes" and allow thoughts about sovereignty and separate national identity to take root (Staliunas 266).

The events in Poland shook the Kyiv community, which nevertheless remained active and actually founded several new periodicals—*Kievskii telegraf* was joined by *Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti* (*Kyivan Diocesan News*), *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii* (*Messenger of Southwestern and Western Russia*), and *Voskresnoe chtenie* (*Sunday Reading*)—that immediately focused on the issue of language of instruction in public schools. Of all these Kyiv periodicals, *Kievskii telegraf* kept the most moderate position on the language question; as a result, its Russian-language texts regularly included excerpts from Ukrainian songs and poetry. In one of his stories, V. Maziukevych described a young man who studied literature and wrote a poem in Ukrainian, "Stoit' divka sered shliakhu" ("A Maiden Stands

[9] Whereas Article 4 of the Provision (July 19, 1864) approved by the State Council recorded that the teaching in public schools is carried out in Russian (*PSZ* 2 No. 41068).

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

Amidst the Path"); another author, signing with the cryptonym "V.S.," prolifically quoted from Ukrainian songs in his novella (Maziukevich 17; S.,V. 8; S-v 2); and notices were regularly printed about the publication of new Ukrainian works, including the historical drama *Karmaliuk* by Kalenyk Sheikovs'kyi, the anthology *Sobranie malorossiiskikh narodnykh pesen* (*Collection of Little Russian Folk Songs*), a translation of Shevchenko's poetry into Polish, etc. *Osnova* printed publication announcements in both Ukrainian and Russian. A fiery debate centred around the first installment of Sheikovs'kyi's *Opyt iuzhnorusskogo slovaria* (*Attempt at a South Russian Dictionary*); its first reviewer, V. Ia., contrasted it with the phonetic orthography of Kulish, calling the latter a charlatan and supporting his charge with Sheikovs'kyi's own negative view of Kulish's work. The tension was broken somewhat by Danylo Moroz, who came to the defence of Kulish's orthography and explained to readers the underlying principles of Sheikovs'kyi's dictionary (Moroz 3; see also Moser's study in this volume). This dispute, however, demonstrates the lack of unity among those engaged in the field of Ukrainian orthography.

A review printed in *Kievskii telegraf* in April 1863 of Kulish's historical short story "Khmel'nychchyna" ("The Khmel'nyts'kyi Era"; published by his St. Petersburg press in 1861), signalled that this newspaper was aligned with periodicals against the idea of creating a modern Ukrainian language. They argued that such a language is not in popular use, that it was invented by Kulish himself, who then self-published his own writings. The author was also chastised for calling the ancient Slavs "*ukraintsi*" (Ukrainians), a name that was not in popular use—although they did acknowledge that it could be found in literary sources. Kulish's attempt to modernize history was judged negatively; moreover, he was accused of seeking to pull the Dnieper lands away from other parts of Russia and twisting historical events in Poland's favour ("Istorychne opovidannia P. Kulisha," 30). Another author, identified as "P.," noted that in Europe, ethnic groups and parties were coming together, while "among us Slavs" everything was developing in the opposite direction, new languages were being invented, new ethnicities were being dreamed up, and for greater effect, those who engaged in this (the *khlopomany*) "walked barefoot along the Khreshchatyk" (2).

Regarding the question of which books should be used for school instruction, the eparchial bulletin of the Russian Orthodox Church, *Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti,* noted that in mass-produced books, their Great Russian language and "tone" were difficult to understand for local peasant children ("Spisok luchshikh knig," 390). Another article argued for the necessity of instruction in Church Slavonic, as the key to literacy for both Great Russians and Little Russians. This remark, however, was actually added by the editor, P. Lebedyntsev, since the article's author, Ivan Annenkov, noted in his "Otzyv o shkolakh Kievskoi eparkhii" ("A Comment

on the Schools of the Kyiv Diocese") articulating the viewpoint of the "party of general Russian education," that knowledge of Russian, the language in which the laws were written, was simply indispensable. He was also familiar with the views of the "Polish party," whose adherents considered supporters of instruction in Ukrainian to be their rivals, whose demagoguery could lead to a civil war between the estates, when even Shevchenko would be blamed for his creation of a poetic Little Russian language (Annenkov 392). In other such articles, the *Vedomosti* argued with *Osnova* for advocating instruction of peasant children in the vernacular "South Russian" language. It reported in measured tones on Aleksandr Vostokov, Izmail Sreznevskii, and Aleksandr Nikitenko's analysis of Pylyp Morachevs'kyi's Ukrainian translation of the Gospels, although noting the inadvisability of artificially separating the Little Russian language from the Great Russian one, let alone the admixture of Polonisms in it ("Zametki," 77).

For its part, the journal *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii* proclaimed to future readers that it would take into account the ethnic composition of the local populace: Polish, Jewish, and Russian, the latter comprising two peoples, Great Russian and Little Russian. The vision for the publication was envisioned as identifying and renewing national awareness.[10] Various authors, including Iuzefovych and Kulish, would expound in the *Vestnik* on their understanding of the factors influencing the difficult relations between the Russians and the Poles; Kulish serialized his novel *Padenie shliakhetskogo gospodstva v Ukraine obeikh storon Dnepra v 17 v.* (*The Fall of the Nobility in Ukraine on Both Sides of the Dnieper in the 17th c.*) over several issues.

However, the very first article by Ksenofont Hovors'kyi, who served as both editor and publisher of the journal, declared peremptorily that he and his followers considered any conversations about the Little Russian people and their language to be absurd, because they were coarse and uncultivated, the literature they wrote was insignificant, and therefore—which was probably the main point for them—it would not be able to oppose and hold its own against the Polish language ("Zametka na stat'iu," 26; Miller 93). Moreover, one of the articles about the *khlopoman* peasant sympathizer phenomenon argued that it was the Polish *chłopomani* who began calling the Little Russians *Ukraińcy*—all in order to eradicate from the name of this people the denomination Rus' so hated by them, and thus to reduce the number of Russians.

The Ukrainian language was judged equally harshly in an annotation to a report by A. I. Stoianov about one of Kyiv's extracurricular school programs

[10] It was clearly stated: "The time we live in can primarily be called an era of universal aspiration by peoples to elucidate and reconstruct nationalities. To this end, in Kyiv we shall undertake to publish a journal with this title" ("Programa izdaniia," 203).

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

that operated on the premises of the university on Sundays and used the works of Shevchenko and *Osnova* texts to advance literacy. In this note, the editor explained to readers the difference between a language and a dialect: the latter could never become a means of public discourse, just as a part could not be equated to the whole, and therefore, a dialect could not be imposed in religion, nor in jurisprudence or literature, let alone in schooling (Stoianov 207). Going beyond this note, in the February 1863 issue Hovors'kyi held forth in an entire article on Stoianov's information about the school, greatly expanding his array of arguments against the Ukrainian language: it divided the single Rus' (or Russian) nation, was artificial in origin, and was therefore not universally supported. Thus, the strivings of the "*khokhlomany*" to render the word of God and to create literature in Ukrainian were a utopia stemming from the excessive ambitions of its proponents. His text had none of the restraint previously visible in 1862, as noted by Aleksei Miller (93); Hovors'kyi now openly accused Stoianov, and all those who had signed the "Otzyv iz Kieva" ("A Reply from Kyiv") that their strivings to grant a dialect the status of a language would lead to political separatism (Redaktor 55-72; see also Moser's study in this volume).

The polemics escalated into sharp accusations when it was joined by the Kyiv governor general's official for special assignments A. F. Voronin, who contributed a detailed article titled "Mestnye voprosy" ("Local Issues"), which communicated views that were not only his own but also those of the regional authorities. His thoughts dovetailed with Hovors'kyi's ideas about the single Rus' (or Russian) nation, whose only possible language was Russian, and therefore a Ukrainian language had no right to exist. Filling the lacunae in Hovors'kyi's text, Voronin denied the existence of Ukrainian literature; he said Kvitka's works were the writings of an aristocrat who wrote in Ukrainian for aristocratic entertainment. He called Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi's *Eneida* (*Aeneid*) a jocular translation and Shevchenko's fame—a product of false patriotism (Voronin 62-66). Subsequent publications in the *Vestnik* only refined the already prevalent position rejecting the Ukrainian language. A contribution signed "I." argued that all historical documents were actually written either in Polish or Latin or Russian, and not a single one of them was composed in Ukrainian. The "Little Russian dialect" could not form the basis of a language capable of abstract scholarly discourse; it did not even have a grammar because the people were backward and "preoccupied" (I.... 170). At the same time, this author paradoxically seemed to sketch out a plan for constructing a full-blooded Ukrainian language.

The position articulated by Ivan Rakovs'kyi stands out somewhat amidst the repeated denials of the Ukrainian language's right to exist. He believed that public education would only benefit from the use of "natural" language and literature, but added that all the peoples of the empire had jointly

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

created the Russian language, and therefore it was not worth rejecting (Rakovs'kyi 257). Another author, S. Eremeev, declared that the *khlopomany*'s attempts to teach the twelve-million-strong people who spoke Little Russian in their own language were not only naïve but harmful, because the people themselves did not want it (9). All the issues of the *Vestnik* from 1863 addressed the Ukrainian language issue one way or another, even when the influential St. Petersburg newspaper *Golos* (*Voice*) published Mykola Kostomarov's essay persuading readers that instruction in the native language would help counteract peasants' misgivings about having their children attend school. Hovors'kyi now accused *Golos* of being ignorant of local specifics—namely, that any Little Russian or Belarusian understands Russian and disrespects his own language. He was irritated that a different point of view existed on this issue, and that he was not the only one who could speak out on the question of language attitudes ("Otklik 'Vestnika' 'Golosu,'" 78-79).

The July 1863 issue of *Vestnik* included a similarly biased piece regarding a letter by Kostomarov to the editors of the newspaper *Den'* (*The Day*). In that letter, the historian sought to explain his right to a difference of opinion, and also hinted that the future verdict would support the wisdom gained through experience. Here again, Hovors'kyi the *Vestnik* editor brashly accused him of virtually committing treason, and argued that locally no one purchased—rather, everyone wholeheartedly rejected—any books written in Little Russian (D., A. 2, 5).

It is worth highlighting one other cluster of articles in the *Vestnik*, having in common a prejudiced attitude to the *khlopomany* movement—particularly two of them, one printed anonymously and the other signed by Eremeev ("Chto takoe khlopomaniia," 139-56; Eremeev 1-21). Both authors were convinced that all the members and sympathizers of this movement were of Polish ethnic origin, that their fondness for the common people was going to be short-lived, and that it was they who called themselves Ukrainians and began developing the Ukrainian language. And most importantly, that they sowed the seeds of dissatisfaction with Muscovites and Russian authority among the people, taking advantage of their lack of knowledge of the Russian language.

In this way, not only public opinion but also state forces were mobilized to react to the situation and correct it. Indeed, looking through the prism of what was printed in the *Vestnik* about local language issues, the authorities may have formed the opinion that the Ukrainophiles did not have any public support, that their ideas were rejected by educated persons, not to mention the peasantry or burghers, and that therefore the local population had no need for any special self-identification. On the other hand, the Ukrainophiles did not manage to clearly articulate their vision of the language issue, let alone appeal to the broad masses in order to elucidate their program and

explain the task of shaping a national identity. The population at large was still recovering from the repeal of serfdom, suffering a lack of social freedoms, while open debate was limited only to proclamations by the state, with the single goal of promoting liberal reforms. Questions of autonomy and ethnic identity, however, were not permitted.

Vitalii Shul'hyn, a talented historian and public lecturer, became yet another public figure on the Kyiv scene who actively contributed to the shaping of local opinion. As noted and appreciated by Governor General N. N. Annenkov, Shul'hyn and his eloquence became a highly valuable asset for the local authorities. At first, Mykhailo Drahomanov and Galagan also appreciated him. Drahomanov, who was recommended by Shul'hyn to the university, described Shul'hyn and Iuzefovych as being a civilizing influence in the region, and Galagan even invited Shul'hyn to become the director of his famous college. Shul'hyn was pleased to accept an invitation to start a state-funded newspaper, the *Kievlianin* (*The Kyivan*), which was meant to become an assertive mouthpiece of Russian authorities in the region. *Kievskii telegraf*, which had been published for five years by then, was not a good fit for the new situation. A newspaper without state funding, reliant only on subscription revenues, could not be expected to be an assertive organ of Russification. Although the *Kievlianin* started publication after the Valuev Directive, the fact that many of the best local writers and journalists became its regular contributors, and that the majority of them believed it necessary to assert the "*russkii*" rather than Polish character of the region, serves to affirm that the general ideological and political atmosphere was organized to counter the Poles. Among the *Kievlianin*'s contributors were such prominent figures as Maksymovych and F. F. Voroponov. The latter was an active proponent of rural reform and a good journalist who accepted the newspaper's invitation and gave up his earlier ties with *Odesskii vestnik* (*The Odesa Herald*), as he felt dissatisfied with Odesa's dominant commercialized atmosphere. The list of *Kievlianin* contributors include many famous persons and well-known literary figures, among them Vasilii Avseienko, Oleksii Andriiashev, Antonovych, Galagan, Oleksii Hattsuk, Vasyl' Hnylosyrov, Drahomanov, Pavlo Zhytets'kyi, Oleksandr Kistiakivs'kyi, Mykola Lysenko, Rigel'man, Ivan Rudchenko, Oleksandr Rusov, and at least two dozen others (Novitskii), resonating considerably across the local society and testifying to its leanings.

The arguments among the intellectuals about galvanizing of local language use spread throughout society, and were reflected in the correspondence of Kyiv residents with their relatives, friends, and colleagues. The majority of the letters intercepted by the local gendarmes concerned Polish demonstrations, recitals, and memorial masses for Joachim Lelewel. One letter described the conflict between the Russians, Ukrainians, and Poles, arguing that each participant group pursued its own

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

goals—which were different for the Russians and the Ukrainians; meanwhile, the Poles, it argued, wanted the Ukrainians to shed their local patriotism and join the Polish cause. A few other letters, addressed to editors of the *Kievskii telegraf*, argued that the Great Russians unfairly imposed their language and customs. They also discussed the rivalry between the Ukrainians and the Russians concerning their interests in the regions, but argued that the hostility "among cousins" should be stopped, to avoid a return to the Cossack era, with its Nalyvaikos and Khmelnyts'kyis (Instytut rukopysu Natsional'noi biblioteky Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernads'koho, I, 11452, ark. 15-16, 20, 27, 28). All in all, the educated segment of Kyiv's population was fairly objective in its assessment of local events.

In sum, we can see that on the eve of the Valuev Directive there was no unity within the Kyiv intellectual milieu concerning the role and meaning of the Ukrainian language in constructing one's own identity. The older generation expressed the position of keeping an alliance with the Russian authorities against the Polish movement. The imperial Russian authority saw language as a reliable mechanism of assimilation, and did not rush to grant the Ukrainians even a tiny segment of their cultural space—even where Ukrainian literature had already asserted itself. They resorted to a ban of the language to halt the development of Ukrainian national consciousness. The younger generation of intellectuals also understood the importance of language as the clearest indicator of the difference between the Ukrainians and the Russians, and therefore sought to enhance its role in order to increase cultural distance from the Russian dominance. The preservation of language was meant to save Ukrainians from complete absorption by the empire. The specificity of the local language situation consisted in that it was not so much the educated representatives of Ukrainian ethnic background but those whose roots were in the Polish *szlachta* who sought to achieve social equality for the peasantry, by means of granting the Ukrainian language literary status and that of a language of instruction. The latter especially alarmed the imperial Russian authorities, who viewed the Polish uprisings as an extreme and catastrophic threat.[11] Russians' harsh reaction to Polish protests and Polish uprisings decreased the tolerance they had earlier displayed towards the Ukrainians. On the other hand, the attempts to create a modern Ukrainian language on the basis of the rural vernacular were not immediately understood and accepted by the broad spectrum of society, either. However, even when rejecting these processes, pointing to the closeness and similarity between the two languages and the trivialization of this process in the press, the public

[11] As Faith Hillis argues, the Valuev Directive of 1863 was also motivated by the desire to disperse the Russian literary language throughout the Russian Empire (66-70).

debates by representatives of the local milieu generated a whole range of serious proposals. Drawbacks were also pointed out, but such suggestions actually helped the Ukrainophiles to achieve full status for the Ukrainian language—a language with a developed vocabulary, literary tradition, working orthography, and linguistic profile. They pursued this goal with dignity, and successfully raised the Ukrainian language to the level of other well-developed languages.

Archives Cited

Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA)
Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in the City of Kyiv (TsDIAK Ukrainy)
Instytut rukopysu Natsional'noi biblioteky Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernads'koho

Works Cited

Annenkov, Ivan. "Otzyv o shkolakh Kievskoi eparkhii." *Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti,* vol. 14, 1862, p. 392.

"Chto takoe khlopomaniia i kto takie khlopomany." *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 2, 1862, pp. 139-56.

D., A. "Po povodu pis'ma g. N. Kostomarova k g. redaktoru i izdateliu gazety 'Den'' 1863 g., № 29.'" *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 7, 1863, pp. 2-5.

Eremeev, Stepan. "Po povodu svitok i khokhlomanii." *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 4, 1863, pp. 1-21.

Hillis, Faith. *Children of Rus': Right-Bank Ukraine and the Invention of a Russian Nation*. Cornell UP, 2013.

I…. "O kharaktere i deiateliakh narodnogo obrazovaniia." *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 2, 1863, pp. 115-82.

"Istorychne opovidannia P. Kulisha." *Kievskii telegraf*, vol. 27, 1863, p. 3.

Maksymovych, Mykhailo. *Lysty.* Compiled by V. Korotkyi, Lybid', 2004.

Maziukevich, V. (V. Maziukevych) "Obyknovennyi sluchai." *Literaturnoe pribavlenie k "Kievskomu telegrafu*," vol. 2, 1862, p. 17.

Miller, Aleksei. '*Ukrainskii vopros' v politike vlastei i russkom obshchestvennom mnenii (vtoraia polovina XIX v.).* Aleteiia, 2000.

Moroz, Daniil. (Danylo Moroz) "Zametka po povodu stat'i g-na V. Ia. o 'Iuzhnorusskom slovare' K. Sheikovskogo." *Kievskii telegraf,* vol. 21, 1862, p. 3.

Novitskii, Ivan. *"Kievlianin" pod redaktsiei Vitaliia Iakovlevicha Shul'gina,* 1880.

Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie na Ukraine v 1856-1862 gg.: Dok. i mater. Introduction by G. I. Marakhov, Naukova dumka, 1964.

"Otklik 'Vestnika' 'Golosu.'" *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 5, 1863, pp. 78-79.

"Otzyv iz Kieva." *Sovremennaia letopis'*, vol. 66, 1862, p. 5.

Pinchuk, Iurii. "Kyivs'kyi period tvorchosti M. I. Kostomarova: do problemy samosvidomosti istoryka." *Eidos*, vol. 2, 2006, pp. 344-51.

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956

P. "Narodnosti i partii." *Kievskii telegraf*, vol. 40, 1862, p. 2.
Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii (*PSZ*). Vol. 24 (*S 6 noiabria 1796 po 1798*), Sankt-Peterburg, 1830.
Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii (*PSZ* 2). *Vtoroe sobranie*. Vol. 39, pt. 1 (*1864*), Sankt-Peterburg, 1874.
"Programa izdaniia." *Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, vol. 6, 1862, p. 4.
Rakovskii, Ivan. "Pis'mo 6." *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii,* vol. 3, 1863, pp. 251-59.
Redaktor. "Otvet g. Stoianovu, vyzvannyi ego stat'eiu 'Nepravdivost' i ravnodushie—glavneishie pomekhi k rasprostraneniiu gramotnosti.'" *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 2, 1863, pp. 55-72.
Savchenko, Fedir. *Zaborona ukrainstva 1876*: *do istorii hromads'kykh rukhiv na Ukraini.* Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1930.
Sheveliv, Borys. "Petytsii ukrains'kykh hromad do Peterburz'koho komitetu hramotnosty z r. 1862." *Za sto lit: Materiialy z hromads'koho i literaturnoho zhyttia Ukrainy XIX i pochatkiv XX stolittia*, edited by Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, vol. 3, Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928, pp. 11-16.
"Spisok luchshikh knig dlia prostonarodnogo chteniia." *Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, vol. 2, 1862, p. 390.
Staliunas, Darius. "Granitsy v pogranich'e: Belorusy i etnolingvisticheskaia politika Rossiiskoi imperii na zapadnykh okrainakh v period Velikikh reform." *Ab Imperio*, vol. 1, 2003, pp. 261-92.
Stebnitskii, Petr. "Ocherk razvitiia deistvuiushchego tsenzurnogo rezhima v otnoshenii malorusskoi pis'mennosti." *Ob otmene stesnenii malorusskogo pechatnogo slova,* Tipografiia Imperatorskoi AN, 1905, pp. 19-34.
Stoianov, Aleksandr. "Ezhednevnaia shkola v Kieve." *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii,* vol. 9, 1862, p. 207.
S., V. "Byloe." *Literaturnoe pribavlenie k "Kievskomu telegrafu,"* vol. 8, 1862, p. 8.
S-v, D-tsa. "Malorossiiskaia pesnia." *Literaturnoe pribavlenie k "Kievskomu telegrafu,"* vol. 99, 1862, p. 2.
Valuev, P. A. *Dnevnik P. A. Valueva ministra vnutrennikh del v 2 t*. Edited by P. A. Zaionchkovskii, vol. 1, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1961.
Voronin, Aleksandr. "Mestnye voprosy." *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 1, 1863, pp. 62-66.
"Zametka na stat'iu 'Sovremennika' 'Natsional'naia bestaktnost'.'" *Vestnik iugo-zapadnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 1, 1862, p. 26.
"Zametki." *Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, vol. 3, 1863, p. 77.
Zhytets'kyi, Ihnat. "Kyivs'ka hromada za 60-kh rokiv." *Ukraina: naukovyi dvokhmisiachnyk ukrainoznavstva*, vol. 1, 1928, pp. 91-125. http://izbornyk.org.ua/rizne/ukr14.htm. Accessed 12 May 2015.

© 2017 *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (ewjus.com) ISSN 2292-7956