



## The President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov: A Note on Pëtr A. Valuev's Anti-Ukrainian Edict of 1863

Author(s): DAVID SAUNDERS

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3/4 (December 1993), pp. 365-383

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036531>

Accessed: 20-04-2015 15:30 UTC

### REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036531?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036531?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Mikhail Katkov and Mykola Kostomarov:  
A Note on Pëtr A. Valuev's Anti-Ukrainian Edict of 1863\*

DAVID SAUNDERS

I have argued elsewhere that the main reason for St. Petersburg's anti-Ukrainian edicts of 1847, 1863, and 1876 was the Russian authorities' determination to prevent Ukrainian peasants from receiving primary education in their native language.<sup>1</sup> Other scholars have emphasized St. Petersburg's mistrust of Ukrainian intellectuals and fear of Polish nationalists.<sup>2</sup> The present note concedes that, even if Ukrainian intellectuals and Polish nationalists were not of overriding importance in the genesis of the edicts, they contributed significantly to the feverish atmosphere in which Pëtr Aleksandrovich Valuev, Russia's Minister of Internal Affairs, prohibited the publication of educational literature in Ukrainian on 18 July 1863.<sup>3</sup>

The note recounts a debate which took place in the Moscow and St. Petersburg press in the summer of 1863 between the right-wing Russian journalist Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov and the populist Ukrainian historian Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov. By attacking Ukrainophiles on the grounds that their movement was an offshoot of the contemporary Polish rebellion, Katkov heightened his readers' fear of Polish nationalists. By responding aggressively to Katkov's accusations, Kostomarov increased Russians' mistrust of Ukrainian intellectuals. In the course of the dispute, Kostomarov turned to Valuev for help. His previously unpublished letter to the minister appears in Russian and English at the end of this commentary.

---

\* I am indebted to the British Academy for funding the research on which this paper is based and to Professor Orest Pelech for commenting on an earlier version.

1. David Saunders, "The Kirillo-Methodian Society," *Slavonic and East European Review* 71 (1993): 684–92; idem, "Russia and Ukraine under Alexander II: The Valuev Edict of 1863," *International History Review* 17 (1995): 23–50; idem, "Russia's Ukrainian Policy (1847–1905): A Demographic Approach," *European History Quarterly* 25 (1995): 181–208.

2. Fedir Savchenko, *Zaborona ukraïnstva 1876 r.* (Kyiv, 1930; Munich, 1970), focuses on Ukrainian intellectuals; S. N. Shchegolev, *Ukrainskoe dvizhenie, kak sovremennyi etap iuzhnorusskogo separatizma* (Kyiv, 1912), highlights Poles.

3. Valuev's edict was incorrectly dated 8 July in a volume printed for use within the Ministry of Internal Affairs in 1865: Ministry of Internal Affairs, *Sbornik rasporiashenii po delam pečati (s 1863 po 1-e sentiabria 1865 goda)* (St. Petersburg, 1865), 9. For the correct date, see Mikhail Lemke, *Èpokha tsenzurnykh reform 1859–1865 godov* (St. Petersburg, 1904), 302, n. 1, and the original: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (hereafter RGIA), fond (hereafter f.) 775 (Central Censorship Department), opis' (hereafter op.) 1, delo (hereafter d.) 188, listy (hereafter ll.) 13–14.

Remarkably, in view of the reputation he made as a right-winger between 1863 and his death in 1887, Mikhail Katkov was one of the most liberal editors in Russia between 1856 and the end of 1862. When, in those years, Boris Chicherin sent him a review of Alexis de Tocqueville's *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution* which took exception to the book's condemnation of the centralized administrative structure of pre-revolutionary France, Katkov refused to publish it because he found its argument unacceptable. The purpose of centralization, he believed, was "to render unto Caesar all that is Caesar's, but very much not to give to Caesar what can in no way belong to him."<sup>4</sup> In the late 1850s, in other words, Katkov sympathized with Tocqueville's opinion that central government ought to be non-interventionist and minimal. For the time being, his ideal political system was that of contemporary England.<sup>5</sup>

Why Katkov changed tack after the outbreak of the Polish rebellion in January 1863 is unclear. Perhaps he was simply a time-server, anxious to remain in favor with a Russian government whose priorities were changing. Perhaps, having been brought up on Hegel, he thought one set of rules applied to well-established states but another to stateless minorities like the Poles (and, *a fortiori*, Ukrainians). Perhaps securing the Russian Empire's borders against the possibility of pro-Polish intervention by foreign powers was more important to him than the pursuit of domestic reform. Perhaps his supposedly "liberal" views of the period 1856–62 were really a covert means of advocating the maintenance of the social hegemony of a Russian landowning elite, in which case he did not shift his ground at all. Or perhaps he was simply shaken by the Polish rising and threw his prior convictions to the winds. The abundant literature on his life and career makes all these arguments tenable.<sup>6</sup>

What matters for present purposes, however, is less the reason for Katkov's reorientation than the fact that it took place. By June 1863, when he attacked Ukrainophilism, he had turned his newspaper *Moskovskie vedomosti* (*Moscow News*) into the principal organ of militant Russian nationalism. In the process

4. B. N. Chicherin, *Vospominaniia: Moskva sorokovykh godov* (Moscow, 1929), 281.

5. See Eugene Pyziur, "Mikhail N. Katkov: Advocate of English Liberalism in Russia, 1856–1863," *Slavonic and East European Review* 45 (1967): 439–56.

6. On Katkov see especially S. Nevedenskii, *Katkov i ego vremia* (St. Petersburg, 1888); Marc Raeff, "A Reactionary Liberal: M. N. Katkov," in idem, *Political Ideas and Institutions in Imperial Russia* (Boulder, Colorado, 1994), 22–31 (first published in 1952); Martin Katz, *Mikhail N. Katkov: A Political Biography 1818–1887* (The Hague and Paris, 1966); J. D. Morison, "Katkov and Pan Slavism," *Slavonic and East European Review* 46 (1968): 422–41; V. A. Tvardovskaia, *Ideologiia poreformennogo samoderzhaviiia* (M. N. Katkov i ego izdaniia) (Moscow, 1978); and Karel Durman, *The Time of the Thunder: Mikhail Katkov, Russian Nationalist Extremism and the Failure of the Bismarckian System, 1871–1887* (Boulder, Colorado, 1988).

he had made the paper enormously popular among the sort of Russian whose prime conviction was loyalty to the throne. "It is difficult for someone who did not himself live through the 1860s," wrote a later head of the imperial censorship, "to have the slightest conception of the enormous influence which articles in *Moskovskie vedomosti* exerted in respect of the Polish question."<sup>7</sup> In 1863 Katkov's influence extended to the highest levels of government. When he wrote to Valuev in March about a step St. Petersburg had just taken to widen the gap between the Polish landlords of the empire's western provinces and their non-Polish peasants, the minister welcomed his letter and encouraged him to write again:

I make a request of you, and I put to you a proposition: the request is that you always tell me your opinion with the same frankness; the proposition is that you conclude a treaty with me, a *pactum*, concerning an ongoing exchange of thoughts and opinions. I am prepared, so far as is possible, to give you a *confidential* answer to every question you put to me, and I should like, in my turn, to be able to turn to you, equally *confidentially*, for notification of your view on the questions concerning which I should like to learn your opinion.<sup>8</sup>

Katkov made extensive use of Valuev's offer, writing to him throughout 1863 and subsequently.<sup>9</sup> Although the published version of the correspondence between the two men contains no material between 4 June and 29 July 1863, and therefore no reference to developments between Katkov's initial attack on Ukrainophilism (22 June) and Valuev's anti-Ukrainian edict (18 July), V. A. Tvardovskaia has pointed out that additional letters have survived in manuscript.<sup>10</sup> It is possible, therefore, that Valuev's main reason for banning educational literature in Ukrainian was an as yet unpublished letter from Katkov whose importance no one has realized. If this turns out to be the case, Mikhail Lemke's view that the press debate between Katkov and Kostomarov was enough in itself to explain Valuev's edict will have been proved more or less correct.<sup>11</sup> The Soviet scholar who went so far as to attribute to Katkov the most famous phrase in the edict ("there has not been, is not, and cannot be a Little Russian language") will not have been far wrong either.<sup>12</sup> In the absence of such a letter, however, it ought to be borne in

7. E. Feoktistov, *Za kulisami politiki i literatury 1848–1896* (Leningrad, 1929; Moscow, 1991), 83.

8. V. Mustafin, "Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov i graf Pëtr Aleksandrovich Valuev v ikh perepiske (1863–1879 gg.)," *Russkaia starina*, 1879 (8): 295 (italics in the original).

9. See Mustafin, "Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov," *Russkaia starina*, 1879 (8): 279–300; (9): 403–413; (10): 91–95; (11): 247–51; (12): 416–30, and 1916 (6): 346–65.

10. Tvardovskaia, *Ideologiia poreformennogo samoderzhaviia*, 33, n. 45.

11. Lemke, *Epokha*, 295–309.

12. Fedor Iastrebov, *Revoliutsionnye demokraty na Ukraine: Vtoraia polovina 50-kh–nachalo 60-kh godov XIX st.* (Kyiv, 1960), 284.

mind that the archival file on Valuev's edict makes no reference to Katkov, that the minister's published diary makes no reference to the journalist in the context of Ukrainian affairs in 1863, that in late July 1863 the minister told Katkov that he did not always agree with him, and that recent work on Katkov makes as much of the fact that the imperial government found him hard to handle as it does of the fact that the authorities welcomed his support.<sup>13</sup> Katkov undoubtedly had Valuev's ear. It is hard to believe that the minister did not read his newspaper with care.<sup>14</sup> But as I have tried to show elsewhere, St. Petersburg had grounds other than Katkov's Ukrainophobia for promulgating the first of its bans on Ukrainian-language publishing.

Some of the activities of Mykola Kostomarov illustrate what those other grounds were. Kostomarov has not attracted the degree of scholarly attention enjoyed by Katkov. Although his historical, journalistic, and ethnographic writings were reprinted early in the twentieth century,<sup>15</sup> the first substantial biographies appeared only in the 1990s.<sup>16</sup>

Perhaps because in the last thirty years of his life (1855–85) Kostomarov chose to spend most of his time in St. Petersburg and to write almost exclusively in Russian (and often on non-Ukrainian subjects), Ukrainian students of his work have found it hard to take him to their hearts. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, for example, concluded a commemorative article on his historical writing with several pages of criticism. Whilst acknowledging that in the 1840s Kostomarov had been directly involved in generating the liberating ideas of Ukraine's "Cyrillo-Methodians" ("this high point of Ukrainian national self-consciousness"), Hrushevs'kyi believed that by the end of his life the historian had "succeeded only in part in realising them in his

---

13. See RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, d. 188 (the archival file); P. A. Valuev, *Dnevnik* (2 vols., Moscow, 1961); Mustafin, "Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov," *Russkaia starina*, 1915 (9): 406; and V. G. Chernukha, "M. N. Katkov i 'Moskovskie vedomosti,'" in her *Pravitel'stvennaia politika v otnoshenii pechati 60–70-e gody XIX veka* (Leningrad, 1989), 151–97.

14. On 29 July 1863 Valuev referred explicitly to an article in *Moskovskie vedomosti* (Mustafin, "Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov," *Russkaia starina*, 1879 (9): 407). After leaving the Ministry of Internal Affairs in 1868 he kept up with the newspaper even in Italy: RGIA, f. 908 (P. A. Valuev), op. 1, *editsa khraneniia* 168, l. 23, Valuev to A. E. Timashev, Rome, 31 January/12 February 1869 (complaining about Katkov's criticism of the imperial censorship).

15. N. I. Kostomarov, *Sobranie sochinenii: Istoricheskie monografii i issledovaniia* (21 books in 8 vols., St. Petersburg, 1903–8); M. I. Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsychni i polemichni pysannia* (Kyiv, 1928); idem, *Etnohrafichni pysannia* (Kyiv, 1930).

16. Iu. A. Pinchuk, *Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov* (Kyiv, 1992); Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography* (Toronto, 1996).

historical oeuvre and left the generations of his heirs a great deal more to do.”<sup>17</sup>

At the time of his argument with Katkov, however, Kostomarov was probably the best-known Ukrainian activist in the Russian Empire. After spending a year in prison and eight years in exile in Saratov in the wake of the suppression of the Cyrillo-Methodians in 1847, he had returned to scholarship in 1856, published a major study of Bohdan Khmel’nytskyi in 1857, and been appointed to a chair at St. Petersburg University in 1859. In his inaugural lecture he made clear that in dealing with the history of Kyivan Rus’ he would “select from [the wearisome series of internecine princely conflicts and wars] only what points to the degree of the people’s involvement in them, the people’s view of them and the effect they had on the people’s life.”<sup>18</sup> Unlike Katkov, in other words, Kostomarov was a populist. That his populism was of an explicitly Ukrainian variety is evident in every line of the long letter he sent Alexander Herzen for publication in *Kolokol* (*The Bell*) in 1860.<sup>19</sup> The most striking of the many contributions he made to *Osnova* (*The Foundation*), the journal in which the literary activities of Ukrainians reached their peak in St. Petersburg in 1861 and 1862, argued that the word “Russian” needed to be reinterpreted to take account of the difference between Russians and Ukrainians. In Kostomarov’s opinion, one should speak not of one but of “Two Russian Nationalities.”<sup>20</sup> Hrushevs’kyi may have had doubts about Kostomarov’s achievement as a whole, but he acknowledged that his articles in *Osnova* “effected ... a sea-change (*povnyi perevorot*) in the historical thinking of Eastern Slavdom.”<sup>21</sup>

In May 1862 Kostomarov moved beyond activism of a purely literary kind when he started a fund-raising campaign in *Osnova* for the publication of books in Ukrainian from which children could be taught in Ukrainian primary schools.<sup>22</sup> This step and its context and consequences were to be among the main reasons for Katkov’s attack on Ukrainophilism the following year. Since the centrality of the question of native-language education in the genesis of Russia’s anti-Ukrainian edicts of 1847, 1863, and 1876 is the thesis of my other articles on the subject,<sup>23</sup> I shall not attempt here to repeat the detailed

17. M. Hrushevs’kyi, “Ukraïns’ka istoriohrafia i Mykola Kostomarov,” *Literaturno-naukovyi vistyky* 50 (1910): 225.

18. N. I. Kostomarov, *Lektsii po russkoi istorii* (St. Petersburg, 1861), 12.

19. Anon. (M. I. Kostomarov), “Ukraina,” *Kolokol*, no. 61 (15 January 1860): 499–503.

20. N. I. Kostomarov, “Dve russkie narodnosti,” in idem, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 1: 33–65 (first published in March 1861).

21. M. Hrushevs’kyi, “Z publitsystychnykh pysan’ Kostomarova,” in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, x.

22. His appeal is reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 137–40.

23. See above, n. 1.

evidence put forward there. Suffice it to say that the first Sunday school in the Russian Empire had opened in Kyiv in the autumn of 1859, that the notion of Ukrainian-language primary education had gained ground rapidly between then and 1862, that a number of textbooks in Ukrainian had appeared in print already, and that Kostomarov was merely trying to lend his authority to a development that promised significant returns. It is time to return to Katkov.

Until the Polish rebellion broke out in January 1863, Katkov seems to have been mildly sympathetic to Ukrainians. In a leader of January 1861 on the emergence of new European nationalities, he implied support for Ukrainian subjects of the Habsburgs.<sup>24</sup> In January 1862 he printed a letter on the progress of serf emancipation in Russian Ukraine which applauded the use of the Ukrainian language in dealings between Russian officials and Ukrainian peasants.<sup>25</sup> In November 1862 he published "An Opinion from Kyiv," in which twenty-one Ukrainian signatories attempted to rebut the charges that they were firebrands, that they were encouraging peasants to impede the enactment of their own emancipation, and that they were separatists. Introducing this memorandum, Katkov said that he was the last person to seek the imposition of constraints on Ukrainian literature. He doubted whether it could be successfully promoted and feared that valuable energy would be expended to no purpose, but he accepted that others might take a different view. He disagreed with the Ukrainians whose statement he was publishing, but he was prepared to believe that the principles behind it were cognate with his own and that, therefore, it deserved some sympathy.<sup>26</sup> He seems to have maintained this broadminded view until January 1863, when on two occasions he printed appeals from Kostomarov for money to further the campaign he had started in *Osnova*.<sup>27</sup>

Admittedly, there were signs as early as June 1862 that Katkov mistrusted the rise of the Ukrainian language. Commenting on a report from Kyiv about educational debates in Ukraine, he took the view that conflicting educational interests were lamentable "in one of the most fundamental (*korennnykh*) Russian regions," and that the language of instruction in the Russian Empire's primary schools ought to be Russian. The language spoken in Ukraine, Katkov claimed, differed less sharply from standard Russian than did certain local dialects to be found elsewhere in the Slavic part of the

24. Editorial, *Russkii vestnik: Sovremennaia letopis'*, 1861 (4): 10–14.

25. K. Kushchin, "Pis'mo k izdateliu," *Russkii vestnik: Sovremennaia letopis'*, 1862 (4): 32.

26. *Russkii vestnik: Sovremennaia letopis'*, 1862 (46): 3n.

27. N. Kostomarov, "Zaiavlenie," *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 12 January 1863, and idem, "Ob'iavlenie," *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 30 January 1863.



empire. Such dialects nowhere “compete[d] with the general language ... of the people. The Russian language is the common property both of the so-called Great Russians and of Little Russians [i.e., Russians and Ukrainians]. It is not Great Russian but Russian, which has been forged by history and with which Russian education is inextricably intertwined.”<sup>28</sup>

A year later, Katkov began a sustained attack on Ukrainophilism. In a fulminating leader of 22 June 1863 he claimed that rebellious Poles had “naturally not omitted to make use even of Ukrainophile tendencies, to which our public opinion has not yet given the attention it deserves.”<sup>29</sup> Having formerly been prepared to give what he called “Ukrainophile tendencies” a hearing, the editor now believed that they were wholly unreasonable. The East Slavs, he felt, were more homogeneous than “any other great national group [*narodnost'*] in Europe.” Although Ukrainians and Belarusians spoke differently from Russians, they did not possess their own languages. The differences among the East Slavs were the result of historical misfortune. “The Mongols and Lithuania divided the populations of Rus' (*russkie narodonaseleniia*) for a time, and after the south-western part of our people fell under the Polish yoke it suffered for a long time and for a long time was drenched in blood.” This “south-western part of our people” eventually escaped from Polish control, “but nevertheless the period of separation from Russia introduced into South-Russian speech a number of Polish elements and in general isolated it,” with the result that the southerners’ speech differed from that of other East Slavs to a greater extent than local forms of speech (*mestnye govory*) differed from each other in Russia. Nevertheless, Ukrainians and Russians were one people. “Ukrainophilism,” Katkov thought, was a recent construct. Polish publicists had started promoting it two or three years previously in order to argue that Ukrainian affinities were Polish rather than Russian. To their shame, Russian writers had responded sympathetically to Polish claims and had begun speaking of “two Russian nationalities and two Russian languages.”<sup>30</sup>

To Katkov, this attempt to distinguish between Russians and Ukrainians represented “A scandalous and preposterous sophism!” He admitted, however, that Ukrainophilism had had remarkable consequences. “Enthusiastic propagators of Little Russian literacy in sheepskin hats began to appear in Ukrainian villages and to set up Little Russian schools, contrary to the efforts

28. P. Annenkov, “Iz Kiev,” *Russkii vestnik: Sovremennaiia letopis'*, 1862 (25): 3n.

29. Editorial, *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 22 June 1863. All subsequent quotations in this paragraph come from this editorial, part of which is to be found in translation in Martin McCauley and Peter Waldron, *The Emergence of the Modern Russian State, 1855–81* (Basingstoke and London, 1988), 208–9.

30. A clear reference to Kostomarov’s article “Two Russian Nationalities” of March 1861 (see above).



of the local priesthood, who along with the peasants did not know how to repel these uninvited enlighteners. Booklets began to appear in the newly invented Little Russian language. Then a professor with a literary reputation formally opened a nation-wide subscription-list to collect money for the publication of Little Russian books and booklets.”<sup>31</sup> Ukrainophiles were undoubtedly “in the hands of [Polish] intriguers.” “We know that the most fanatical of the Polish agitators expect that their concerns will benefit, sooner or later, from Ukrainophilism.” Although Katkov found even the Poles’ aspirations for themselves objectionable (let alone their attempts to persuade Ukrainians to join them), he accepted that, strictly speaking, Polish claims were rational because Poland had once been an independent state and Polish was certainly a separate language. He could not understand, however, why Ukrainophiles allowed themselves to be converted to Polish ways of thinking. “Ukraine has never had a distinctive history, has never been a separate state, the Ukrainian people is a purely Russian people, a primeval (*korennoi*) Russian people, an essential part of the Russian people without which the Russian people cannot go on being what it is.” Traditionally, Katkov said, Ukrainians and Poles disliked each other. The Ukrainian language did not exist. Ukrainian peasants were hostile to Ukrainophile intellectuals. Even in distant Austrian-ruled Galicia the language of the Ukrainian natives had been close to Russian until recently. The language of the Hungarian part of Ukraine was almost wholly Russian. “A sad fate is overtaking Ukrainophile aspirations! They coincide point for point with the anti-Russian interests of the Poles and the dispositions of the Austrian government.” In conclusion, Katkov mentioned Kostomarov by name, telling him not to send *Moskovskie vedomosti* any more advertisements in connection with his fund-raising campaign and hoping that this “Ukrainian” collection would be smaller than collections being made for the purpose of fighting Poles.

Kostomarov took up the cudgels. On 6 July 1863 he denied, in I. S. Aksakov’s Slavophile Moscow weekly newspaper *Den’* (*The Day*), that his collection of funds for the publication of educational books in Ukrainian was inspired by Poles. The idea, he said, was his own. Far from supporting him, Poles in right-bank Ukraine were positively hostile to the notion of promoting the Ukrainian language. He had received no money whatever from the province of Volhynia, and very little from the provinces of Kyiv and Podolia. Russians, he believed, ought to be sympathetic to his endeavour. They ought not to listen to those who associated Ukrainophilism with Polish nationalism. Imagining a connection of this kind “would be very funny, if it

---

31. Another clear reference to Kostomarov, this time to the fund-raising campaign he had launched in *Osnova* in May 1862.

were not so insulting.” *Moskovskie vedomosti* ought either to prove that the connection existed or admit its mistake: “I demand this in the name of insulted civic honour.”<sup>32</sup>

In publishing Kostomarov’s article, the editor of *Den’* appended a long note to it in which he expressed sympathy for the use of Ukrainian and Belarusian in the primary education of the relevant ethnic groups. He was of the opinion, indeed, that forbidding the employment of these languages might have the counter-productive effect of increasing support for the “false theory of federalism.” On the other hand, he believed that St. Petersburg had the right to insist on the use of Russian in schools funded by the state. Instruction in Ukrainian and Belarusian ought to be confined to schools whose funding was private. Nor was it proper to seek the standardization of the Ukrainian language for educational purposes. Imposing the Poltava or Chyhyryn dialect on Ukrainians further west (*Chervonorussy*) was “despotic.” Whilst accepting that Kostomarov himself had no ulterior motive in promoting Ukrainian-language literacy, the editor believed that the loyalty to the Russian Empire of other (unnamed) Ukrainians was more doubtful.<sup>33</sup>

Kostomarov wrote again. After thanking *Den’* for publishing his article, he took issue with its editorial comments. He conceived federalism as a way of looking at the East Slavs’ past, not as a recipe for their future; he knew of no Ukrainian activists whose loyalty to the empire was doubtful; he saw no great difference between the various Ukrainian dialects; and he believed that the question whether Ukrainian intellectuals were out of step with the Ukrainian masses would be easily resolved if the former were supported rather than obstructed in their endeavour to expose the latter to the possibility of achieving literacy in their native language rather than Russian.<sup>34</sup>

The editor of *Den’* dissented from some of these propositions,<sup>35</sup> but Kostomarov refrained from writing to the newspaper a third time because by now his principal adversary had returned to the fray. Katkov responded to the first of his articles in *Den’* by declaring in the “Sunday Supplements” to *Moskovskie vedomosti* that Kostomarov would be well advised simply to abandon his Ukrainophilism, for “nothing good” could come of it. On this occasion Katkov was gracious enough to acknowledge that Kostomarov had “no relations whatever with the Polish insurrectionists” and was pursuing

32. N. Kostomarov, “Otvét ‘Moskovskim Vedomostiam,’” *Den’*, 6 July 1863: 18–19 (reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 159–60).

33. Ibid. (but not reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*).

34. Nikolai Kostomarov, “Piśmo k redaktorowi,” *Den’*, 20 July 1863: 19–20 (reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 160–62).

35. In a series of footnotes in *Den’*, 20 July 1863: 19–20 (but not reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*).

"quite different goals from theirs." He claimed, moreover, not to be seeking the persecution of Ukrainophiles. He still held, however, that the cause to which Kostomarov had committed himself was "in no way better" than that of the Poles. Superficially, he said, Kostomarov's objectives were limited, but if he succeeded in achieving them the consequences threatened to be unfortunate. People other than Kostomarov realized that "if two Russian nationalities were to appear, then one of them would immediately cease to be Russian." There could be "no rivalry between the southern and the northern part of one and the same nationality, just as there can be no rivalry between the two hands, between the two eyes of one and the same living organism." Kostomarov was wrong to think that, far from assisting the Poles, the promotion of Ukrainian culture was the best means of preventing Ukraine from being Polonized. The best that could be said of Ukrainophiles was that they were the victims of "naivety and stupidity." If they were successful in inculcating mass literacy in Ukrainian, it would be necessary, at some point in the future, to eradicate the consequences of their success by force.<sup>36</sup>

Kostomarov replied by asking whether he had been wrong to sense in Katkov's first article that he was being accused of complicity with the Poles; by pointing to the illogicality of recommending the non-persecution of Ukrainophiles whilst at the same time warning of the likelihood that, in the event of their success, it would be necessary to stamp out the effects of their activity by force; and by drawing attention to the sympathy with which Katkov had treated Ukrainian matters only two years previously.<sup>37</sup> To defend his position at greater length, he composed a more substantial article for the recently established liberal newspaper *Golos (The Voice)*. The censors informed him, however, not only that the article was unsuitable for publication, but also that he was not to be allowed to continue publishing educational literature in Ukrainian. At this point he took his case to the top. Since, in March 1863, control of the censorship had passed from the Ministry of Education to the Ministry of Internal Affairs,<sup>38</sup> it was to Valuev, the head of the latter, that he was obliged to address himself. His letter to the minister appears in Russian and English at the end of this commentary.

Valuev's response was to ask Kostomarov to visit him at his dacha on 28 July.<sup>39</sup> There, he told him that the idea of publishing in Ukrainian was meritorious in principle but unacceptable in practice because the government

36. M. N. Katkov, "Neskol'ko slov v otvet g. Kostomarovu," *Sovremennaiia letopis': Voskresnye pribavleniia k "Moskovskim Vedomostiam,"* 1863 (24): 1–4.

37. *Sankt-peterburgskie vedomosti*, 21 July 1863 (reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 162–63).

38. Charles A. Ruud, *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804–1906* (Toronto, 1982), 135.

39. RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, d. 205, l. 3.

was obliged "not to give ill-intentioned people the chance of putting [the idea] to other uses ... and ... not to give them the opportunity, under the pretext of disseminating popular academic books, of disseminating illegal calls for revolts and disturbances."<sup>40</sup>

It is unclear whether Valuev also told Kostomarov that, ten days before they met, he had issued a general ban on Ukrainian-language educational literature. It would be surprising if he did not, but Kostomarov said in his memoirs that he learned of the edict only subsequently.<sup>41</sup> Either way, Kostomarov's campaign for the promotion of literacy in Ukrainian was at an end. The article he had intended for *Golos* saw the light of day only recently.<sup>42</sup>

Katkov continued to fulminate. In August 1863 he tackled Kostomarov's charge that he had changed his opinion on Ukrainian affairs since 1861 by claiming that it was not he but the nature of Ukrainian affairs that had changed. Long-term goals, he believed, underpinned Kostomarov's cautious descriptions of his plans. If the Ukrainian language were to be employed in Ukrainian primary schools, it would not be long before it came to be used in higher Ukrainian schools and in the courts. If Ukrainian achieved the linguistic status of Polish or Czech, the millions of people who had become literate in it would have grounds for claiming autonomy. The possibility, Katkov felt, had to be forestalled.<sup>43</sup>

Kostomarov noted in reply that he could no longer write fully "for reasons which are very well known to the editor of *Moscow News*." He was still sending Katkov historical work for publication, but denied that in doing so he was conceding defeat in their argument about Ukrainophilism. He invited Katkov to print the letter on this point which he had enclosed when sending him the historical work.<sup>44</sup> In another enormous article on Ukrainophilism, Katkov rejected the request. Here, he delighted in the fact that "Mr. Kostomarov is now encountering obstacles to his activity on the part of

40. Such, at least, is Kostomarov's record of the meeting: N. I. Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia* (Kyiv, 1989), 595. Valuev's record says only that he "told [Kostomarov] gently, but clearly and categorically, that the step [he] had taken would remain in force": Valuev, *Dnevnik*, 1: 239. An anonymous bureaucrat's record says that the minister told Kostomarov "how he should behave in situations of this kind": RGIA, f. 775, opis' 1, delo 205, list 4.

41. Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, 595. Valuev did not make the edict public, but merely dispatched copies of it to the censors.

42. Entitled "Are Our Accusers Right?", it is to be found in Iu. A. Pinchuk, "Zaboronena stattia M. I. Kostomarov," *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1990 (7): 140–46.

43. M. N. Katkov, "Po povodu ob'iasnenii g. Kostomarov," *Sovremennaia letopis'*, 1863 (26): 1–5.

44. Nikolai Kostomarov, "Zametka," *Sankt-peterburgskie vedomosti*, 21 August 1863 (reprinted in Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 163–64).

various government agencies.” His references to the letter he had received from Kostomarov make plain that it was similar to the letter Kostomarov had sent to Valuev. Kostomarov had complained of not being able to publish instructional literature in Ukrainian and of not being able to publish a long article in his own defense in one of the St. Petersburg newspapers. He had asked Katkov not only to give up his attack but also to intercede on his behalf with the authorities. Katkov had no intention of doing so, but, sarcastically, told Kostomarov not to despair. He could hope for support among proponents of the Belarusian identity. “Who would have thought that certain enthusiasts want to elevate even the Belorussian dialect into a literary language? What a harvest for the future!”<sup>45</sup>

The one prominent bureaucrat who sympathized with Kostomarov, Minister of Education Aleksandr Vasil'evich Golovnin, made it possible for him to publish an article on differences between the Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish languages in his ministry's official organ in September 1863.<sup>46</sup> Thereafter, Kostomarov seems to have given up the unequal struggle. In 1864 he felt obliged to turn down the offer of a professorship in Kyiv after learning that the local Governor-General intended to oppose his appointment.<sup>47</sup> By 1871 he was writing that Ukrainian literature had “ceased to exist” within the confines of the Russian Empire.<sup>48</sup> Not until 1881, near the end of his life, did he make another sustained attempt to promote the fortunes of the Ukrainian language.<sup>49</sup> Katkov, meanwhile, remained firmly anti-Ukrainian. In April 1866 he angered the writer Danylo Mordovets'-Slipchenko by levelling the charge of Ukrainophilism at him in the tense atmosphere that obtained after Dmitrii Karakozov's attempt on the life of the tsar.<sup>50</sup> In February 1875 he made space in his monthly *Russkii vestnik* (*The Russian Herald*) for an indictment of the next generation of Ukrainophiles that played a significant part in the background to St. Petersburg's final and most wide-ranging proscription of Ukrainian literature in 1876.<sup>51</sup> Having convinced himself, in

45. *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 4 September 1863.

46. Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 168–79. On Golovnin's sympathy for Kostomarov and hostility to Valuev's edict see Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, 595–6, and Lemke, *Epokha*, 304–306.

47. Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, 596; see also Ihnat Zhytets'kyi, “Kyiv'ska Hromada za 60-tykh rokiv,” *Ukraina*, 1928 (1):102 n. 3.

48. Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia*, 246.

49. *Ibid.*, 267–80.

50. *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 28 April 1866. Mordovets'-Slipchenko countered that he could no more be said to belong to a Ukrainophile party than Katkov could be said to belong to a “Patagonian” party (*Golos*, 4 May 1866).

51. Z., “Sovremennoe ukrainofil'stvo,” *Russkii vestnik* 115 (1875): 838–68. On the importance of this article in the background to the edict of 1876 see Savchenko, *Zaborona*, 134–41.

1863, that the promotion of Ukrainian interests was fraught with danger for the unity of the Russian Empire, he seems never to have returned to the relative sympathy for Ukraine he had occasionally manifested prior to the outbreak of the Polish rebellion.

Although no one has ever demonstrated the existence of a direct connection between Katkov's attack on Ukrainophilism and Valuev's anti-Ukrainian edict, and although, as I have shown elsewhere, the immediate occasion of the edict was a letter from censors in Kyiv rather than articles by a journalist in Moscow,<sup>52</sup> it is difficult, in view of the above, to believe that Russia's Minister of Internal Affairs was wholly unaffected by the debate between Katkov and Kostomarov of the summer of 1863.

*University of Newcastle upon Tyne*

---

52. Saunders, "Russia and Ukraine," 28–32.

*Transcription*

M. I. Kostomarov to P. A. Valuev, St. Petersburg, 23 July 1863\*

Ваше Высокопревосходительство,

Петр Александрович,

Принимаю смелость просить Вас покорнейше благосклонно прочесть эти строки. Вот в чем дело, Ваше Высокопревосходительство:

В 136 № Московских Ведомостей явилась статья, направляемая против издания книг научного содержания на южнорусском языке, предпринятого мною. В ней бросается на это дело тень подозрения, проводится мысль о солидарности его с польскими замыслами. Публицист прямо выразился, что сбор пожертвований на такое дело гораздо хуже сбора в пользу польского мятежа. Такие выходки требовали с моей стороны возражений и объяснений, но статья моя, посланная в газету 'Голос', не пропущена ценсурю. Между тем ценсор Лебедев, которому я представил две малороссийские рукописи для ценсирования, объявил, что, не находя в них, по содержанию, ничего, противного ценсурным узаконениям, он не может в настоящее время одобрить их к напечатанию, потому что они писаны по-малороссийски.

Из этого можно заключить, что правительство оказывает доверие к тем, которые думают, будто бы издание книг научного содержания на южнорусском языке состоит в солидарности с идеею сепаратизма и стремлениями оторвать Южную Русь от Русского государства.

Но в таком случае да позволено же будет и противной стороне высказаться и также свободно защищать себя, как свободно на нее нападают.

Напечатанный в 'Дне' вызов к объяснению двусмысленных и оскорбительных выражений побудил публициста, в 24-№ воскресных прибавлений, объявить, что он не подозревает меня в прямом



соумышлении с поляками. Тот же публицист, утверждая, будто малороссийское наречие есть неорганическая примесь польских слов и форм к русскому языку и не имеет ничего самобытного, будто народ в нем не нуждается, не дорожит им и охотно усваивает русский книжный язык, легко понимаемый, и будто, наконец, пишущие и издающие малороссийские книги хлопочут о создании искусственного языка, который хотят навязать одиннадцати миллионам, преследуя, при этом, цели, которые окажутся вредными, - высказывает, однако, желание, чтоб я и другие, думающие со мною одинаково, выражали свои мнения свободно. Между тем, в настоящее время, я лишен возможности опровергать моих противников по этому вопросу, потому что судьба статьи, посланной в 'Голос', дает мне повод полагать, что и другие мои статьи в пользу издания книг научного содержания на южнорусском языке не будут допускаться к напечатанию. Сверх-того, запрещение на печатание книг научного содержания на том только основании, что они писаны по малороссийски, ставит меня в невозможность защищать дело против которого вооружается уже не мнение частных лиц, а сила правительства.

*Audiat et altera pars!* В ценсурных постановлениях существует правило, что обвиняемый в чем бы то ни было каким-либо повременным изданием, имеет право печатать в свое оправдание в том же издании. Я обращаюсь к Вашему Высокопревосходительству с покорнейшею просьбою: применить это правило ко мне и позволить мне напечатать оправдание своего дела в Московских Ведомостях, обязав редакцию принять мою статью, а вместе с тем, позволить печатать малороссийские книги научного содержания, если они не будут противны, по содержанию, существующим ценсурным правилам; ибо нет такого постановления, которое бы лишало возможности невинную по мыслям книгу явиться в печати, единственно потому что она написана на таком или ином языке или наречии. Умоляю Ваше Высокопревосходительство отстранить от вопроса об издании книг научного содержания на южнорусском языке бездоказательные и крайне оскорбительные для всех, имеющих честь принадлежать к малорусскому племени, подозрения в солидарности с какими либо вредными замыслами святого дела народного образования, — пусть этот вопрос станет на чисто учено-литературно-педагогическую почву, и будет дозволен свободный обмен доказательств *pro et contra*: тогда само собою окажется в чем истина и в чем заблуждение.

Примите уверение в искренности чувств глубочайшего уважения и  
совершенной преданности с которыми честь имею пребыть

Вашего Высокопревосходительства

покорнейший слуга

Николай Костомаров

Июля 23.1863  
С-Петербург  
Васильевск. Остр.  
IX. линия  
Д. Карманова

---

\* RGIA, fond 775, opis' 1, delo 205, listy 1–2. I am extremely grateful to Pavel Dolukhanov and Marianna Taymanova for checking my transcription of this document; footnotes explaining matters of detail have been added to the translation below.

*Translation*

Your Excellency,

Pëtr Aleksandrovich,

I make so bold as most humbly to ask you graciously to read these lines. This is what is at issue, Your Excellency:

An article appeared in No. 136 of the *Moscow News* inveighing against my scheme for publishing academic books in the South Russian language.<sup>1</sup> It casts a shadow of suspicion on this enterprise, hinting at its association with the designs of the Poles. The publicist said explicitly that collecting donations in support of this scheme is much worse than collecting them to further the Polish revolt. Sallies of this kind required objections and explanations on my part, but the censorship turned down an article I sent to the newspaper *The Voice*. Furthermore, censor Lebedev, to whom I presented two Little Russian manuscripts for censoring, stated that although so far as their content was concerned he could find nothing in them that contravened the censorship laws, at the present time he could not approve them for publication because they are written in Little Russian.<sup>2</sup>

One may conclude from this that the government accepts the view of those who think that publishing academic books in the South Russian language is somehow associated with the idea of separatism and with aspirations to detach Southern Rus' from the Russian state.

But if this is indeed the case, let those who think otherwise be permitted to speak out and defend themselves as freely as they are being attacked.

The publication of a demand in *Den'* for an explanation of his ambivalent and insulting phraseology prompted the publicist to declare in No. 24 of the *Sunday Supplements* that he did not suspect me of direct complicity with the

---

1. I.e., Katkov's article of 22 June 1863, on which see the commentary. I am grateful to Orest Pelech for pointing out that by calling the books in question "academic" (alternatively, "learned"), Kostomarov may have been attempting to make them sound esoteric and therefore of limited appeal. In reality, of course, he intended them to be read widely.

2. For a note on "censor Lebedev" see I. P. Foote, "The St. Petersburg Censorship Committee, 1828–1905," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, new series, 24 (1991): 107.

Poles.<sup>3</sup> After asserting that the Little Russian dialect is a non-organic admixture to Russian of Polish words and constructions and has no life of its own, that the people do not need it, do not value it, find literary Russian readily comprehensible and master it with enthusiasm, and finally that, in soliciting the creation of an artificial language and seeking to foist it upon eleven million people, those who write and publish Little Russian books are pursuing goals which will turn out to be harmful, the same publicist nevertheless expresses the wish that I and those who share my views express their opinions freely. But at present I have been deprived of the possibility of refuting my opponents in this matter, because the fate of the article I sent to *The Voice* leads me to infer that other articles of mine in support of the publication of academic books in the South Russian language will similarly be barred from publication. The ban on printing the academic books themselves, furthermore, on the sole ground that they are written in Little Russian, renders me unable to defend a project against which not merely the opinion of private individuals but the power of the government is arming itself.

*Audiat et altera pars!*<sup>4</sup> The censorship regulations include a rule to the effect that a person accused of something or other by one or another periodical has the right to speak in his own defense in the same periodical. I turn to Your Excellency with a most humble request: apply this rule to me and permit me to print a justification of my project in *Moscow News* by obliging the editorial board to accept an article of mine, and furthermore allow the publication of academic books in Little Russian provided their content does not contravene the existing censorship rules; for there is no regulation preventing a book whose thoughts are innocent from appearing in print solely because it is written in one or another language or dialect. I beseech Your Excellency to eliminate from the question of publishing academic books in the South Russian language the groundless and, to all those who have the honor to belong to the Little Russian tribe, extremely insulting suspicion of solidarity with any damaging schemes whatever in respect of the sacred business of popular education,—let this question be placed on a strictly academic-literary-pedagogical footing, and let a free exchange of evidence for and against be permitted: then what is true and what is false will emerge of their own accord.

---

3. The references here are to Kostomarov's article of 6 July 1863 in *Den'* and Katkov's reply in *Sovremennaiia letopis'*, both of which are summarized in the commentary.

4. "Let the other side be heard too!"

Rest assured of the sincerity of the feelings of deepest respect and most complete devotion with which I have the honor to be Your Excellency's most humble servant

Nikolai Kostomarov

23 July 1863  
St. Petersburg  
Vasil'evskii Island  
9th Line  
Karmanov Building