

THOMAS PRYMAK (Hamilton, Ont., Canada)

MYKOLA KOSTOMAROV AND EAST SLAVIC ETHNOGRAPHY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Mykola Kostomarov (1817-1885), or Nikolai I. Kostomarov as he was generally known in nineteenth-century Russia, was an outstanding intellectual and cultural figure in his time. He was the foremost scholar of the "populist" school of Russian historians, who put the nation or the people (*narod*) at the center of their story and relegated princes and tsars to a secondary role. He was a famed partisan of democratic Panslav federalism who suffered imprisonment and punitive exile for his beliefs but who adapted his espousal of liberty and equality to new conditions and in a different form restated his youthful ideas later in his career. He was also a central figure in the Ukrainian national awakening of the mid-nineteenth century, the romantic writer and historian who became an early ideologue and later on the senior statesman of the Ukrainian national movement. Because of his support for the notions of nationality and the common people, Kostomarov very early acquired an interest in the ethnography of the East Slavic peoples and this interest was reflected in his work as a writer, a historian, an educator, a journalist, and a public figure.¹

Mykola Kostomarov was the son of a Russian nobleman and a Ukrainian peasant girl. He received his basic education in Russian in his native Voronezh province and at the University of

1. For some biographical treatments, see Dmytro Doroshenko's Ukrainian language *Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov* (Leipzig: Ukrainiska nakladnia, 1924), Denis Papazian, "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov: Russian Historian, Ukrainian Nationalist, Slavic Federalist," unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966, and the brief outline by Thomas Prymak, "Nicholas Kostomarov," *Forum* (Scranton, PA), No. 70 (1987), pp. 20-23. For a survey of the Russian and Soviet literature on Kostomarov, see Iu. A. Pinchuk, "Doshovtneva ii radianska istoriografiiia pro M. I. Kostomarova iak istoryk," *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukrainiskoi RSR*, No. 4 (1971), pp. 124-90.

Kharkiv in the heart of the region called Sloboda Ukraine, where at first he pursued an interest in classical antiquity. However, under the influence of the romantic polyglot, Mikhail Lunin (1805-1844, he soon turned to history and hit upon the idea of writing the history of the common folk. Since the conventional history of that time dealt mostly with kings and princes, Kostomarov turned to the living people around him for source material. This led him to the study of popular historical songs and ballads and the published collections in this genre by the Ukrainian Mykhailo Maksymovych (1804-1873), and the Russian I. P. Sakharov (1807-1863). Kostomarov was also strongly influenced by the historical works of the writer Nikolai Gogol' (1809-1852), which were set in Cossack Ukraine, the "Little Russia," as it was then called, where Kostomarov had been raised. "I was struck and then carried away by the sincere beauty of Little Russian folk poetry," the young historian later wrote. "I had never suspected that such elegance, such depth and fresh feelings could be found in the creations of the [common] people who were so close to me and about whom I unfortunately knew nothing."²

Kostomarov immediately took up the study of the Ukrainian language, which was then widely considered to be a dialect of Russian, but which the young scholar had considerable difficulty in mastering. He was soon collecting folk materials in Ukrainian, especially historical songs, and became acquainted with the Kharkiv professor, I. I. Sreznevskii (1812-1880), who was just completing the publication of his wide-ranging collection of songs and materials concerning the history of the Zaporozhian Cossacks which he published under the title *Zaporozhskaiia starina* (1833-1838). As soon as his Ukrainian was good enough, Kostomarov began writing in this language. Using folk motifs as models, he composed and published two booklets of Ukrainian language poetry and a historical drama based on Ukrainian folksong and set in Cossack times. Together with Amvrosiia Metlyns'kyi, Sreznevskii, and others, Kostomarov became a central figure in a circle of writers and scholars that later be-

2. N. I. Kostomarov, *Istoricheske proizvedeniia. Autobiografiia* (Kiev: Izdatelstvo pri Kievskom Gosudarstvennom Universitete, 1989), p. 447. All further references are to this version of his autobiography unless otherwise indicated; see also "Autobiografiia N. I. Kostomarova, zapisanaia N. B. Belozerskoi," *Russkaia mysl*, No. 5 (1885) p. 202.

came known as "the Kharkiv school of romantics."³ Ethnography, of course, was an integral part of their creative method.

Kostomarov, however, was not primarily a poet or writer of fiction. He was rather a historian and a scholar who was interested in the fate of the common people, the popular masses (*narodnaia massa*), as he called them. He sought out events in history and points in time when he believed that the whole nation, including the common people, had played a central role, and in the Cossack era of Ukrainian history, he believed that he had found an ideal subject. Therefore, when choosing a topic for his master's degree in history he settled upon the Cossack era. Furthermore, because of a personal interest in religion and contemporary concerns about the eastern rite or Greek Catholic Church, which Tsar Nicholas I was in the process of forcibly suppressing, Kostomarov chose to work on the origins of the Union of Brest (1596) which had established this so-called "Uniate" church. In his dissertation, which was entitled "On the Reasons and Character of the Union in Western Russia," the young historian argued that only hostility to the Union on the part of the common people and the Cossacks had overcome popular suspicion of the Muscovites, suppressed Ukrainian love of liberty, and led to the unification of Orthodox Moscow and Ukraine. Typically, as it turned out, in this work Kostomarov was not overly concerned about high church politics or exalted ecclesiastical polemics. He defended neither the official Catholic nor the official Orthodox positions and the motto with which he prefaced his study clearly reflects this. The historian did not choose a Greek or Latin epigram, but rather a few lines from a historical Ukrainian folksong:

О Боже мій нескінчений,
Дивитися горе,
що тепер на сім світі
віра віру боре.

О Боже мій нескінчений
що ся тепер стало?
усе віра, усе віра,
А милості мало.

3. See, in particular, A. P. Shamrai, *Kharkivska shkolaromantykiv*, 3 vols. (Kharkiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1930), and George Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971), pp. 57-67. Most of Kostomarov's literary work of this period had been reprinted in his *Tvory v dvoikh tomakh* (Kiev: Dnipro, 1967), vol I.

Oh my God eternal
 Look upon the grief
 Faith fights faith
 And gives the world no relief

Oh my God eternal
 What shall happen now?
 Its all faith, all faith,
 And the kindness is hollow.⁴

These few poignant lines of verse aptly captured Kostomarov's deep but independently-minded interests in religion and the church. Always respectful of religious piety, especially of the eastern traditions but always quietly at odds with official state-sponsored Orthodoxy, Kostomarov had an attitude towards the church which has been aptly labeled by later scholars as his "Byzantinism."⁵

Kostomarov's dissertation on the church union proved to be too politically sensitive to be allowed to stand. The Orthodox bishop of Kharkiv was upset with it and government bureaucrats were afraid of it. The work was condemned, officially burned, and its author instructed to write on another subject.⁶

Kostomarov was not intimidated by these extraordinary events. His second dissertation was just as innovative and unorthodox as his first. In his second dissertation, however, his interest in ethnography is even more evident. Kostomarov titled his second dissertation "On the Historical Significance of Russian Popular Poetry." This theme reflected his basic idea about using folk materials to write the history of the common peo-

4. Nikolai I. Kostomarov, "O prichinakh i kharaktere Unii v zapadnoi Rossii," in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevsky (Kiev: Derzhavne vydaunytstvo Ukrainy 1928), pp. 1-40. P. M. Popov, *M. Kostomarov iak folkloryst i etnohraf* (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1968), p. 14, has established that Kostomarov took these lines from a folk song in the collection of Maksymovych (1834).

5. See Hrushevsky's "Z publitsystychnykh pysan Kostomarova," in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. v-vi.

6. I. Aizenshtok, "Persha dysertatsiia Kostomarova," *Ukraina*, No. 3 (1925), pp. 21-27; James T. Flynn, "The Affair of Kostomarov's Dissertation: A Case Study of official Nationalism in Practice," *Slavonic and East European Review*, 52 (1974), 188-96. Flynn was unaware of the fact that in 1928 Hrushevsky had reprinted Kostomarov's dissertation and he did not consult the work.

ple; that is, Kostomarov remained a historian first, considering ethnography to be mainly a tool.

In his work on Russian folk poetry, Kostomarov clearly showed himself to be a romantic idealist and follower of the German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), who believed that culture was manifested in the national spirit in which language played an especially important role, and that the well-spring of true poetry originated not in the cultivated elite but in the common folk. "Every nation," wrote Kostomarov in the preface to his study, "has something characteristic about it which is more or less reflected in each person who belongs to it. This is national character which enables us to view the entire mass as a single person." Kostomarov then stated that just as a person's character is best revealed when he is acting unconsciously, so too is the character of a nation revealed best in its unconscious movements and creations which would be good source materials for the historian. "Literature is such a source," he wrote. "The saying that all literature is an expression of society is entirely true."

If there are no original creations in a literature but only imitations, only the foreign, then this means that society does not reveal itself in this literature, does not love its nationality, and lives by what is foreign. . . . True poetry cannot tolerate lies and hypocrisy. . . . In reality, the folk song takes first place among all creative work: it gives feelings to what is not thought out, spiritual movements which are not pretended, and conceptions which are not borrowed. The nation (*narod*) presents itself as it really is: song is truth.

But Kostomarov did not stop with this remarkable assertion. He continued:

A second quality of folksongs are their general nature. No one says when a song was composed or who made it up. [Rather] it flows from the entire mass. Whoever sings it, considers it to be his own creation. No where does the people [*narod*] reveal itself as a single person as in these reflections of its soul. Therefore, nowhere is its character revealed as in folksongs.⁷

7. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevsky (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1930), pp. 5-8.

Having thus stated what he believed to be the general relationship between a society and its folksongs, Kostomarov passed on to the specific uses of song for the historian. He saw these as being of four different kinds. Firstly, a folksong could be a chronicle of events or a source for "external" history. But its use in this way, Kostomarov admitted, was limited because only historical songs were valuable here and even their value was severely circumscribed by flights of poetic fantasy which often concealed historical realities. Secondly, a folksong can reveal something about ways of life; that is, it can be a source for "internal" history, which deals with social structure, family life, customs, and so on. Its value in this regard, Kostomarov believed, was somewhat greater than for "external" history, but all the same, was again circumscribed by mistakes, fragmentary exposition, and vagaries which demand supplementation and criticism. Thirdly, a folksong could be used as a philological source, valuable, not so much for the history of the people as a whole, as for the history of language in particular. Fourthly and lastly, Kostomarov believed that folksong was important as a monument of the people's view of itself and its surroundings, and in this sense, so he claimed, it was truly valuable. He thought that there was no need for criticism here: it was only necessary to prove that a song was of folk origin and that would suffice. With an idealism typical for the Romantic period, he wrote: "Life in all its forms flows from the internal point of view of a person. This is what we call character: a special view of things. Both each individual person and entire peoples possess it."⁸

With these assumptions about ethnography and history and with this assumption about the existence of national character, Kostomarov set forth his findings about the historical significance of Russian folk poetry.

Kostomarov divided Russian folk poetry into two parts corresponding to what he believed to be the two major ethnolinguistic branches or "nationalities," as he called them of the Russian people: Russian or "Great Russian," to use the nomenclature of the day, and Ukrainian or "Little Russian." (He entirely ignored Belorussian sources.) Kostomarov began by examining the symbolism of folk poetry and discussed the symbolic meaning of var-

8. *Ibid.*

ious flowers, plants, and animals. His work in this area, according to later critics, was pioneering but undistinguished, and he passed on to historical songs.⁹ Firstly, he dealt with Ukrainian historical folksongs, the corpus of which was larger and somewhat better explored than the Russian.

Kostomarov noted the military nature of Ukrainian political history which was dominated by the figure of the armed Cossack fighting for faith and homeland. He divided the corpus of Ukrainian historical songs into three distinct cycles: the Turko-Tartar cycle, which dealt with the wars against the Muslims. (These he subdivided into three types: those concerning the Cossack expeditions to the Danube, those concerning the Cossack naval expeditions against the Turks and Tatars on the Black Sea, and those concerning the battles and events which took place on the open Steppe.) The second cycle outlined by Kostomarov was the Polish cycle and the songs of this cycle concerned the Cossack revolts against Polish political and religious supremacy. (Songs about Bohdan Khmelnytskiy and the great events of 1648-1657 fell into this class and elicited the special interest of Kostomarov.) Finally, he designated the third cycle of Ukrainian historical songs as the "Russian" cycle since they concerned the political and military history of the "Hetmans" who ruled "Little Russia" or Left Bank Ukraine under Russian suzerainty. Kostomarov concluded by noting that after the era of Hetman Ivan Mazepa (d. 1709) the corpus becomes very thin, only a few songs concerning the revolt of 1768 (the so-called Uman slaughter) and the destruction of the Zaporozhian Cossack headquarters or *Sich* in 1775 being known in the 1840s when he was writing.¹⁰

Kostomarov then briefly treated "Great Russian" or Russian historical songs which he found to be less well-known and less full than the Ukrainian corpus but which still displayed a considerable variety. Most remarkable were the ancient songs or *Byliny* dealing with Kievan Rus' and the person of Prince

9. According to A. N. Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, 4 vols. (Saint Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1891), III, 168, towards the end of the 1840s, Kostomarov's work was superceded by that of Buslaev, Afans'iev, and others. Hruushevsky, "Etnografychne dilo Kostomarova," in *Etnografichni pysannia Kostomarova*, p. xvi, states that Kostomarov's work on symbolism had a profound influence upon O. O. Potebnia, who was to hold the field in this area for many years.

10. Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskome znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," especially pp. 50-60.

Vladimir. Ironically, songs about this era had died out in the Ukrainian south where most of the events were said to have taken place and Kostomarov supposed that the stormy political life of the Ukrainian lands was responsible for this disappearance. At any rate, these Russian songs were far older than the various Ukrainian cycles and Kostomarov observed that they were filled with confusion, marvels, and symbolism; that is, they were less historical and more fabulous than the Ukrainian songs and they were replete with anachronisms. Thus in one song set in Kievan Rus', Jerusalem, the Mongols, Greece, and the Lutherans all appear. Kostomarov delineated a second cycle of Russian songs dealing with the history of Novgorod in which he detected the spirit of republicanism; and a third cycle about the history of the Muscovite Tsardom. These latter, he thought, were permeated by the spirit of autocracy and the main principle of folk life seemed to be service to the tsar. Kostomarov also mentioned a fourth cycle emanating from the Don Cossacks and a fifth dealing with modern military campaigns but these were still little-known and Kostomarov did not analyse them.¹¹

Kostomarov's final chapters dealt with the social life of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples as revealed in their folksongs. He distinguished four basic Ukrainian types: the Cossack warrior, the carter or *chumak*, the vagrant or *burlak*, and the villager or agriculturalist; he further believed that these reflected the course of Ukrainian history from the high summer of Cossackdom, so to speak, through the autumn of the *chumak* and *burlak*, to the cold winter of agricultural serfdom. By contrast, Kostomarov believed that Great Russian folk poetry was dominated by the figure of the tsar who is a kind of reflection of God on earth. From the collection of Sakharov, he quotes the common folk:

Слава Бoгу на небе, слава.
Государю нашему на сей земле слава.

Glory to God in heaven, Glory.
Glory to our lord on this earth.

Kostomarov also delineated the boyar and the ordinary Russian, the *russkii chelovek*, as social types but found that most Russian

11. *Ibid.*, especially pp. 60-63.

folk poetry did not go beyond the sphere of simple family relations. The figures of the "bold young man" (*udaloi dobryi molodets*), the robber (*razboinik*), and the Russian Cossack who lived on the borderlands of the Muscovite state, were thus marginal figures who could not remove the tsar and the family from the center of Russian life. If Ukrainian history was marked by discontinuity and rapid movement which was reflected in the richness of its poetry, Great Russian history, according to Kostomarov, was characterized by continuity and slowness of change which was also reflected in its poetry and limited this poetry to certain spheres.¹²

In spite of the low regard in which ethnography was held in Russian universities during the first half of the nineteenth century, and in spite of a great reluctance on the part of some members of the Kharkiv faculty, Kostomarov passed his official examination without incident and received his degree. On the other hand, his work was severely criticized in the journals. The radical "Westernizing" Russian literary critic, Vissarion Belinskii, disparaged the very subject matter, as did his conservative counterpart, O. Senkovskii. The latter even mocked Kostomarov for trying to find "the historical significance of white wine and pretty girls in the philosophy of couchmen."¹³ Only Sreznevskii praised Kostomarov's work, saying that it should be noted by scholars in Russia such as Sakharov, in the western Slavic lands such as Jan Kollár, and even in Germany by the Grimm brothers. Sreznevskii did, however, criticize Kostomarov for his stress upon Ukrainian at the expense of Russian folk poetry and faulted him for neglecting mythology and the pre-Christian relics in the folk tradition.¹⁴ Kostomarov,

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 63-114, especially pp. 102 and 105.

13. Senkovskii's remarks from *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* are quoted in full in V. Naumenko, "N. I. Kostomarov kak etnograf," *Kievskaiia starina*, No 5 (1885), p. xi, and in Popov, *Kostomarov kak folkloryst i etnograf*, pp. 29-30. See also V. G. Belinskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 13 vols. (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1955), VIII, 152-53.

14. *Moskvitianin*, No. 3, pt. 2 (1844), pp. 144-54 and analysed in Popov, *Kostomarov kak folkloryst i etnograf*, pp. 30-32. Later critics, including Kostomarov himself, faulted his early work for putting too much faith in Sreznevskii's *Zaporozhskaia starina* which was partly invented by Sreznevskii himself, and for accepting a poem about Novgorod as truly genuine when, in fact, it had been composed by Sakharov, its supposed discoverer. See Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, III, 174. More generally, see A. Grushevskii [O. Hrushevs'kyi], "Ranniia etnograficheskaia raboty N. I. Kostomarova," *Izvestiia*

it seems, took these criticisms very seriously for in his next work in ethnography he took up these very subjects.

After graduating from Kharkiv University, Kostomarov worked for a while as a school teacher in Volhynia where he had requested a position in order to study the folklore about Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi and the great Cossack revolt against the Poles. In Volhynia, he encouraged his students to collect folk materials of a historical nature and he added them to his personal collection which had already numbered some 500 songs at the time of his graduation.¹⁵ The following year he was called to teach at schools and at the university in Kiev and, at this time, became a leading member of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius. This "brotherhood" was a secret society devoted to the promotion of a democratic Panslavic federation. The goals of the society were to be attained through scholarship and education. Its program envisioned an independent Ukraine as the centerpiece of a free federation of Slavic nations and the society's members and collaborators included the poet, Taras Shevchenko, and the writer Panteleimon Kulish.¹⁶ Both men shared many of Kostomarov's historical and ethnographic interests and together with Kulish, Kostomarov planned to edit a journal devoted to the publication and study of Ukrainian historical and ethnographic materials.¹⁷

During this period, Kostomarov taught Russian history at the University of Kiev and in the absence of a department of Slavic studies introduced a course on Slavic mythology. At the beginning of 1847, he had these lectures printed in book form in old Slavonic Cyrillic type. The use of old Cyrillic type reflected the

Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovestnosti (Saint Petersburg), 17, No. 1 (1911), 77-120.

15. On Kostomarov's experiences in Volhynia, see his "Autobiografia," pp. 463-72, and Volodymyr Miiakovs'kyi, "Kostomarov u Rivnomu," *Ukraina*, No. 12 (1925), pp. 28-65. On his personal collection of folksongs, see his "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," p. 114.

16. There is a large literature on the Cyril-Methodian brotherhood. See, in particular Mykhailo Vozniak, *Kyrylo-Motodiivske Bratstvo* (Lvov: Stavropropytskiy Institut, 1921); P. A. Zaionchkovskii, *Kirilo-Mefodievskoe obshchestvo (1846-1847)* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1959); V. Miiakovs'kyi, "Knyha pro Kyrylo-Metodiivske Bratstvo," *Suchasnist*, No. 3 (1963), pp. 85-96, which is an analysis of the previous literature; and D. Papazian, "N. I. Kostomarov and the Cyril-Methodian Ideology," *Russian Review*, 29, No. 1 (1970), 59-73.

17. I. Aizenshtok, "Do etnografichnyh planiv 1840-kh rokov," *Za sto lit* (Kiev, 1929), IV, 12-24; George Luckyj, *Panteleimon Kulish* (Boulder, Colo: East European Monographs, 1983), p. 25.

scholar's pious attitude toward religion and Slavic antiquity and is another clear example of his "Byzantinism."¹⁸

In his work on Slavic mythology, Kostomarov discussed the general questions of Slavic mythology, the feast days on the calendar of the pagan Slavs, pagan rites in general and those of ancient Rus' in particular. He compared the paganism of the Baltic Slavs, as revealed in German Latin-language chronicles, with the Slavic sources and with folk legends, customs, and beliefs, and he tried to find meaning in the resulting facts. In general, he came to the conclusion that Slavic pagan theology, as preserved in folktales and custom, represented a symbolization of the powers and events of nature. Moreover, although he admitted that the ancient Slavs had many Gods, Kostomarov stressed the importance of the cult of the sun and of celestial bodies, thus claiming that the ancient Slavs anticipated the purer monotheism of later times. He also underlined the yearly cycle of death and resurrection, of winter and summer of the physical world, which in his own words, "is the incarnation of the divine being on earth, of beneficence, suffering, and victory." Thus ancient Slavic mythology, in Kostomarov's view, was a "natural" religion which anticipated the Christian theology of the incarnation. It was, he concluded, "a marvelous presentiment [*chudesnym predchuvstviem*] of the coming of the Son of God, the sun of truth, the light of the world, and serves as a great historical confirmation of the truth of our Holy Scriptures."¹⁹ With this quasi-mystical interpretation of the role of paganism in God's plan, Kostomarov concluded his study of Slavic mythology.

It was not widely read after its publication. In the spring of 1847, Kostomarov was arrested for his role in the Cyril-Methodian Brotherhood—he had authored the Brotherhood's programmatic tracts on Panslavism and the political birth of the Ukrainian people—and the government forbade distribution of his published works. The young scholar was condemned to a year of imprisonment followed by punitive exile to Saratov on the middle Volga. (This was a purely Russian area far from his beloved Ukraine.) In spite of the legal impediments of exile life, Kostomarov continued to engage in historical and ethnographic

18. Nikolai Kostomarov, *Slavianskaia mifologiya* (Kiev: Bainer, 1847); photoreprinted (London-The Hague: Mlyn, 1978). Hrushevsky also reprinted this work in modern type in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 203-40.

19. 1847 ed., pp. 51-54, and quoted with analysis in Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, III, 176.

activities whenever he could and he developed creative relationships with a variety of fellow exiles and intellectuals who were living in the vicinity. These included a circle of Polish political exiles, the archimandrite Nikanor, who was later named Bishop of Kherson, the radical thinker N. G. Chernyshevskii, and the Russian cultural historian, A. N. Pypin.²⁰ It was in Saratov that Kostomarov had his first direct experiences with the Russian, as opposed to the Ukrainian, common people. He took a lively interest in the "Old Believer" sectarians who lived in the district and were persecuted by the authorities, and in the company of a young friend, Hanna Paskhalova, he frequently visited the countryside around Saratov and recorded the folksongs of the local population. In 1854, without signing his name to the submissions, he published some of these songs in the *Saratovskie gubernskie vedomosti*. The impious and somewhat risqué tone of these verses, it seems, upset the Saint Petersburg authorities, who thereafter wrote the paper complaining and fired the local censor. Kostomarov himself, however, escaped unscathed.²¹

Since his official duties in Saratov were not heavy, Kostomarov found it possible to continue to engage in scholarship. He once again began work on the era of Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi. The Polish aristocrat, Count Konstanty Swidzinski, who possessed a large private library, sent him numerous books and manuscripts, and Kostomarov was able to complete the first draft of a major study which he titled "Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi and the Restoration of Southern Rus' to Russia." In this work, Kostomarov made use of both older chronicles and historical folksongs—including some from Sreznevskii's *Zaporozhskaia starina*—to recreate the feeling and color of seventeenth-century Ukraine. As early as 1851, Kostomarov submitted the work for publication, but, as Chernyshevskii informed Sreznevskii at the time, the censor's cuts had made such nonsense of the work that for the time being the historian gave up on it

20. There is a detailed description of Kostomarov's life in Saratov in his "Autobiografiia," pp. 490-23. On Pypin, who, of course, was to later write a monumental history of Russian ethnography, see pp. 571-78. This section also discusses Kostomarov's somewhat chequered relationship with Chernyshevskii.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 495-96. In his "Autobiografiia zapisanaia N. B. Belozerskoi," No. 5, p. 27, Kostomarov states that the matter went all the way to Tsar Nicholas I, who condemned the verses in the strongest terms.

entirely.²² It was only in 1857, that is, well after the death of Nicholas I and after even further run-ins with the censor that Kostomarov finally saw the work in print.²³

After the completion of his *Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi*, Kostomarov turned to other historical and ethnographic projects. Most of them were purely Russian in nature, but like his work on *Khmelnyts'kyi*, they continued to reflect his interest in social history and ethnography. He worked on the history of trade and commerce in old Muscovy and on the peasant and Cossack revolts led by Stenka Razin (1630-1671) and Emelian Pugachev (1742-1775) which had partly taken place in the Saratov region and about which Kostomarov was able to gather folk materials during his period in exile. His study of Stenka Razin first appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in various numbers for 1858 and his materials on Pugachev were given to his friend, Paskhalova's husband, D. L. Mordovtsev [Mordovets], who intended to use them in a larger study about this famous Cossack rebel. In particular, Kostomarov's work on Stenka Razin enjoyed a considerable popularity among the radical Russian intelligentsia and was even read in the original Russian by Karl Marx who in his own hand copied out in Cyrillic letters one of the folksongs about Razin printed by Kostomarov. Marx also noted the comparisons made by Kostomarov between Russian *razboinik* songs and those of various Serbian and Greek insurgents.²⁴

22. N. G. Chernyshevskii, letter of November 16, 1851, to I. I. Sreznevskii, in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 16 vols. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoe Literatury, 1949), XIV, 219-21.

23. Since the work contained lively descriptions of civil conflict, the authorities specified that it could only appear in measured doses, in article form, scattered through one of the journals. But they further specified that it could appear in parts of no less than three chapters, since, seemingly, if chapters appeared separately, the countryfolk could misinterpret them. Kostomarov also had to revise several dozen pages describing peasant attacks on their noble masters. It was published as "Bohdan Khmelnytsky i vozvrashchenie Iuzhnoi Rusi k Rossii," in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in various numbers for 1857. Later, it was revised and republished in book form. See I. Butych, "M. I. Kostomarov i tsarska tsenzura," *Arkhiv Ukrainy* (Kiev), No. 6 (1967), pp. 64-66, and S. Velychenko, "Tsarist Censorship and Ukrainian Historiography, 1828-1906," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 23, No. 4 (1989), 398-99.

24. D. Riazanov, "K. Marks. Stenka Razin," *Molodaia gvardiia*, No. 1 (1926) Marx's outline of Kostomarov's work, and Popov, *Kostomarov kak folkloryst i etnograf*, p. 56, discusses Marx's notes on Russian folklore. More generally, see V. G. Sarbei and E. S. Shabliovskii, "N. I. Kostomarov v istoriograficheskom nasledii Karla Marksa," *Voprosy istorii*, No. 8 (1967), pp. 49-59.

Although exile in Saratov brought Kostomarov first-hand experience with Great Russian folklore and ethnography, he never completely abandoned the study of Ukrainian materials. He corresponded with various scholars interested in Ukrainian subjects and during the early 1850s helped Metlyns'kyi prepare his collection of *Popular South Russian Songs*. So pleased was Kostomarov with the publication of this work, which was compiled entirely from unpublished materials, that he considered it, in his own words, "one of the best in the Slavic world."²⁵

In fact, Ukrainian ethnography made steady progress during the two decades following the publication of Kostomarov's dissertation on Russian popular poetry and the exiled historian was well aware of it. Thus when in 1856, Panteleimon Kulish published his encyclopedic two-volume *Notes on Southern Rus'*, Kostomarov penned a book length review of the work in which he outlined the recent progress in Ukrainian ethnography and revealed a sharpened critical sense toward its earlier productions. In particular, he now criticized Sreznevskii for not revealing the "secret sources" of his fantastic legends about Zaporozhian history and hinted that the veteran ethnographer had been somewhat carried away by his own imagination. Kostomarov criticized Kulish too for his neglect of the geography and lineage of folk materials, but he praised him for the detail in his collection which contained both poetry and prose; that is, both folksongs and tales, anecdotes, and legends of various sorts. Kostomarov was also seemingly impressed by Kulish's orthography, which accurately reflected the sounds of spoken Ukrainian, solved the basic question of the deliniation of the "Great" and "Little Russian" languages, and was eventually accepted as the standard for modern literary Ukrainian. Kostomarov concluded that he wished to see Kulish continue his work, for in the historian's own words, "with his basic knowledge of the history, ethnography, and language of the South Russian region, citizen Kulish is at the present time the single writer upon whom we lay our hopes for the development of

25. See A. Metlyns'kyi, *Narodnye iuzhno-russkie pesni* (Kiev, 1854). Kostomarov's remark is taken from page 242 of his review of the literature on Ukrainian ethnography published in his article on Kulish's *Zapiski o iuzhnoi Rusi* cited in note 26 below. More generally, see *Slovianska folklorystyka* (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1988), pp. 100-01.

the Little Russian word and the expression of the Little Russian element in Russian literature."²⁶

Beginning in 1855, Kostomarov worked closely with D. L. Mordovtsev, who was employed as his aide in the Saratov Statistical Committee. The two men shared many ethnographic and historical interests and collaborated on the production of a Ukrainian literary almanac which they published in Saratov in 1859. Kostomarov contributed some literary material and the large collection of historical songs which he had gathered in Volhynia in 1844. However, strict censorship caused the compilers severe problems and much of the material was distorted or altogether omitted. "Unfortunately," Kostomarov later wrote, Matskevich, the censor to whom Mordovstev had sent the manuscript, dealt with the songs in a truly barbaric way."

He threw out everything that he did not like without the slightest hesitation, not considering that the songs sometimes lost their meaning because of it. It seems that the affair of my Saratov folksongs was known to him and served him as a moral example by which he used his red pencil. He did this most especially on those places where young maidens might be offended by the text. Although they were printed, these songs suffered horribly. I remained extremely unsatisfied with this manner of publishing the folk materials that I had gathered.²⁷

When it finally appeared, Kostomarov's Volhynian collection contained 202 songs including a number of compositions on historical themes. Kostomarov gave these historical songs - beginning with one on the legendary Cossack Hetman Svirhovs'kyi to whom he had earlier devoted an entire journal article - pride of place and added suitable historical annotations.²⁸

26. Mykola Kostomarov, "Z privedu 'Zapisk o iuzhnoi Rusi' P. Kulisha," in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 241-81, esp. 241, 244, 263, 281. This work first appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in various numbers for 1857.

27. "Autobiografiia," p. 501. Other songs in this almanac had to be omitted because they glorified the Ukrainian past or mentioned the struggle against Muscovy. See P. Lobas, "Ukrains'kyi literaturnyi zbirnyk," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, No. 2 (1968), pp. 74-80, and Velychenko, "Tsarist Censorship," p. 398.

28. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Narodnye pesni, sobrannye v zapadnoi chasti volynskoi gubernii v 1844 godu," *Malorusskii literaturnyi sbornik* (Saratov, 1859), pp. 179-353, and reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 127-202.

The accession of Alexander II to the throne greatly changed Kostomarov's life. The new tsar issued a coronation manifesto which liberated the historian and many other political exiles. Kostomarov used his new freedom to travel abroad, work in archives in Saint Petersburg, and generally intensify his scholarly endeavors. He worked for a while on the Saratov Committee for the Improvement of the Status of the Serfs, which was preparing the ground for the great emancipation of 1861, and in April 1859, he was invited to teach Russian history at Saint Petersburg University.²⁹

In Saint Petersburg, Kostomarov lectured at the university, contributed to the scholarly journals, and socialized with a number of his old friends from Kiev and Saratov. In particular, in collaboration with Panteleimon Kulish, Vasyi Bilozers'kyi, and others, he worked on a new journal of Ukrainian studies titled *Osnova*. Kostomarov contributed a number of important historical and polemical articles to this journal. Most of them were shorter syntheses of his historical works or summaries of his university lectures which argued in favor of the existence and cultural independence of the Ukrainian nationality and against Russian or Polish claims on the country. Many of these articles touched directly upon ethnographic questions, as for example, his polemic against the Polish émigré from Kiev, Franciszek Duchinski, who claimed that both Poles and Ukrainians were Slavs but that the Muscovites were really of Finnish ancestry and therefore of different racial stock and cultural type. Kostomarov, however, plainly rejected this theory and strongly criticized its implication: namely, that the "Asiatic" or "Turanian" Finns were somehow inferior to the "European" Slavs. "It is absurd and inhuman," he wrote, "to react with contempt to any kind of nation. There would not be the slightest shame for the Great Russians in being Finn, Tatar, even Kalmuks, if they really were so, and the whole question could be reviewed without any premise of Don Quixote national pride,"³⁰ Thus Kostomarov re-

29. His position at the university was not immediately confirmed. Complaints were voiced that *Stenka Razin* was written in an undesirable spirit. The matter went all the way to the tsar, who read the book, liked it very much, and approved the appointment. See Kostomarov's "Autobiografia," p. 526. More generally, see E. S. Shablovskii, "N. I. Kostomarov v gody revoliutsionnoi situatsii (1859-1861 gg.)," in *Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii 1859-1861 gg.*, 5 (Moscow: Nauka 1970), pp. 101-23.

30. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Otvēt na vykhodki gazety (Krakovskoi) 'Czas' i zhurnal 'Revue Contemporaine,'" *Osnova* (Saint Petersburg), No. 2 (1861), pp.

jected race and heredity as a basis for understanding cultural and national differences.

He was, however, intimately concerned with the problem of national character and devoted one of his most important contributions to *Osnova* to this very subject. In his wide-ranging essay on the "Two Russian Nationalities," Kostomarov outlined the different courses of Russian and Ukrainian history and speculated upon how historical factors revealed what he believed to be the basic traits of the Russian and Ukrainian national characters. Many of the points made by Kostomarov in this essay, including the primary one concerning the very existence of the "Little Russian," "South Russian," or Ukrainian nationality, were developments of ideas stated in his 1843 dissertation on the historical significance of Russian folk poetry, or they were extensions of points made earlier elsewhere.³¹

Kostomarov began by stating that geography and historical circumstances were responsible for national differences. He pointed out that there had been differences among the various Slavic tribes, including the Slavs who belonged to the Rus' polity (*Russkii materik*), since ancient times. He discussed the problem of the meaning of the name "Rus'" and stated that it originally had a territorial and ethnic meaning in South Rus' but merely a political, and later ecclesiastical, meaning in the north: that is, the sense of belonging to the Rus' polity, the ethnic core of which lay in the South. By the fifteenth century, the Slavic tribes of the territory that later became Russia were divided into four parts: Novgorod, Muscovy, Lithuania (that is Belorussia),

121-35, and reprinted in *Naukovo-publistystychni i polemiichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 75-84. On Duchinski, see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "Francisek Duchinski and his Impact on Ukrainian Political Thought," in his *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 187-202.

31. In his "Istoricheskie znachenie russkoi narodnoi poezii," p. 8, Kostomarov had clearly stated his position: "According to this system, in contradiction to the views of some ethnographers, the Russian nationality has always been divided into two halves: the South Russian and the Northern, or, as they are usually called: the Little Russian and the Great Russian. Therefore, in our survey of Russian folk poetry we will take into consideration the creations of both nationalities." In their edition of Kostomarov's *Dvi Rus'ki Narodnosti* (Kiev-Leipzig: Ukrainska nakladnia, n.d.), Oleksander Konysky and Dmytro Doroshenko, p. 6, remark that Kostomarov was unable to use the term "Ukrainian" because of the Russian censor and therefore tried to introduce the term "South Russian" (*Iuzhnorusskii*). But this term never really caught on, and "Little Russian" (*Malorusskii*) remained in use until the revolution of 1917 when it was finally and completely replaced by the term "Ukrainian" (*Ukrainskii*).

and Rus' (that is, what later came to be called Little Russia or Ukraine.) Novgorod was linguistically and culturally closest to Rus' because it was tied to the South by a common ethnic origin. The popular assembly or *vech*, a federal state structure, and poetic feelings were characteristic of Southern Rus' from the earliest times and reemerged during the Cossack era; similar values were held in Novgorod before its conquest by Muscovy. But in Vladimir-Suzdal and its successor Muscovy, princely rule, centralized power, and the tradition of conquest were established almost from the very entry of this region into recorded history. Out of the mixture of early Finnish and Slavic tribes of the Northeast and in a new physical climate there emerged a new national type—the Great Russian. Kostomarov thought the Great Russian to be practical and materialistic but with little poetry or love for nature; by contrast he thought the Southerner to be impractical and poetic with a great love for nature. According to Kostomarov, in religion the Great Russian was stiff, formal, and intolerant, and this gave rise to schisms and heretical sects of various sorts; by contrast, the "South Russian" was flexible and tolerant and sectarianism did not appear in his land. The Muscovites were suspicious of foreigners and sealed them off; but Southern Rus' was filled with Poles, Jews, and Tatars and for centuries tolerated them well. The Great Russian had autocracy, the village commune, and the ability to found a state; the Southerner had personal freedom and individual ownership but was weak in the management of a state. Kostomarov concluded that in some ways the "South Russians" or Ukrainians, to use the modern term, were more like the Poles than like the Great Russians, but that in general, the first of these peoples was historically characterized by democracy, the second by aristocracy, and the third by autocracy.³²

Kostomarov's essay on the "Two Russian Nationalities" made an immediate and lasting impression upon the reading public in the Russian Empire. The Ukrainians, of course, were delighted by it, and, to the turn of the century, held it in such high esteem that it was regarded by many as "the gospel of Ukrainian nation-

32. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Dve russkii narodnosti," *Osnova*, No. 3 (1861), pp. 33-80, and reprinted in his *Sobranie sochinenii*, Kn. 1 (Saint Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1903), pp. 33-65. There is an analysis of this work with lengthy quotations in Dmytro Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US*, 5-6 (New York, 1957), pp. 137-39.

alism."³³ Russian opinion, however, was divided. On the one hand, the idea of the existence of two Russian nationalities, with the implications of development for the Ukrainian language and literature were, at first, greeted warmly by some Russians, in a kind of "brotherly love," to use Kostomarov's own phrase.³⁴ On the other hand, in certain quarters, especially among the conservative Moscow Slavophiles, the idea of the existence of a second Russian nationality was simply unacceptable and Kostomarov's evaluation of Great Russian national characteristics seemed downright offensive. Moreover, after the outbreak of the Polish insurrection of 1863, Russian publicists became passionately concerned about national unity and the attacks on Kostomarov suddenly became quite fierce. At this time, he was accused of "Ukrainophilism" and "separatism," and the conservative *Russkii vestnik* dubbed his article on the "Two Russian Nationalities" as "shameful."³⁵

Kostomarov's discovery of the Ukrainian nationality arose from his focus upon the common man in history during his early days in Kharkiv; his 1861 essay on the "Two Russian Nationalities" was only the most developed form of the conclusion resulting from this discovery. But the 1860s also saw him recapitulate his basic assumptions about ethnography and historical methodology. In 1863, Kostomarov published his lecture "On the Relation of Russian History to Geography and Ethnography" and in it restated his basic ideas about the task of the historian.

In Kostomarov's view, both ethnography and history had in the past defined themselves too narrowly. Historians had ignored the lower classes while ethnographers had ignored the upper classes. In future, Kostomarov believed, historians should not restrict themselves to diplomatics, state structures, and laws, but rather address what he believed to be the real lives of the people who exist apart from the state, and, at times, in contradiction to the state. "This is so all the more," he wrote, "since the people are not the mechanical power of the state, but rather its truly living force, its content, and the state, by contrast, is only the form, a dead mechanism which is brought to life only through popular impulses." Similarly, ethnography must expand its scope. It must examine

33. *Ibid.*, p. 139.

34. "Autobiografiiia," p. 534.

35. *Ibid.* Kostomarov replied to some of the early Slavophile attacks on him in "Pravda Moskvycham o Rusi," *Osnova*, No. 10 (1861), pp. 1-15, and reprinted in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 102-10.

law and administrative practices and the views of the different strata of society. "The ethnographer must be a historian of the present," he concluded, "just as the historian must in his work present the ethnography of the past,"³⁶

Kostomarov's career as a university professor was brilliant but short. By 1862, in connection with some student disturbances at the university, he was retired with a full pension and thereafter devoted himself exclusively to work in the archives. During this period, he published a number of works which revealed his interest in social history and his theory about the importance of ethnography for the historian. One after another appeared his work on North Russian popular rule, which dealt with Novgorod, a history of the Time of Troubles, which reflected his interest in periods where the common people took part in the political process, and a history of southern Rus' at the end of the sixteenth century, which was a reworking of his first dissertation on the church union and the early Cossack revolts in Ukraine. Finally, he published *The Last Years of the Commonwealth* which was devoted to the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and focussed upon the fate of the Belorussian and Ukrainian peoples under Polish rule. This period was not far removed from the time that Kostomarov was writing and he was able to gather a considerable amount of folk material revealing the social and national tensions which had existed during the last years of the old regime. He used this material in his exposition of the unpopularity of Polish rule and the continuing hardships of serfdom under the tsars; for example, he quoted the common folk as singing about the rise of Russia in the darkest of tones:

Наступила чорна хмара
настала ще й сива:
Була Польша, була Польша
та стала й Росія.

The Black Cloud approaches
The grey one had come,
Where there had been Poland,
Russia had won.³⁷

36. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii k geografii i etnografii," *Sobranie sochinenii*, I, 719-31.

37. *Idem*, "Poslednie gody Rechi Pospolitoi," *Ibid.*, VIII, 673-74.

As Kostomarov himself later noted, his work on the fall of the Commonwealth was an original contribution to the subject which, with its stress upon social history, contrasted well with the earlier political and diplomatic history of this subject by the prolific official historiographer, Sergei Solov'ev.³⁸

During the last years of his life, that is, during the 1870s and 1880s, Kostomarov continued to open new fields of research for the historian and the ethnographer. Of interest to historians, were his three-volume popular-style history of Russia in biographies, and his studies of the post-Khmelnys't'kyi period in Ukraine, of the so-called "ruin," and of Mazepa and his followers; of interest to ethnographers, were his lengthy revisions to his 1842 dissertation on the historical significance of Russian folk poetry which he published during this period. The latter, part of which he entitled *The History of Cossackdom in the Monuments of South Russian Folksong Creations* was published in serial form in the widely read Russian journals *Beseda* (1872) and *Ruskaia mysl'* (1880-1883). This work, in the opinion of some scholars, was his most extensive and most important contribution to East Slavic ethnography. Certainly, the study was much more detailed than his earlier work, amounting to about 600 pages of closely-packed Cyrillic type. Moreover, it confined itself to only the "South Russian" or Ukrainian folk corpus and so was able to give lengthy quotations from the original songs in the text. Thus the ethnographic base of Kostomarov's work was now much wider than it had been in the 1840s. In fact, this study turned out to be an enormous source book or *khrestomatiia* of Ukrainian folksong which drew extensively both on the published collections by Maksymovych, Sreznevskii, Metlnys'kyi, Kulish, Holovats'kyi, and others, and also on Kostomarov's own private collection and the unpublished collections of the writer Marko Vovchok and her husband O. V. Markovych. Moreover, he printed several historical songs that had been previously unknown.³⁹

38. "Zapiska N. I. Kostomarova ob ego uchenykh trudakh," *Ruskaia mysl'*, No. 5 (1885), pp. 52-53.

39. See Nikolai Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," in *Sobranie sochinenie*, Kn. VIII (1906), pp. 429-1081. Popov, *Kostomarov kak folkloryst i etnograf*, p. 73, praises this work as being "the greatest and most important of [Kostomarov's] researches in the area of folklore and ethnography." Kateryna Hrushevska, *Ukrainski narodni dumy*

The organization and interpretation of Kostomarov's last work, however, changed very little. He still divided the corpus into ritual songs (*obriadnye*), epic songs (*bylevye*), and songs about life-style (*bytovye*), and he retained his original periodization of historical songs with only slight modifications: 1) Pre-historic 2) Princely period or pre-Cossack 3) Cossack 4) Post-Cossack or peasant. He did, however, arrange these songs in historical sequence with appropriate commentaries, and he further restricted their historical significance, admitting that they were only useful for a general picture of the people's view of itself. Kostomarov's work was so large that it was not all published in his lifetime and several new chapters only appeared in the 1970s and 1980s.⁴⁰

While working on *The Historical Significance of South Russian Folksong Creations*, Kostomarov also engaged in other ethnographic activities. He contributed to and edited three volumes of P. P. Chubynskyi's massive collection of Ukrainian folksongs and penned a book-length review of the *Historical Songs of the Little Russian People* by V. B. Antonovych and M. Drahomanov. Kostomarov recognized Antonovych and Drahomanov's achievements in the realm of historical commentary and scientific apparatus--they gave a complete geography and lineage for each of their songs--but he disagreed with their periodization and discovered a few pseudo-folksongs in their collection.⁴¹ In general, Kostomarov's last ethnographic work was more refined and critical than his early studies in this area.

Just how far Kostomarov had come was clear from his February 1880 letter to his old Kharkiv friend O. O. Korsun, in which he thoroughly deprecated what he called "the pseudo-folk creations" (*pseudonarodnykh proizvedeniakh*) and "false chronicle tales" with which Sreznevskii had embellished his *Zaporozhskaia starina*. "My Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi has been cleansed, and cleansed again from this manure," he wrote

vol. I (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1927), pp. cxxxv-cxxxcii, discusses new *dumy* or historical songs printed by Kostomarov.

40. See Iu. A. Pinchuk, "Nedrukovanyi rozdil z monografii M. I. Kostomarova 'Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo posenogo tvorchestva'," *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografia*, No. 5 (1978), pp. 73-85; No. 4 (1982), pp. 67-73, No. 2 (1984), pp. 48-53.

41. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Istoricheskaiia poeziia i novye ee materialy: Istoricheskiiia pesni malorusskogo naroda s obiasneniiami V. Antonovicha i M. Dragomanova. Tom Pervyi," *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 12 (1874), pp. 573-639, and reprinted in *Etnografichni pysannia Kostomarova*; pp. 299-334.

Korsun, "and now after the third edition has still not been completely cleansed." Kostomarov blamed Sreznevskii for lacking the steadfastness to go public and acknowledge "that everything published by him as historical and ethnographic truth, was a lie."⁴² When Kostomarov died in 1885, there is little doubt that he still felt that his great enterprise of writing the history of his native Ukraine through the use of folksongs had been left incomplete.

Judgments are varied as to the significance of Kostomarov's general contribution to East Slavic ethnography. On the one hand, his work on folk symbolism appears superficial and naive compared to the later work of Potebnia; in the 1870s Antonovych and Drahomarov relegated his historical commentaries to second place, and in the 1880s Aleksandr Veselovskii replaced his work on the *byliny*. Contemporaries like Aleksandr Pypin criticized his old-style methodology and his ignorance of the historical-comparative method pioneered by the brothers Grimm, while later on, Soviet critics like M. K. Azadovskii accused him of throughout his long career undergoing no progressive evolution in his approach to folksong.⁴³

On the other hand, it seems clear that Kostomarov did make an original contribution to the East Slavic ethnography of his time. The famed Moscow Slavist, Osyp Bodians'kyi, believed that there was not a single Ukrainian folksong that Kostomarov did not already know, and truly, he knew a great many.⁴⁴ During an era when only a few amateurs were interested in folk materials and did nothing more than collect and publish them, Kostomarov was a true pioneer in the analysis and interpretation of Russian and Ukrainian folk materials. He examined ethnography in a scholarly way at a time when few men in Russia took the subject seriously. During the 1840s, when most of the Russian nobility was still enamoured of the French or German languages and still propounded the philosophy of the enlightenment of the eighteenth century, Kostomarov, echoing Herder, called his countrymen to look seriously at their own native language, their own

42. A. Korsunov [O. o. Korsun], "N. I. Kostomarov," *Russkii arkhiv*, No. 10 (1890), pp. 218-19.

43. Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, III, 178, 186-87; M. K. Azadovskii, *Istoriia russkoi folkloristiki*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Uchebno-pedagogicheskoe Izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Prosvesheniia RSFSR, 1958-63), II, 39-46.

44. Doroshenko, *Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov*, p. 76.

history, and their own Slavic heritage. In doing this, Kostomarov, who was thoroughly imbued with a democratic spirit, quickly discovered that his native Russia was composed of more than one nationality. To the chagrin of the tsar's censors, it was the lesser-known of these nationalities, the "Little Russian" or Ukrainian nationality, that quickly acquired most of his attention and admiration. Before doubters and bureaucrats who were solely concerned with nationality as defined by suzerain and statehood, Kostomarov mustered the ethnolinguistic facts about the East Slavic peoples and sought to display the richness of their native cultures to the outside world. This was especially important for the Ukrainians against whom the Russian government had taken measures after 1863. As late as the 1890s, the Ukrainian historian, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, was still meeting gentlemen scholars who, in the style of Kostomarov, and raised on his writings, were seeking to prove the existence of the Ukrainian people through the exhibition of their rich folk heritage.⁴⁵

For a time, Kostomarov did succeed in capturing the attention of the world. His power lay in the originality of his democratic method and the brilliance of his romantic style. It is true that many of his works were quickly replaced by contributions by other historians and ethnographers with a larger archival or ethnographic base, but the direction which he pointed to and the images which he created were of lasting importance. Towards the end of his long career, Kostomarov observed that in his early work on Russian folk poetry he had tried to show "the historical importance of folksongs not in the sense that they could provide important and reliable material for the exposition of factual history, but rather in that they reveal the national psychology to us and inform us about those impressions which nature, historical circumstances, and social stratification have made upon the spirit of the people."⁴⁶ The enormous popularity of Kostomarov's writings both during his lifetime and afterwards, indicates that at least in part he was successful.

McMaster University

45. Hrushveskyy, "Etnografichne dilo Kostomarova," p. ix.

46. "Zapiska N. I. Kostomarova ob ego unchenykh trudakh," p. 44.