

This article was downloaded by: [Moskow State Univ Bibliote]  
On: 03 February 2014, At: 10:55  
Publisher: Routledge  
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:  
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,  
London W1T 3JH, UK



## The International History Review

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rinh20>

### Russia and Ukraine under Alexander II: The Valuev Edict of 1863

David Saunders<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Published online: 01 Dec 2010.

To cite this article: David Saunders (1995) Russia and Ukraine under Alexander II: The Valuev Edict of 1863, *The International History Review*, 17:1, 23-50

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07075332.1995.9640700>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any

form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

## Russia and Ukraine under Alexander II: The Valuev Edict of 1863

ON 18 JULY 1863, Alexander II's minister of internal affairs, P. A. Valuev, prohibited most forms of publication in 'Little Russian', the contemporary Russian term for Ukrainian. In order to ensure 'that only such works are permitted in print in the Little Russian language as belong to the field of artistic literature', he instructed censors 'temporarily to stop letting through books in that language whose contents are religious, educational, and in general intended for the elementary reading of the people'.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this article is to explain the minister's action.

It is tempting to suppose that St Petersburg felt threatened by Ukrainian nationalists. In the light of the establishment of an independent Ukraine in 1991 and the ensuing arguments between Moscow and Kiev about the Black Sea fleet, Ukraine's nuclear weapons, the Russo-Ukrainian border, Russian access to Ukrainian sugar, Ukrainian access to Russian fuel, and the future of Russians in Ukraine and Ukrainians in Russia, imagining a perennially fraught Russo-Ukrainian relationship is easy. Yet that relationship appears not to have been very fraught at the moment Valuev circulated his edict. For most of the two hundred years before 1863, Russia and Ukraine had been converging. When Russia eliminated the last vestiges of Ukrainian autonomy in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries,<sup>2</sup> Ukrainians, resentful or not, hastened to take advantage of the opportunities given to them by full integration into the Russian Empire.<sup>3</sup> Having dovetailed the Russian and Ukrainian political and social structures, St Petersburg felt confident enough to relax its grip on

I am indebted to the British Academy, the Scouloudi Foundation, and the Research Committee of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne for financial support in the preparation of this essay.

<sup>1</sup> Valuev to the Kiev Censorship Committee, 18 July 1863, R[ossiiskii] g[osudarstvennyi] i[storicheskii] a[rkhiv], f[ond] 775 (Central Censorship Department), op[is'] 1, d[elo] 188, fo. 13 (copy). Censors in Moscow, Vilnius, Riga, Odessa, St Petersburg, Tartu, and Kazan' received similar instructions (ibid., fo. 14).

<sup>2</sup> Zenon E. Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s-1830s* (Cambridge, MA, 1988).

<sup>3</sup> See David Saunders, *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750-1850* (Edmonton, 1985).

manifestations of Ukrainian literary culture. Whereas Peter the Great had required Ukrainian monastic presses to adopt the linguistic practices of their Russian equivalents in 1720,<sup>1</sup> language played no part in the way in which the imperial censors dealt with secular literature in Ukrainian when it began to appear in the Russian Empire at the end of the eighteenth century. Indeed, for most of the nineteenth century until shortly before Valuev's edict, Russian officials and educated Russians tended to show an interest in Ukrainian culture.<sup>2</sup> Although the head of Russia's political police (known as the third department) issued a sternly anti-Ukrainian decree after the suppression of the Kiev-based Kirillo-Methodian Society in 1847,<sup>3</sup> in the mid-1850s St Petersburg allowed the Kirillo-Methodians to resume their activities.

Thus Valuev's edict was at odds with the course of Russo-Ukrainian relations. It was also at odds with Russia's attitude towards minority languages in general. Although, in September 1865, the imperial authorities went on to prohibit Roman-alphabet publications in Lithuanian,<sup>4</sup> St Petersburg's attack on Ukrainian remained unique in the sense that it took the form of hostility to a language rather than a script. Yet the edict did not turn out to be one of the many pronouncements of the imperial government that the authorities issued on the spur of the moment and observed only briefly. Officials applied it so vigorously that, in 1871, the Ukrainian historian and ethnographer Mykola Kostomarov declared that Ukrainian literature had 'ceased to exist' within the confines of the Russian Empire.<sup>5</sup> In 1876, it was incorporated in a broader Russian proscription of Ukrainian culture that remained in force until after the revolution of 1905.<sup>6</sup> Valuev's action warrants careful scrutiny, therefore, for two main reasons: it contradicted earlier Russian policy on Ukraine and set

<sup>1</sup> *Polnoe sobranie zakonov rossiiskoi imperii*, 1st series (St Petersburg, 1830), vi. 244–5 (no. 3653).

<sup>2</sup> See Vasil' Sypov's'kyi, 'Ukraina v rosiis'komu pys'menstvi: Chastyna I (1801–1850rr.)', *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viiddilu Vseukrains'koi Akademii nauk*, lviii (1928), passim; A. I. Komarov, 'Ukrainskii iazyk, fol'klor i literatura v russkom obshchestve nachala XIX veka', *Uchenye zapiski leningradskogo universiteta, Seriya filologicheskikh nauk*, iv (1939), 124–58; Saunders, *Ukrainian Impact*, pp. 145–230; and Paul Bushkovitch, 'The Ukraine in Russian Culture, 1790–1860: The Evidence of the Journals', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, xxxix (1991), 339–63.

<sup>3</sup> 'Novi dzerela pro Kyrylo-Metodiivs'ke bratsvo', ed. D. Bahalii, *Nashe mynule*, no. 2 (1918), pp. 178–9.

<sup>4</sup> Anon., *Materialy, sobrannnye osoboi kommissiei, Vysochaishe uchrezhdennoi 2 noiabria 1869 goda, dlia peresmotra deistvuiushchikh postanovlenii o tsenzure i pechati* (St Petersburg, 1870), v. 7n.

<sup>5</sup> M. Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publytsystychni i polemichni pysannia* (Kiev, 1928), p. 246. For statistical confirmation of Kostomarov's impression, see M. Komarov, *Bibliohrafychnyi pokazhchyk novoi ukrains'koi literatury (1798–1883 r.)* (Kiev, 1883), p. 73.

<sup>6</sup> On the proscription of 1876, see Fedir Savchenko, *Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 r.* (Kharkiv and Kiev, 1930, repr. Munich, 1970).

in train what proved to be a long-term shift in the Russian-Ukrainian relationship.

The edict is usually set in the context of the contemporary Polish rebellion. Valuev is said to have acted as he did because he was afraid of a Ukrainian-Polish alliance. Kostomarov claimed that, prior to the Polish rebellion, 'the drive to develop the language and literature of Little Russia not only led no one to fear the spectre of the dissolution of the state, but was received with brotherly love by the Great Russians themselves.'<sup>1</sup> S. N. Shchegolev, the most eminent student of 'south Russian separatism' in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russian Empire, held that virtually all Ukrainophile activities were of non-Ukrainian origin. When, therefore, the imperial regime moved against Ukrainians in 1863, it was actually worried about Poles.<sup>2</sup> Mikhail Lemke implied a similar, if more subtle, causal chain when he attributed Valuev's instructions to an anti-Ukrainian diatribe by the journalist Mikhail Katkov.<sup>3</sup> As Katkov's principal concern in 1863 was to strengthen the imperial government's resolve to deal with the Poles;<sup>4</sup> as his diatribe argued that 'Ukrainophiles were in the hands of [Polish] intriguers';<sup>5</sup> as, according to a contemporary, 'it is difficult for someone who did not himself live through the 1860s to have the slightest conception of the enormous influence which articles in *Moskovskie vedomosti* [Katkov's newspaper] exerted in respect of the Polish question';<sup>6</sup> and as Valuev and Katkov were friends and correspondents in 1863 and tended to agree, at that time, on the way to deal with the Polish problem,<sup>7</sup> it was likely, Lemke implied, that St Petersburg obstructed Ukrainian-language publishing because the development of Ukrainian culture had become entwined, in the minds of tsarist officials, with the aspirations of Poles. The arguments of other students of Valuev's action – Fedir Savchenko, for example, who claimed on the basis of a file in the archives of the third department that the principal reason for the minister's action was fear on the part

<sup>1</sup> N. I. Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia* (Kiev, 1989), p. 534.

<sup>2</sup> S. N. Shchegolev, *Ukrainskoe dvizhenie, kak sovremennnyi etap iuzhnorusskogo separatizma* (Kiev, 1912), passim, esp. pp. 58–9.

<sup>3</sup> Mikhail Lemke, *Epokha tsenzurnykh reform 1859–1865 godov* (St Petersburg, 1904), pp. 300–1, citing *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 22 June 1863, pp. 1–2.

<sup>4</sup> See especially V. A. Tvardovskaia, *Ideologiia poreformennogo samoderzhavii* (M. N. Katkov i ego izdaniia) (Moscow, 1978), pp. 24–73.

<sup>5</sup> *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 22 June 1863, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup> E. Feoktistov, *Za kulisami politiki i literatury 1848–1896* (Leningrad, 1929, repr. Moscow, 1991), p. 83.

<sup>7</sup> V. G. Chernukha, *Pravitel'stvennaia politika v otnoshenii pechati 60–70-kh godov XIX veka* (Leningrad, 1989), pp. 153–4.

of the Russian authorities of Ukrainian activism in the imperial army,<sup>1</sup> or Daniel Beauvois, who believes that Valuev's attitude towards publishing in Ukrainian is best understood in the light of another edict of July 1863 which aimed to improve the lot of Ukrainian peasants by increasing the rate at which they could sever the ties which bound them to their Polish landlords<sup>2</sup> – differ only in detail and emphasis from the Polish-orientated approaches of Shchegolev and Lemke.

In these explanations, the contemporary efforts of ethnically aware Ukrainians to point out the differences between their interests and those of the Poles have to be deemed unsuccessful.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps they were. It is certainly hard to deny that, up to a point, proponents of Ukrainian culture suffered in 1863 from the fact that their opponents managed to tar them with the Polish brush. As the Imperial Academy of Sciences put it in 1905, the Ukrainophiles of the 1860s got 'a hang-over at someone else's banquet (*pokhmel'e vo chuzhom piru*)'.<sup>4</sup>

The argument presented here, however, is that fear of Poles only partly explains Valuev's action. Accepting the 'Polish' interpretation as a complete explanation raises the immediate difficulty that, as at least two historians have recognized, Poles not only encouraged the cultural aspirations of Ukrainians but also complained about them.<sup>5</sup> The imperial authorities could hardly have been convinced that Ukrainian sympathies lay overwhelmingly with the Poles when, on occasion, Poles objected to Ukrainian cultural initiatives. There is a second and more important reason for doubting the explanatory power of arguments that depend on the Polish rebellion. They are narrow and short-term. It is not unreasonable to ask whether a far-reaching and long-lived measure ought to be seen in the context of the other far-reaching and long-term changes which were taking place in the structure of the Russian imperial state at the beginning of the 1860s.

<sup>1</sup> Savchenko, *Zaborona*, pp. 183–204, esp. 200–1.

<sup>2</sup> Daniel Beauvois, *La bataille de la terre en Ukraine, 1863–1914: Les Polonais et les conflits socio-ethniques* (Lille, 1993), pp. 85–6.

<sup>3</sup> Such efforts included V. Antonovich, 'Moia Ispoved': Otvet panu Padalitse', *Osnova*, no. 1 (1862), pp. 83–96; Kostomarov, *Pysannia*, pp. 159–60 (a response in the newspaper *Den'* to Katkov's anti-Ukrainian diatribe); Iu. A. Pinchuk, 'Zaboronena stattia M. I. Kostomarov', *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, no. 7 (1990), esp. pp. 145–6 (a more substantial response which was prohibited by the censors); Kostomarov to Valuev, 23 July 1863, RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, d. 205, fos. 1–2; and L. Sokal'skii, 'Materialy k istorii natsional'nogo dvizheniia 60-kh godov proshlogo veka', *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 2 (1905), 1st pagination, pp. 189–200 (a paper drafted in 1863 by Ukrainians in St Petersburg under the title 'The Little Russian and Polish Nationalities').

<sup>4</sup> Anon., *Ob otmene stesnenii malorusskogo pechatnogo slova* (Kiev, 1914), p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Shchegolev, *Ukrainskoe dvizhenie*, p. 59; Ivan Krevets'kyi, "'Ne bylo, net i byt' ne mozhet!'", *Literaturno-naukovyi vistyky*, xxvi (1904), 137; Nik. Fabrikant (Ivan Krevets'kyi), 'Kratkii ocherk iz istorii otnoshenii russkikh tsenzurnykh zakonov k ukrainskoi literature', *Russkaia mysl'*, no. 3 (1905), 2nd pagination, p. 132.

In 1861, the imperial authorities emancipated peasants who lived on privately owned property. In July 1864, they enacted a law on primary education. In 1866, they completed the emancipation of peasants who lived on property owned by the state. These steps, which had been in the minds of bureaucrats since 1856, implied the possibility of rapid divergence between Russians and Ukrainians. In the 1850s and 1860s, almost all the Russian Empire's native speakers of Ukrainian were peasants. Almost all of them were uneducated. If, after the legal constraints on Ukrainian peasants were removed, they gained access to education in their native language, it was possible that they would start believing that their ethnic identity differed significantly from the ethnic identity of Russians. Such a belief on their part could have had significant political consequences, for Ukrainians were much the largest of the Russian Empire's non-Russian communities. A good case can be made for the view that, in the pre-emancipation period, St Petersburg found controlling the Ukrainian countryside more difficult than controlling the countryside in other parts of the empire:<sup>1</sup> the imperial regime, then, was unlikely to welcome the thought that, as a result of emancipation and primary education, the inhabitants of the Ukrainian countryside might become more troublesome still. A Ukrainophile newspaper was to say in 1875 that the charges of 'separatism' which were then being levelled at Ukrainophile intellectuals derived, essentially, from gentry antipathy to the upward mobility of the Ukrainian lower orders.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Valuev felt he had grounds for such antipathy as early as 1863.

It will be argued here that this was exactly what he felt; that Russian officials had been troubled by the direction in which Ukrainian culture was moving before the Polish rebellion broke out; that Valuev or someone like him would eventually have felt obliged to intervene anyway; that, although the problem which the imperial authorities faced in Ukraine was connected with problems posed by Poles, it was also a problem in itself; and that the question whether to go on permitting all types of publication in Ukrainian required a unique solution on the part of St Petersburg because, in the years prior to 1863, Ukrainian enthusiasts for Ukrainian popular culture had become particularly hard to handle.

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, I. O. Hurzhii, *Borot'ba selian i robotnykiv Ukrainy proty feodal'no-kriposnyts'koho hntu (z 80-kh rokiv XVIII st. do 1861 r.)* (Kiev, 1958); *Selians'kyi rukh na Ukraini*, ed. M. N. Leshchenko et al. (Kiev, 1978 - ); and Serhii Shamrai, 'Kyivs'ka kozachchyna 1855 r. (Do istorii selians'kykh rukhiv na Kyivshchyni)', *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu Vseukrains'koi Akademii nauk*, xx (1928), 199-324.

<sup>2</sup> Untitled leader in *Kievskii telegraf*, 4 July 1875.

To substantiate these claims, one must turn first to the documents in the archival file on Valuev's edict. Although the memorandum which the minister composed in support of his action has been published on at least four occasions,<sup>1</sup> none of the published versions is faithful to the original and none of them sets the memorandum in the context of the manuscript documents to which it is most closely related. These drawbacks are addressed in the second section. The rest of the article is interpretative, and stresses the need to take greater account, in explaining Valuev's action, of the distinction he drew between 'high-brow' and 'low-brow' Ukrainian literature. Mykhailo Drahomanov pointed out in the 1870s that it was still legal after 1863 to publish poetry and fiction in Ukrainian and even to translate Hegel into the language, but 'it became impossible to print what would have been real sustenance for the people'.<sup>2</sup> It is argued here that, although Valuev's action took place at the time that it did because of the Polish rebellion, it took the form that it did because the minister sensed that if 'low-brow' publications in Ukrainian became widely available, Ukrainians would start differing radically from Russians. In other words, the edict of 1863 betrayed an awareness on the part of Valuev of the potential emergence of a Ukrainian nation. In this sense, paradoxically, Valuev's action reflected not only his conservatism but his intelligence.

\* \* \*

On 27 June 1863, the Kiev Censorship Committee wrote to Valuev to explain why it had banned a work entitled *The Parables of Our Lord Jesus Christ Related in Ukrainian*. The first two reasons needed no elaboration: on the one hand, newspapers were saying that Morachevs'kyi's complete Ukrainian translation of the Gospels was about to appear in St Petersburg; on the other, religious works were the responsibility of the ecclesiastical rather than the secular censors. The third reason gave rise to a lengthy supporting argument. Having drawn attention to the preface of the rejected manuscript, which made clear that the purpose of the work was educational, the censors observed that:

in all schools without exception instruction takes place in the general Russian language (*na obshcherusskom iazyke*) and the use in schools of the Little Russian

<sup>1</sup> Anon. (ministry of internal affairs), *Sbornik rasporiazhenii po delam pechati (s 1863 po 1-e sentiabria 1865 goda)* (St Petersburg, 1865), pp. 9-11; Lemke, *Epokha*, pp. 302-4; Krevets'kyi, "'Ne bylo, net i byt' ne mozhet!'", pp. 138-9; Fabrikant (Krevets'kyi), 'Kratkii ocherk', pp. 132-4.

<sup>2</sup> M. Drahomanov, *Narodni shkoly na Ukraini sered zhyt't'a i pys'mennstva v Rossii* (Geneva, 1877), p. 78.



dialect is not permitted anywhere. The very question of the value and practicality of using this dialect in schools has not only not been decided, but even the mere raising of this question is received by the majority of Little Russians with a displeasure which often finds expression in print. They show very convincingly that there was not, is not, and cannot be any special Little Russian language, and that their dialect, used by the common people, is just the Russian language (*tot zhe russkii iazyk*), but corrupted by the influence on it of Poland; that the general Russian language (*obshcherusskii iazyk*) is just as comprehensible to the people here as it is to Great Russians, and even a great deal more comprehensible than the so-called Ukrainian language (*tak nazyvaemyi Ukrainskii iazyk*) which is currently being constructed for them by certain Little Russians and, in particular, Poles. The majority of Little Russians accuse people who belong to the circle which is striving to prove the contrary of certain separatist designs which are inimical to Russia and fatal to Little Russia.<sup>1</sup>

The committee feared that if it sanctioned works like the one it had banned, it might become the unwilling ally of those who sought the development of a distinctive Ukrainian identity. It faced the difficulty, however, that few such works contravened the censorship regulations directly; only their underlying purpose was harmful. It therefore sought a ruling from the ministry of internal affairs on 'manuscripts and books which issue from the desire to differentiate the Little Russian language and to give the people here a chance of managing without the use of the general Russian language (*obshcherusskogo iazyka*)'.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of the letter, the committee returned to the relationship between 'the Little Russian nationality' and 'the political designs of the Poles'.<sup>3</sup> Interest in the former, it said, owed much to the latter. The committee had in its hands a brochure in Polish which welcomed the emergence of the Ukrainian language on the grounds that it gave Poles the chance of convincing other peoples in general and Russians in particular that 'Rus'' (the eastern Slavonic world as a whole) was not synonymous with 'Moscow' (Russia).<sup>4</sup> The committee asserted that many of the Ukrainian works which it had been called upon to assess were actually written by Poles. In conclusion, it asked again whether the ministry did not think it necessary 'to take some sort of steps to counter the emergent aspiration of certain Little Russians, and alongside them Poles, to alienate the people here from the general

<sup>1</sup> Kiev Censorship Committee to Valuev, RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, d. 188, fos. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., fo. 2 verso.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., fo. 2 verso-3.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., fo. 3.

Russian language and nationality (*otchuzhdat' zdesnii narod ot obshcherusskikh iazyka i narodnosti*).<sup>1</sup>

The one in-house 'briefing paper' in the imperial government's file on the 1863 proscription supports the hypothesis that, from the point of view of the ministry of internal affairs, the prime interest of the Kiev Censorship Committee's letter lay in its relevance to the debate which had been going on for years in official circles about the language or languages of instruction to be used in the empire's primary schools.<sup>2</sup> The document began:

Teaching literacy in the local dialect was discussed in all regions of Russia in connection with the circulation in 1861 of the draft statute on instructional institutions devoted to general education (*obshcheobrazovatel'nykh uchebnykh zavedenii*). Opinions differed. Some accepted that teaching in pro-gymnasia and gymnasia ought to be conducted in Russian but considered teaching in the local language was necessary in primary schools in order, first, to preclude disunity in the family (which would make the extension of education among the mass of the people very difficult), and, second, to make the teaching clear to the pupils. Pupils' development can be achieved only by permitting the people's language and, on the other hand, may be greatly hindered by completely excluding it from teaching. Others assert that, first, in the western provinces [Lithuania, Belarus, and the part of Ukraine which lay to the west of the river Dnieper] everyone understands Russian. Lithuanians employ the Belorussian dialect with ease and their children are no less successful than other pupils. Second, instruction in the local dialect – Lithuanian, for example – is impossible because of the shortage of teachers. Third, initial instruction in local languages utterly disassociates foreign (*inoplemennye*) nationalities from the rest of the population, deprives them of the methods and means to take their education further, and brings in its wake many other inconveniences.<sup>3</sup>

These disagreements, the document went on, had been resolved by a compromise. It had been decided 'that in Little Russia and Belorussia, on account of pupils' inadequate comprehension of the Great Russian language, it was important to commence instruction in primary schools in the local dialect and only later to move gradually to the Russian language proper'.<sup>4</sup> The compromise, however, had not necessarily been the end of the matter. 'At the present time,' the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., fo. 3 verso.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., fos. 9–10. Untitled, unsigned, undated, and not in copperplate, this document could have been composed either before or after Valuev's memorandum of 11 July. The first possibility seems the more likely.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., fo. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., fo. 9 verso.

document concluded, 'the draft law on primary schools has been subjected to a further revision. Whether, in the new statute, teaching in Little Russia and Belorussia will still be in the local dialect with a gradual transition to the study of Russian is unknown.'<sup>1</sup>

In other words, in mid-1863, St Petersburg was still in the process of deciding whether to permit languages other than Russian in primary schools. Valuev appears to have felt that, so far as Ukrainian was concerned, he could not afford to wait for the relevant authorities to resolve the matter. He was responsible for the domestic tranquillity of the empire. The letter from Kiev claimed that the publication of primary educational literature in Ukrainian was causing 'the majority of Little Russians' grave disquiet. On 11 July 1863, therefore, the minister wrote a memorandum for the tsar.<sup>2</sup>

'For a long time now,' Valuev began, 'arguments have been going on in our press about the possibility of the existence of an independent Little Russian literature.'<sup>3</sup> Recently, 'as a result of purely political circumstances which have no connection with specifically literary interests',<sup>4</sup> the arguments had changed direction. Older work in Ukrainian, Valuev observed, was designed

... solely for the educated classes of south Russia; now, proponents of the Little Russian nationality have turned their attention to the uneducated mass, and under the pretence of disseminating literacy and enlightenment, those of them who are striving to realize their political designs have set about publishing elementary readers, primers, grammars, geography books, and so on. Activists of this kind formerly included members of the Khar'kov secret society and latterly included a great number of people whose criminal activities were investigated by the Commission set up under the chairmanship of State Secretary Prince Golitsyn. The quondam Professor Kostomarov is even collecting donations in St Petersburg for the publication of cheap books in the south-Russian dialect. Many of these books have already come to the St Petersburg Censorship Committee for scrutiny. A significant number of such books is also being submitted to the Kiev Censorship Committee. The latter is particularly embarrassed by the need to sanction such publications.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., fo. 10.

<sup>2</sup> P. A. Valuev, 'O knigakh izdavaemykh dlia naroda na malorossiiskom narechii' ('On Books Published for the People in the Little Russian Dialect'), memo, 11 July 1863, *ibid.*, fos. 4-8. This is the document published in defective versions by the ministry of internal affairs in 1865, Lemke and Krevets'kyi in 1904, and Fabrikant (Krevets'kyi) in 1905. The ministry, Krevets'kyi, and Fabrikant dated it 8 July, Lemke 18 July.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., fo. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., fo. 4-4 verso.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., fos. 4 verso-5. None of the published versions of the memorandum makes mention of 'State Secretary Prince Golitsyn' or 'the quondam Professor Kostomarov'. Only Lemke included

To explain why the censors in Kiev were 'particularly embarrassed', Valuev proceeded to incorporate in his own submission the lengthy passage from their letter which appears in translation near the beginning of the present section.<sup>1</sup> Then he added that the governor-general of Kiev 'considers dangerous and harmful the publication of the Little Russian translation of the New Testament which is now being considered by the ecclesiastical censorship'.<sup>2</sup> Finally, he pointed out that the empire's educational system was mainly run by the state. Private educational initiatives were permitted only if they furthered the government's objectives, and then only under government supervision: 'Past deviations from this rule, such as, for example, the creation of Sunday schools on the basis of private, social initiative, without supervision on the part of the Government, had extremely unpleasant consequences both for the Government and for the people.'<sup>3</sup>

The minister's conclusion was that 'the question of publishing books for the people in the Little Russian language is particularly important as things stand at the moment (*pri tepereshnykh obstoiatel'stvakh*), and finding a solution to it requires extremely cautious action.'<sup>4</sup> With a view to drawing up legislation, he proposed consultation between himself and the minister of education, the head of the holy synod, and the head of the third department. Until a law could be finalized, he suggested introducing constraints on Ukrainian-language publishing.<sup>5</sup> The tsar assented to this course of action on 12 July 1863, and six days later Valuev communicated with the three specified ministers and the censors.<sup>6</sup>

\* \* \*

The reference at the beginning of Valuev's memorandum to Ukrainian publications which were designed 'solely for the educated classes of south Russia' made clear that the minister did not seek the

---

the reference to 'the Khar'kov secret society' (in a footnote). By omitting the penultimate sentence in the passage quoted here, Fabrikant transferred the feelings of the Kiev censors to their colleagues in St Petersburg.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., fos. 5-6.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., fo. 6 verso.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., fo. 7. None of the published versions of the memorandum contains Valuev's remarks on the empire's educational system.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., fos. 7 verso-8.

<sup>6</sup> Alexander II signified and dated his approval of Valuev's memorandum on its opening page (ibid., fo. 4). For the abbreviated version which went to the minister of education and the information that identical communications had been sent to the third department and the holy synod, see ibid., fos. 11-12. For the instructions Valuev dispatched to the censors, see the opening paragraph of this article.

suppression of 'high-brow' Ukrainophilism. In this he differed from the officials who had dealt with the Kirillo-Methodian Society in 1847.<sup>1</sup> The regime had relaxed its grip on educated Ukrainians after the accession of Alexander II in 1855, with the result that former members of the Kirillo-Methodian circle and Ukrainians of a similar disposition had found outlets for their views: Panteleimon Kulish published *Notes on Southern Rus'* (*Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi*) and versions in both Ukrainian and Russian of his novel *The Black Council* (*Chorna rada*); Mykola Kostomarov completed studies of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and Stepan Razin and became a professor at St Petersburg University; Taras Shevchenko reprinted his most celebrated poems; a Podillian priest published a second edition of his sermons; a friend of Kostomarov issued a Ukrainian miscellany in Saratov; Osyp Bodians'kyi returned to the secretaryship of Moscow University's Society of Russian History and Antiquities and devoted much of its journal to the history of Ukrainians; and in 1861 and 1862, the former Kirillo-Methodians and others collaborated in St Petersburg on a Ukraine-centred periodical, *The Foundation* (*Osnova*).<sup>2</sup>

It is true that the authorities monitored, limited, and sometimes forbade developments of this kind.<sup>3</sup> In the main, however, they permitted them. Their handling of *The Foundation* seems to have exemplified their attitude. Although the secret police initially prohibited the journal and subsequently kept watch on it, they did not close it down. Rather, it closed in 1862 because of conflict among the editors and dissatisfaction on the part of subscribers.<sup>4</sup> Where the

<sup>1</sup> For the investigative materials to which the prosecution of the Kirillo-Methodians gave rise, see *Kyrylo-Mefodiius'ke tovarystvo*, ed. P. S. Sokhan' et al. (Kiev, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> See George Luckyj, *Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of His Life and Times* (Boulder, 1983), pp. 73-139; E. S. Shabliovskii, 'N. I. Kostomarov v gody revoliutsionnoi situatsii (1859-1861gg.)', in *Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861gg.*, ed. M. V. Nechkina et al. (Moscow, 1970), pp. 101-23; Pavlo Zaitsev, *Taras Shevchenko: A Life*, trans. and ed. George S. N. Luckyj (Toronto, 1988), pp. 222-68; Protoierei Grechulevich, *Propovedi na malorossiiskom iazyke* (St Petersburg, 1857); D. Mordovtsev, *Malorusskii literaturnyi sbornik* (Saratov, 1859); O. V. Todichuk, *Ukraina XVI-XVIIIvv. v trudakh Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (Kiev, 1989), pp. 20-1.

<sup>3</sup> On Kulish's difficulties see, for example, RGIA, f. 777, op. 2, g. 1857, d. 5 (censorship of *The Black Council*), and f. 772, op. 1, d. 4619 (rejection of the proposal that *Notes on Southern Rus'* become a serial publication). On the censorship of Kostomarov's study of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, see I. Butych, 'M. I. Kostomarov i tsars'ka tsenzura', *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, no. 6 (1967), pp. 64-6. On Shevchenko's arrest in Ukraine in 1859, see *Kyrylo-Mefodiius'ke tovarystvo*, ed. Sokhan' et al., ii. 371-6, and E. S. Shabliovskii, *T. G. Shevchenko i russkie revoliutsionnye demokraty* (2nd ed., Kiev, 1975), pp. 119-43. On the censorship of the Saratov Ukrainian miscellany, see P. Lobas, 'Ukrains'kyi literaturnyi zbirnyk v otsintsi peterburz'koi tsenzury', *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, no. 2 (1968), pp. 74-80. On the censors' refusal to permit a reprint of the anonymous Ukrainophile tract *Istoria rusov* in 1858-9, see RGIA, f. 772, op. 1, d. 4565.

<sup>4</sup> See *Kyrylo-Mefodiius'ke tovarystvo*, ed. Sokhan' et al., i. 464, 466; M. D. Bernshtein, *Zhurnal 'Osnova' i ukrains'kyi literaturnyi protses kintsia 50-60-kh rokiv XIX st.* (Kiev, 1959), esp. pp. 198-9;

principal activities of the former Kirillo-Methodians were concerned, officials appear to have shared the view of the Ukrainian nobleman who wrote in 1860 that Ukrainian *littérateurs* were simply too few in number and too limited in the range of their undertakings to make a significant mark.<sup>1</sup>

What worried Valuev was 'elementary readers, primers, grammars, geography books, and so on'. He could tolerate 'high-brow' Ukrainophilism, but felt that a new 'low-brow' variant had to be stopped in its tracks. His main reason for recommending constraints on Ukrainian-language publishing was that 'proponents of the Little Russian nationality have turned their attention to the uneducated mass'.

Ironically, the imperial authorities were themselves largely responsible for creating the favourable climate in which this 'low-brow' Ukrainophilism took root. Officials had realized in the mid-1850s that emancipating peasants required them to think about expanding the empire's primary educational system. It took them until July 1864 to devise general legislation on the subject,<sup>2</sup> but in Ukraine they acted rapidly. On 24 September 1859, Nikolai Pirogov, curator of the Kiev Educational District, informed Prince Illarion Vasil'chikov, the governor-general of right-bank Ukraine (Kiev, Volyn', and Podillia), that he had assented to the establishment of a Sunday school on the Podil in Kiev.<sup>3</sup> On 20 October, Vasil'chikov recommended to the ministry of internal affairs that the Orthodox parish priests of the region for which he was responsible be given additional educational responsibilities.<sup>4</sup> These steps inaugurated an expansion of Ukrainian primary education whose role in the genesis of Valuev's edict was to be crucial. More than one hundred Sunday schools came into being in Ukraine between 1859 and 1862,<sup>5</sup> and Vasil'chikov claimed that priests in the provinces of Kiev, Volyn', and Podillia set up 2,875 additional parish schools between 1859 and July 1861.<sup>6</sup>

Lemke, *Epokha*, p. 296; and a retrospective exchange of letters between the Main Press Administration and the St Petersburg Censorship Committee, Sept. 1870, RGIA, f. 777, op. 2, g. 1859, d. 127, fos. 18–19.

<sup>1</sup> Savchenko, *Zaborona*, p. 353 (a letter of Hryhorii Halahan).

<sup>2</sup> V. Z. Smirnov, *Reforma nachal'noi i srednei shkoly v 60-kh godakh XIX v.* (Moscow, 1954), pp. 25–165; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii*, 2nd series (St Petersburg, 1830–84), xxxix. 613–18 (no. 41068).

<sup>3</sup> Aleksandr Brezhnev, *Pirogov* (Moscow, 1990), pp. 352–3.

<sup>4</sup> See 'On the Dissemination of Literacy among Peasants in the Kiev Governor-Generalship', an unsigned and undated memo in Valuev's personal archive which deals with the fate of this initiative between 1859 and 1862: RGIA, f. 908, op. 1, d. 174, fos. 1–5.

<sup>5</sup> G. I. Marakhov, *Sotsial'no-politicheskaia bor'ba na Ukraine v 50–60-e gody XIX veka* (Kiev, 1981), p. 62.

<sup>6</sup> RGIA, f. 908, op. 1, d. 174, fo. 2.

The authorities' reason for expanding primary education more rapidly in Ukraine than in other parts of the empire turned on their desire to strengthen Russian culture in the region at the expense of Polish. In this sense – at a considerable remove – Valuev's ban did indeed arise out of St Petersburg's fear of Poles. Ukrainian-language primers printed in the Roman rather than the Cyrillic alphabet surfaced in right-bank Ukraine in the spring of 1859. Pirogov thought that they stemmed from the desire of Poles in Galicia to Polonize the Ukrainians of both the Habsburg and the Russian Empires.<sup>1</sup> The head of the holy synod, Prince Sergei Urusov, argued that they were part of a Polish campaign to substitute Catholicism for Orthodoxy.<sup>2</sup> Although the ministry of education banned them immediately,<sup>3</sup> officials in Kiev felt the need for positive as well as negative action. When justifying the Ukrainian Sunday schools in 1863, Pirogov was to write that he had 'hoped that the most reliable and the most moral means of combatting Polish propaganda (whose existence in the region no one doubts) would be Russo-Little Russian propaganda'.<sup>4</sup> As for economic reasons, the Orthodox priests of right-bank Ukraine had become deeply unpopular with their parishioners in the 1840s and 1850s, and as their unpopularity was supposed to have 'facilitated the work of Catholic propagandists', Vasil'chikov almost certainly promoted clerical education in Ukraine in order to offset the work of such propagandists by convincing the peasants that their priests had something to offer them.<sup>5</sup>

Unfortunately, from the point of view of the regime, expanding Ukrainian primary education turned out to be a mistake. It did not eliminate the threat it had been designed to counter, for in May 1862 and January 1866 St Petersburg had to reiterate its instructions of 1859 prohibiting the import into the empire of Ukrainian works printed in Polish characters.<sup>6</sup> Insofar as it involved increasing the educational

<sup>1</sup> Pirogov to Main Censorship Administration, 5 Apr. 1859, *ibid.*, f. 772, op. 1, g. 1859, d. 4840, fo. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Urusov to N. A. Mukhanov (a member of the Main Censorship Administration), 7 Aug. 1859, *ibid.*, f. 797 (Chancery of the Procurator of the Holy Synod), op. 29, 1 *otdelenie*, 2 *stol*, d. 158, fos. 3-4 (copy).

<sup>3</sup> Lemke, *Epokha*, p. 295; Marakhov, *Sotsial'no-politicheskaia bor'ba*, p. 44.

<sup>4</sup> N. I. Pirogov, 'O voskresnykh shkolakh', in *idem*, *Sochineniia* (St Petersburg, 1887), ii. 220.

<sup>5</sup> On the attitude of peasants to priests in right-bank Ukraine in the 1850s, see Gregory L. Freeze, 'P. A. Valuyev and the Politics of Church Reform (1861-1862)', *Slavonic and East European Review*, lvi (1978), 71 (quotation), and *The Parish Clergy in Nineteenth-Century Russia: Crisis, Reform, Counter-Reform* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 200-5.

<sup>6</sup> Anon., *Materialy*, v. 6-7; circular from Main Press Administration to provincial governors, 14 Jan. 1866, RGIA, f. 777, op. 2, g. 1874, fo. 64.

responsibilities of the Church, it irritated the ministry of education.<sup>1</sup> Above all, it gave rise to educational institutions over which the state had little control. Sunday schools were set up and run by private individuals. The one to which Pirogov gave his approval in Kiev in September 1859 issued from a plan put forward by seventeen local students.<sup>2</sup> The objectives of such people were not necessarily those of the government. Not for nothing did Valuev say in his memorandum of July 1863 that, from the point of view of the imperial authorities, 'the creation of Sunday schools on the basis of private, social initiative ... had extremely unpleasant consequences.' Although, in making this remark, the minister was probably thinking mainly of what transpired in Sunday schools in Russia (for the school which opened in Kiev in the autumn of 1859 found imitators in many parts of the empire), he must also have had in mind the way in which Ukrainian Sunday schools became outlets for that 'low-brow' Ukrainophilism which he was determined to eradicate.

\* \* \*

The central feature of 'low-brow' Ukrainophilism was enthusiasm for the education of unprivileged Ukrainians in their native language. The Kiev censors cut a long story very short in June 1863 when they claimed in their letter to Valuev that 'the use in schools of the Little Russian dialect is not permitted anywhere'. It had never been positively encouraged, but St Petersburg had started actively to consider the educational use of languages other than Russian in 1861 (as the 'briefing paper' in the file on the 1863 proscription made clear). Teachers in the Ukrainian Sunday schools began teaching in Ukrainian almost as soon as the schools came into being. Oleksandr Konys'kyi, who taught in a Sunday school in Poltava, explained why: he could not achieve very much in two hours a week, he said, so long as the language in which he was trying to impart literacy was Russian but the language in which he had to explain what he was doing was Ukrainian. On asking 140 pupils whether they would rather read a fairy tale in the Russian of Ivan Krylov or the Ukrainian of Ievhen Hrebinka, he learned that 123 of them preferred the latter.<sup>3</sup> On

<sup>1</sup> For evidence of inter-agency wrangling as a result of the Ukrainian educational expansion, see not only RGIA, f. 908, op. 1, d. 174, fos. 1-5 (explained above), but also *ibid.*, fos. 16-21 (a letter of 9 July 1862 from the minister of education to Valuev, enclosing a memorandum he had just dispatched to the civil governor of the province of Kiev).

<sup>2</sup> G. I. Marakhov, *Kievskii universitet v revoliutsionno-demokraticeskom dvizhenii* (Kiev, 1984), p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> A. Konisskii (O. Konys'kyi), 'Iz vospominanii starogo poltavtsa', *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 3 (1900), 2nd pagination, p. 150.



visiting a school run by the ministry of state properties in the Poltava countryside, he found that although the best girl pupil read fluently in Russian, she was unable to explain what she had read in Ukrainian. When given the same passage to read in her native language, she could both read and explain it 'satisfactorily'. In another school, Konys'kyi discovered that not a single pupil knew the Russian words for 'fruit', 'cloud', or 'lamb'.<sup>1</sup>

In a trenchant submission of March 1862 to the St Petersburg Literacy Committee (an official agency), Konys'kyi and two of his colleagues in Poltava revealed the depth of their attachment to Ukrainian:

[The] indigenous population of the province of Poltava is purely south Russian ... and therefore ... the dissemination of literacy in this region ... must be conducted in its own language. It is easier and fairer to translate books into the local language than to re-direct millions of people to an alien language, even a related one ... All attempts to impart literacy in the Great Russian language have been merely futile and bear the stamp of extreme compulsion. Neither sermons in churches, nor judicial procedure, nor even instruction in the local [state-run] primary schools in the Great Russian language have had good effects on the people here either from an intellectual or – we make so bold as to say – from a moral point of view. The people have remained deaf to education in a form which is foreign to them; they do not want to be and cannot be reconstructed (*pererodit'sia*) for the sake of literacy and learning, in the force and power of which they do not believe much anyway; and they have preferred to study exclusively church literacy [i.e., Church Slavonic], in which they at least see something pleasing to God. Experience has shown that despite all the efforts of various authorities ... even intelligent Ukrainian boys ... prove to be unsuitable for instruction in the Great Russian language ... As for the moral consequences of instruction not in the indigenous language, even without speaking of the gap in families between parents and children (which often gives rise to ugly moral occurrences), we can point to a fact which everyone here is aware of. Canton and village scribes who, in the course of a number of years, have acquired a certain familiarity with the Great Russian language, see in this some sort of right to superiority over the rest of the population and misuse for their own selfish ends their ability to mangle the Russian language, trading in it as if it were some sort of mystery beyond the grasp of others.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Minutes of the St Petersburg Literacy Committee, 18 Sept. 1862, RGIA, f. 91 (St Petersburg Literacy Committee), op. 3, d. 28, fo. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Memo by Konys'kyi, V. Loboda, and D. P. Pyl'chikov to St Petersburg Literacy Committee, 10 Mar. 1862, RGIA, f. 398 (agriculture department of the ministry of state properties), op. 26, d. 9979, fos. 2–3; Borys Sheveliv, 'Petytsii ukrains'kykh hromad do peterburz'koho komitetu hramotnosti z r. 1862', *Za sto lit*, iii (1928), 13.

Teachers in the Sunday schools of Kiev felt just as strongly. Eighty-four of them wrote to the St Petersburg Literacy Committee in the first half of 1862 to say that instructing Ukrainians in Russian reduced the pupils' comprehension, divorced them from their cultural background, inclined them to look down on the sort of work they traditionally engaged in, diminished their potential contribution to the local economy, and impaired the teachers' capacity to combat education in Polish. Above all, the Kievans found the use of Russian deplorable on moral grounds. Alongside civil rights, the lower classes had to be granted the right 'to respect themselves, their moral organism, with all its legitimate manifestations'.<sup>1</sup>

To teach in Ukrainian, teachers needed textbooks in the language. Kulish had published *A Grammar (Hramatka)*, 'the first Ukrainian text for primary schools',<sup>2</sup> as early as 1857. At the end of 1860, presumably in the hope that it might be approved for use in Ukraine's rapidly growing network of clerical schools, he submitted the book to the ecclesiastical censors.<sup>3</sup> After visiting Ukraine and making contact with teachers in Kiev, Shevchenko published *A South Russian Primer (Bukvar' iuzhnorusskii)* at the beginning of 1861.<sup>4</sup> Having solicited what Valuev was to call 'donations ... for the publication of cheap books in the south-Russian dialect' in *The Foundation* in May 1862 and in *Moscow News* and *The Voice* in January and April 1863, Kostomarov succeeded in getting one or two texts into print before the edict of July 1863 brought his efforts to an end.<sup>5</sup> These St Petersburg initiatives attracted a warm response from Ukrainophiles in Ukraine. Someone gave the Metropolitan of Kiev six thousand copies of Shevchenko's primer in the summer of 1861 (again, no doubt, in the hope that they might find an outlet in schools run by the church).<sup>6</sup> One of the reasons the Poltavans wrote to the St Petersburg Literacy Committee in March 1862 was to gain official approval for the use of Kulish's

<sup>1</sup> D. D. Protopopov, *Istoriia S.-Petersburgskogo Komiteta Gramotnosti, sostoiavshego pri Imperatorskom Vol'nom Ekonomicheskom Obshchestve (1861-1895gg.)* (St Petersburg, 1898), pp. 79-83 (quotation from p. 80).

<sup>2</sup> Zaitsev, *Shevchenko*, p. 216.

<sup>3</sup> Academic Conference of the St Petersburg Theological Academy to the Schools Administration of the Holy Synod, 31 Dec. 1860, RGIA, f. 802 (Synod Schools Administration), op. 2, d. 1345, fo. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Zaitsev, *Shevchenko*, p. 258; Marakhov, *Kievskii universitet*, pp. 56-7.

<sup>5</sup> Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsyistychni i polemichni pysannia*, pp. 137-40 (the original appeal), 156-9 (the article in *The Voice*); *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 12, 30 Jan. 1863; Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, p. 579.

<sup>6</sup> F. A. Iastrebov, *Revoliutsionnye demokraty na Ukraine: Vtoraia polovina 50-kh – nachalo 60-kh godov XIX st.* (Kiev, 1960), pp. 281-2.

Grammar in schools run by the ministry of state properties.<sup>1</sup> From the east of the Dnieper, if not from the west, Kostomarov received an encouraging response to his attempts at fund-raising.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, Konys'kyi wrote a pamphlet on Ukrainian writing and Oleksandr Stronin, the most experienced teacher in Poltava, published a Ukrainian version of the best-known contemporary Russian-language guide to the acquisition of primary reading skills.<sup>3</sup>

Up to a point, non-Ukrainophiles approved of the idea of making greater use of the Ukrainian language. In March 1861, the chancery of the state council responded positively to Kulish's proposal for a Ukrainian translation of the key parts of the emancipation legislation.<sup>4</sup> In September 1861, the Poltava church authorities sanctioned preaching in Ukrainian.<sup>5</sup> In December 1861, the civil governor of the province of Kiev employed Ukrainian in both speech and writing when trying to expedite the preparation of post-emancipation agreements between peasants and their former landlords.<sup>6</sup> In 1862, the St Petersburg Literacy Committee put out a list of books for popular reading which contained almost as many works in Ukrainian as Russian.<sup>7</sup> The committee's parent body, the Free Economic Society, expressed approval of the Poltava teachers' advocacy of Ukrainian when passing their memorandum to the minister of state properties.<sup>8</sup> Pirogov thought teachers in Kiev were quite right to give Ukrainian explanations of passages set for reading in Russian.<sup>9</sup> To judge by the 1862 draft of the primary education law which reached the statute book two years later, his superiors agreed with him.<sup>10</sup> The majority of those who received invitations to comment on the draft advocated tuition in languages other than Russian in non-Russian parts of the empire.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> RGIA, f. 398, op. 26, d. 9979, fo. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Kostomarov, *Istoriicheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, p. 579.

<sup>3</sup> Konisskii, 'Iz vospominanii', pp. 150-2; O. Konys'kyi, *Ukrains'ki propysy* (Poltava, 1862); Anon. (O. I. Stronin), *Azbuka po metode Zolotova dlia iuzhno-russkogo kraia* (Poltava, 1861).

<sup>4</sup> G. Vashkevich, 'Perevod P. A. Kulisha na ukrainskii iazyk manifesta 19 fevralia 1861 goda i Polozheniia o krest'ianakh', *Kievskai starina*, no. 2 (1905), 1st pagination, p. 324.

<sup>5</sup> S. P., 'Ukaz o propovediakh na malorusskom iazyke', *Kievskai starina*, no. 1 (1902), 2nd pagination, pp. 81-3.

<sup>6</sup> K. Kushchin, 'Pis'mo k izdateliu', *Russkii vestnik: Sovremennaia letopis'*, no. 4 (1862), p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> M. Grushevskii, *Ocherk istorii ukrainskogo naroda* (3rd ed., Kiev, 1911, repr. Kiev, 1991), p. 318.

<sup>8</sup> President of the Free Economic Society to minister of state properties, 7 May 1862, RGIA, f. 398, op. 26, d. 9979, fo. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Pirogov, 'O voskresnykh shkolakh', p. 222.

<sup>10</sup> For a copy of this draft, see RGIA, f. 908, op. 1, d. 174, fos. 6-15; paragraph 4 (fo. 6 verso) provided for the use of 'local dialects' in initial oral explanations.

<sup>11</sup> Smirnov, *Reforma nachal'noi i srednei shkoly*, pp. 130-1; for a response to the draft which proposed instruction in Ukrainian, see G. Danilevskii, 'Sel'skie uchilishcha i narodnoe

In certain quarters, however, the promotion of the Ukrainian language caused outrage. The next two sections describe a mounting conflict.

\* \* \*

Noblemen in Ukraine deplored Ukrainophilism. The antipathy of Polish nobles, Pirogov believed, could be discounted, as it showed only that the Ukrainian Sunday schools were improving the imperial authorities' chances of challenging the cultural predominance of Poles in the south-western region of the empire.<sup>1</sup> In view, however, of the fact that St Petersburg's Polish policy at the very beginning of the 1860s combined determination to put down unrest with preparedness to make concessions to Polish interests,<sup>2</sup> officials in St Petersburg may have felt obliged to take seriously even Polish antipathy to Ukrainophilism in the period prior to the Polish insurgency. They certainly took seriously anti-Ukrainophilism on the part of noblemen in Ukraine who thought of themselves as Russian. Not many such noblemen were as enlightened as Hryhorii Halahan, who in 1860 urged the wider dissemination of Kulish's *Grammar* and expressed support for its author's attempt to reprint the Ukrainian stories of Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko at prices peasants could afford.<sup>3</sup> A Russian observer of Ukrainian cultural developments, Pavel Annenkov, said rightly in a report from Kiev of June 1862 that 'the cool attitude of the Little Russian upper classes to the party of purely local education deprives it of essential support.'<sup>4</sup> If the imperial authorities were in two minds about taking advice from Poles, they could ill afford to overlook the anti-Ukrainophilism of nobles whose loyalty to the empire was unquestionable.

In St Petersburg, hostility to the notion of primary education in Ukrainian found incisive expression on the part of the empire's Main Censorship Administration as early as July 1861. When asked what the Metropolitan of Kiev was to do with his six thousand copies of Shevchenko's *South Russian Primer*, the censors condemned out of hand the idea that they might be distributed among the ecclesiastical schools of Ukraine:

---

obrazovanie v Khar'kovskoi gubernii', *Otechestvennye zapiski*, ciii (1864), 1st pagination, p. 548.

<sup>1</sup> Pirogov, 'O voskresnykh shkolakh', pp. 221-2.

<sup>2</sup> David Saunders, *Russia in the Age of Reaction and Reform, 1801-1881* (London and New York, 1992), p. 289.

<sup>3</sup> Savchenko, *Zaborona*, pp. 354-6.

<sup>4</sup> P. Annenkov, 'Iz Kiev', *Russkii Vestnik: Sovremennaia Letopis'*, no. 25 (1862), p. 3. In view of the fact that Annenkov spoke of Poles separately, by 'Little Russian upper classes' he clearly meant nobles in Ukraine who thought of themselves as Russian.

The publication both of this booklet and of others like it, namely works written in Little Russian for the common people of Little Russia, betrays an intention ... to call back to life the Little Russian nationality, the gradual and durable fusion of which with the Great Russian nationality into a single indissoluble whole ought to be the subject of pacific but nevertheless constant endeavours on the part of the government ... [I]n no way must the natural course of the *rapprochement* of the two peoples be obstructed and the government must not, by enlivening Little Russian speech and Little Russian literature, facilitate the emergence of that separation of the two related tribes which was once so fatal for both of them and which might even be dangerous from the point of view of the unity of the state.<sup>1</sup>

At the time of this indictment, censors reported to the ministry of education, whose Kiev representative, Pirogov, was pro-Ukrainian, and whose lengthy consideration of the plans for a new law on primary schools had not yet ruled out Ukrainian as a medium of instruction. From March 1863, however, they reported to the minister of internal affairs.<sup>2</sup> A simple way of explaining Valuev's ban is to say that, shortly before it was enacted, the censors acquired a superior whose readiness to listen to them was greater than that of his predecessor.

Security agencies, however, usually carried more weight than the censors in the decision-making processes of the imperial regime. Valuev made clear in July 1863 that he thought certain Ukrainian cultural activists were politically motivated: 'Activists of this kind formerly included members of the Khar'kov secret society and latterly included a great number of people whose criminal activities were investigated by the commission set up under the chairmanship of State Secretary Prince Golitsyn.'

On 25 January 1860 (after receiving a denunciation from Mikhail Garshin, the father of the future writer), the secret police raided the home of one Petro Zavads'kyi in the Ukrainian town of Kharkiv (in Russian, Khar'kov). What they discovered enabled them to reconstruct the history of a secret society which had come into being some four years previously. In 1858, in the wake of unrest at Kharkiv University, the society's principal members had moved to Kiev. There, they played a significant part in the foundation of the city's Sunday schools. According to a paper Valuev wrote in September 1862, members of the Kharkiv (or Kharkiv-Kiev) society had been trying 'under the pretence of disseminating literacy to prepare the

<sup>1</sup> Iastrebov, *Revoliutsionnye demokraty*, p. 283, citing the archives of the third department.

<sup>2</sup> Charles A. Ruud, *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906* (Toronto, 1982), p. 135.

common people for participation in the realization of [their] secret goals'.<sup>1</sup> Since, at a banquet for the departing Professor Pavlov of Kiev on 14 December 1859, one of the members of the society spoke approvingly of the attempt at a military uprising in Senate Square in St Petersburg on 14 December 1825,<sup>2</sup> it was not difficult for the imperial authorities to imagine that the society's 'secret goals' were extremely ambitious. In May 1860, fifteen of its members were found guilty of criminal activity.<sup>3</sup> The Sunday schools survived (presumably because, in 1860, St Petersburg's desire to increase the availability of primary education outweighed its obsession with security), but Pirogov came under pressure from Governor-General Vasil'chikov to monitor the Kiev schools more closely and conservative officials in St Petersburg began to look for additional ways of casting doubt on the schools' activities.<sup>4</sup>

Early in the summer of 1862, officials who had mistrusted the Sunday schools from the outset found a way of closing them down. In May, when multiple copies of a bloodthirsty proclamation entitled 'Young Russia' surfaced in St Petersburg, the tsar set up a commission under Prince A. F. Golitsyn to investigate 'political crimes'. Unexplained fires in the capital intensified the authorities' alarm. The establishment of a tenuous connection between political dissent, the fires, and two of the St Petersburg Sunday schools persuaded Alexander II, on 10 June, to suspend the schools throughout the empire.<sup>5</sup> An inevitable consequence of these non-Ukrainian events was that teachers in the Ukrainian Sunday schools lost the principal outlet for their Ukrainophilism. Worse, from their point of view, was to follow. The authorities' shift to the right accelerated when, at the beginning of July 1862, the police captured letters from Alexander

<sup>1</sup> *Rabochee dvizhenie v Rossii v XIX veke*, ed. A. M. Pankratova et al. (Moscow, 1950-63), vol. ii, pt. 1, p. 592.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 593.

<sup>3</sup> Marakhov, *Sotsial'no-politicheskai bor'ba*, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> This is not the place for a full discussion of the Kharkiv-Kiev secret society, which might be called the Russian Empire's first populist organization. The principal documents on the subject are to be found in *Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie na Ukraine v 1856-1862gg.*, ed. G. I. Marakhov et al. (Kiev, 1963), pp. 2-5, 11-17, 19-22, 27-64, 68-77. The major secondary study is Iastrebov, *Revoliutsionnye demokraty*.

<sup>5</sup> B. P. Koz'min, 'P. G. Zaichnevskii i "Molodaia Rossiia"', in idem, *Iz istorii revoliutsionnoi mysli v Rossii: Izbrannye trudy* (Moscow, 1961), pp. 222-3, 258, 484; P. A. Valuev, *Dnevnik* (Moscow, 1961), i. 168-9, 174, 189, 387-8; Reginald E. Zelnik, *Labor and Society in Tsarist Russia: The Factory Workers of St Petersburg, 1855-1870* (Stanford, CA, 1971), pp. 191-3; Mikhail Lemke, 'Delo voskresnikov', in idem, *Ocherki osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniia 'shestidesiatykh godov'* (St Petersburg, 1908, repr. The Hague and Paris, 1968), p. 423; RGIA, f. 1275 (council of ministers), op. 1, d. 38, fo. 33 (the text of the decree of 10 June).

Herzen in London to radicals in Russia.<sup>1</sup> The secret police embarked on an empire-wide witch-hunt. So far as Ukrainophiles were concerned, it involved re-sentencing a number of those who had first been prosecuted in 1860 and consigning to exile several of the activists who had come to the fore subsequently (notably Konys'kyi and Stronin of Poltava).<sup>2</sup>

The government had not set out to nip Ukrainophilism in the bud. Rather, at a time of panic, it had punished anyone against whom it had a shred of evidence. Its militancy looked likely, however, to bring Ukrainophilism to an end. At first sight, indeed, it is difficult to explain why Valuev was still worried about the rise of Ukrainian culture in the middle of 1863 when many of its most energetic proponents had been put out of circulation in the middle of 1862.

\* \* \*

For at least three reasons, the argument about whether to permit the use of the Ukrainian language in primary education continued after the 1862 arrests. Kievan Ukrainophiles remained at liberty; Kostomarov was still active in St Petersburg; and the authorities were still trying to finalize their legislation on primary schools run by the state.

The closure of the Sunday schools appears to have drawn Ukrainophiles in Kiev closer together.<sup>3</sup> Late in the summer of 1862, forty-four of them sought an ally in Kostomarov by urging him to take the vacant chair of Russian history at Kiev University.<sup>4</sup> In November 1862 twenty-one of them, led by Volodymyr Antonovych, published a formal statement of their opinions in Katkov's Moscow weekly *Contemporary Chronicle*.<sup>5</sup>

Antonovych and his co-signatories emphasized their moderation. Polish noblemen, they said, had tried to accuse them of radicalism by inventing the pejorative term 'peasant-lovers' (*khlopomany*) to describe them. The term was not necessarily abusive, however, since one could be a 'peasant-lover' without being a revolutionary. The signatories

<sup>1</sup> Lemke, 'Protess 32-kh', in idem, *Ocherki*, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> P. Gurevich, "'Delo o rasprostraneniі malorossiiskoi propagandy'", *Byloe*, no. 7 (1907), pp. 169-75; Dmytro Hrachovets'kyi, 'Pershi nedil'ni shkoly na Poltavshchyni ta ikh diiachy (1860-1862rr.)', *Ukraina*, no. 4 (1928), pp. 69-71; V. R. Leikina-Svirskaiia, 'A. I. Stronin', in *Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v seredine XIX veka: deiateli i istoriki*, ed. M. V. Nechkina et al. (Moscow, 1986), p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> I. Zhytets'kyi, 'Kyivs'ka Hromada za 60-tykh rokov', *Ukraina*, no. 1 (1928), p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>5</sup> 'Otzv iz Kiev', *Sovremennaia Letopis' Russkogo Vestnika*, no. 46 (1862), 14 Nov. 1862. On the composition and censorship of this document, see Zhytets'kyi, 'Kyivs'ka Hromada', p. 98; V. Miiakovskii, "'Kievskaiia gromada" (Iz istorii ukrainskogo obshchestvennogo dvizheniia 60-kh gg.)', *Letopis' revoliutsii*, no. 4 (1924), p. 149; and R. G. Eimontova, *Russkie universitety na grani dvukh epokh: Ot Rossii krepostnoi k Rossii kapitalisticheskoi* (Moscow, 1985), p. 299.

said that they wanted merely to promote the fortunes of the Ukrainian masses by confirming them in their commitment to religion, landownership, Ukrainian 'ethnographic particularities', and the family. They invited anyone who thought their goals were more wide-ranging to prove it, and denied explicitly that they were in sympathy with the views exemplified in the bloodthirsty 'Young Russia' proclamation which had surfaced in St Petersburg in May. They rejected the charge that they were trying to persuade Ukrainian peasants not to agree to detailed terms of emancipation with their former landowners. They found the notion that they were Ukrainian separatists ridiculous. Separatism, they said, took two forms, 'state' and 'national'. 'If we are charged with separatism, or at least with a desire for a separate state, then we declare that this is the most absurd and naïve slander.' They did not deny, however, that they were committed to promoting Ukraine's cultural identity. No one, they said, believed any longer in trying to demonstrate the need for turning one nationality into another. Everyone sympathized with the attempts of Bulgarians, Croatians, Slovenes, and Lusatian Sorbs to resurrect or develop their literatures. The efforts of Ukrainians in the Austrian Empire (*Rusiny galitskie*) to remove the Polish influence on their identity enjoyed universal respect; 'why must Russian Ruthenes (*Rusiny russkie*) alone be denied a right granted to all other nationalities?' In conclusion, Antonovych and his co-signatories acknowledged that their essay would give rise to objections on both the right and the left of the political spectrum. They were particularly anxious to meet potential objections from the left. To support their view that unduly radical action was ill advised, they pointed to the closure of the Sunday schools, a 'melancholy event which has thrown our sphere of activity into confusion and obliged us to make the present protest'. They hoped that their opponents would be as frank as they had been themselves.

In July 1862, these opponents had begun publishing a monthly journal in Kiev, *The Herald of South-Western and Western Russia*, which became the principal outlet for those who accused Ukrainophiles of sympathizing with Poles.<sup>1</sup> Two articles which appeared anonymously in the *Herald* in November 1862 made the accusation clear. The first included an attack on the 'particular breed of separatists and imitators of Polish patriots' who had taken to wearing traditional Ukrainian rather than European clothing. The second began by claiming that 'the very make-up of the word *khlopo*-mania tells us clearly of its

<sup>1</sup> *Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii: Istoriko-literaturnyi zhurnal* (Kiev, 1862-4).



Polish origin' and went on to assert that Ukrainian 'peasant-lovers' espoused the ideas of 'Young Russia', that the term Ukraine was a Polish invention, that the contemporary campaign for native-language education was to be deplored, and that 'it is sinful and shameful for us ... to permit the Poles to introduce enmity into our family and to arm us against our brothers and heirs.' Traditional-minded inhabitants of Ukraine, the article concluded, ought to devote their attention to persuading the young people of the country to abandon their mistaken opinions.<sup>1</sup>

In December 1862, the Kiev landowner Stepan Eremeev responded explicitly in the *Herald* to the statement published by Antonovych and his friends in Moscow in November. He particularly lamented the group's lack of interest in the recent educational activities of the Orthodox clergy in Ukraine. He objected to the idea of teaching peasants in Ukrainian, which in his opinion would have the effect of cutting them off from the rest of Ukrainian society. 'And is the question here', he asked, 'merely one of language? After all, if you study in the general Russian language and in Slavonic, you can also easily read things written in Ukrainian, writing and reading in which is not forbidden. Is there not a sub-text here?'<sup>2</sup>

When, in Moscow in March 1863, the committed Ukrainophile Hryhorii Zaliubovs'kyi defended the practice of wearing native as opposed to European clothing, proceeded to attack all sorts of Ukrainophobia, and expressed enthusiasm for the policy statement published by Antonovych and his co-signatories,<sup>3</sup> Eremeev returned to the fray. In an article of April 1863, he disagreed strongly with Zaliubovs'kyi's commitment to the use of the Ukrainian language in schools. Which was older, he asked, Russian literature or 'Ukrainian'? 'When and why did the desire appear to teach the local people in the everyday language? No more than three years ago, i.e. at the point when Polish patriots began to dream of resurrecting Poland and when the clergy opened *Russian* parish schools everywhere and the success of these schools exceeded all expectations, which evidently displeased the peasant-lovers extremely.' According to Eremeev, neither the peasants themselves, nor the upper levels of the local community, nor 'local

1 Anon., 'Dva-tri slova o sochuvstvii patrioticheskim dvizheniiam i pritiiazaniiam poliakov', *Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii*, i, book v (Nov. 1862), *otdel* iv, esp. pp. 132-4; Anon., 'Chto takoe khlopomaniia i kto takie khlopomany?', *ibid.*, pp. 139, 148, 150 n. 1, 152-3, 156. The words *khlopoman* and *khlopomaniia* came from the Polish *chłop*, 'peasant'.

2 Stepan Eremeev, 'Zamechaniia po povodu voprosa o narodnykh u nas shkolakh', *Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii*, i, book vi (Dec. 1862), *otdel* iv, pp. 209-25, esp. 222-5.

3 Grigorii Zaliubovskii, 'Golos iz Khar'kova, po povodu chumarok i svitok', *Den'*, 16 Mar. 1863, pp. 9-11.

literary organs' wanted education in Ukrainian. The people who did want it, he insisted, were Polish. Most Ukrainian-language books submitted to the Kiev censor in 1862, he claimed, had been written by Poles. It was not true to say that Ukrainians did not understand Russian: they understood it even prior to 1831 when the region was Polish, and indeed, many of them at that time went north to teach. After 1831, Russian was immediately and readily accepted. About twenty years previously, Ereemeev went on, the ministry of state properties had started setting up village schools, creating peasant administrations, and appointing peasant scribes, all of which and all of whom operated in Russian. Three years previously, the church had begun to introduce Russian-language parish schools. Finally, the canton and village administrations which came into being everywhere with the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 all conducted their correspondence in Russian. The possibility that Ukrainian peasants did not understand Russian was not even raised at that time. The peasants 'had become so accustomed to Russian that it is far more likely they will not understand the Little Russian books which the modern peasant-lovers are writing, as they are disfigured by peculiar spelling and full of words not used in everyday speech and completely incomprehensible to the people.' Ereemeev recalled a village elder asking him to read out the text of a speech by the local governor. He read it out in Russian first and then began reading the Ukrainian translation. The elder stopped him, saying that although the Ukrainian version had probably been produced to make comprehension easier, 'anyone who wants to understand it will understand it perfectly well in Russian, and those who don't want to understand it won't do so whatever language you address them in or write in.' Ereemeev believed Ukraine's 'peasant-lovers' ought to forget the language question and address themselves to the peasants' more pressing needs. He acknowledged that the peasants were spiritually and educationally backward, but he denied that their problems could be solved more easily in Ukrainian than Russian. If they received their primary education in Ukrainian, moreover, it would be difficult for them to go on to Russian-language secondary schools. The inevitable consequence of primary education in Ukrainian, he claimed, would be the bifurcation of the local community.<sup>1</sup>

In May 1863, a professor at Kiev University, Syl'vestr Hohots'kyi,

<sup>1</sup> S. Ereemeev, 'Po povodu svitok i khokhlomanii', *Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii*, i, book x (Apr. 1863), *otdel* iii, pp. 1-21. The similarity between Ereemeev's views and those expressed by the Kiev Censorship Committee in its letter to Valuev of 27 June 1863 is remarkable.

expressed himself in terms similar to those employed by Eremeev in respect of the language of Ukrainian primary education. He was strongly in favour of using Russian rather than Ukrainian. Literary Russian, he said, was no more incomprehensible to Ukrainian children than it could be to Russian children. Those who advocated the use of Ukrainian exaggerated the difficulty of using Russian. The argument that because the Ukrainians of the Austrian Empire studied in Ukrainian the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire had to do so too was unconvincing: Ukrainians in Austrian Galicia could not understand Russian, whereas Ukrainians in the Russian Empire could, and Galician Ukrainians needed to use their native language to defend themselves against German and Polish. Advocates of teaching in Ukrainian were mistaken to argue that Russian-language instruction instilled arrogance on the part of those who acquired Russian towards those who did not; such arrogance derived from other causes, above all from 'coarse morals'. Anything that cut off the south-western part of the Russian Empire from Russia would involve south-westerners in grave future misfortunes.<sup>1</sup>

Ukrainophiles seemed to be faring badly in debates among intellectuals. In the wake of the closure of the Sunday schools, they had little chance of creating an alternative constituency for their views among the unprivileged. Nikolai Ballin, a Russian bookseller in Kharkiv who sympathized with the Ukrainophile cause, reported to the St Petersburg Literacy Committee in December 1862 that 'as a result of the closure of the Sunday schools, fewer good books [were] being bought and more folk tales circulated.'<sup>2</sup>

Outside Ukraine, however, the St Petersburg Literacy Committee, the Academic Committee of the ministry of state properties, the ministry of education, the Academy of Sciences, and even parts of the ministry of internal affairs remained sympathetic to Ukrainophile interests. Despite the fact that at a meeting of April 1862 some members of the St Petersburg Literacy Committee questioned the need for books in Ukrainian, the committee included thirty-eight of them on a list of 155 works which it recommended for elementary reading in February 1863.<sup>3</sup> In November 1862, three committee

<sup>1</sup> S. Gogotskii, 'Na kakom iazyke sleduet obuchat' v sel'skikh shkolakh iugo-zapadnoi Rossii?', *Kievskii telegraf*, 5, 9, 12 May 1863.

<sup>2</sup> Minutes of St Petersburg Literacy Committee, 4 Dec. 1862, RGIA, f. 91, op. 3, d. 28, fo. 16 verso; on Ballin, see I. E. Barenbaum, 'Memuary N. P. Ballina i obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v kontse 50-kh – nachale 60-kh godov XIX v.', in *Revoliutsionnaia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859-1861 gg.*, ed. M. V. Nechkina et al. (Moscow, 1970), pp. 295–341.

<sup>3</sup> Protopopov, *Istoriia S.-Peterburgskogo Komiteta Gramotnosti*, p. 83; for a printed copy of the list, see RGIA, f. 733 (department of the ministry of education), op. 142, d. 18, fos. 3–19.

members rejected Ereemeev's view that Ukrainian peasants preferred books in Russian and Church Slavonic to books in Ukrainian.<sup>1</sup> In 1863, the committee advertised a 300-ruble prize for the best popular-educational work in Russian, Ukrainian, or Belorussian.<sup>2</sup> In February 1863, the Academic Committee of the ministry of state properties expressed support for the views put forward by Konys'kyi and his Poltava colleagues in their memorandum of March 1862.<sup>3</sup> On learning of Valuev's ban, the minister of education objected to it strongly.<sup>4</sup> At a public meeting of the Second Section of the Academy of Sciences on 29 December 1862, A. V. Nikitenko told the assembled company that the section was recommending the holy synod to sanction the publication of Pylyp Morachevs'kyi's Ukrainian translation of the Gospels.<sup>5</sup> At some point in the first half of 1863, an official in the ministry of internal affairs criticized two governors-general of the western provinces (Vasil'chikov and V. I. Nazimov) for opposing primary education and the publication of books in non-Russian languages. The official did not believe such activities reflected federalist inclinations. They were not thought to be politically threatening, he said, in the Baltic provinces of the Russian Empire, for teaching was permitted there in both Estonian and Latvian. Various countries in western Europe, moreover, appeared to be politically stable despite containing different languages.<sup>6</sup>

Since, at roughly the time this official was writing, *Moscow News* and *The Voice* were giving Kostomarov the opportunity to continue his public campaign for the collection of money to fund publications in Ukrainian, Ukrainophiles seemed still to have many supporters. The prospect of a Ukrainian Bible, however, stung their enemies into further action. In February 1863, V. A. Dolgorukov, the head of the third department, received an anonymous denunciation of

<sup>1</sup> Protopopov, *Istoriia*, pp. 83-4.

<sup>2</sup> Anon., 'Pravila konkursa, ob'iavliaemogo komitetom gramotnosti', *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, cxvii (1863), *otdel vi*, pp. 104-5.

<sup>3</sup> Minutes of the academic committee of the ministry of state properties, 28 Feb. 1863, RGIA, f. 398, op. 26, d. 9979, fos. 8-9 (copy).

<sup>4</sup> A. V. Golovnin to Valuev, 20 July 1863, *ibid.*, f. 775, op. 1, d. 188, ll. 15-17; Lemke, *Epokha*, pp. 304-6.

<sup>5</sup> *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*, 26 Jan. 1863, p. 89. On Morachevs'kyi, see V. Naumenko, 'F. S. Morachevskii i ego literaturnaia deiatel'nost', *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 11 (1902), 1st pagination, pp. 171-86, and no. 12 (1902), 1st pagination, pp. 459-79. The ecclesiastical authorities' file on the Morachevs'kyi affair (RGIA, f. 797, op. 32, 1 *otdelenie*, d. 93a, 107 fos.) has disappeared (*vybylo*), but the Procurator of the Holy Synod made plain his hostility to the idea of Ukrainian translations of the scriptures when approving of the ban of 1863 more than a year after it had been promulgated: A. P. Akhmatov to Valuev, 24 Dec. 1864, RGIA, f. 775, op. 1, d. 188, fos. 19-26.

<sup>6</sup> V. Naumenko, 'K ukrainskomu voprosu', *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 5 (1905), 2nd pagination, pp. 148-9.

Ukrainophilism which, in reviewing Ukrainian cultural debates of the previous two years, made Morachev'skyi's translation of the gospels look like the ultimate outrage: 'From the ashes of Shevchenko', the denunciation began, 'has arisen a whole band of the most zealous separatists and enemies of Russia.' Their main centre was Kiev, 'but several of them have set up a group around *The Foundation*, in which almost every article smacks of revolution and the setting apart of Little Russia'. The main aim of these revolutionaries was 'separating Little and Great Russia and federation with Poland; if the Poles did not set store by these people, they would not have been so ambitious and barbarous'. Ukrainian 'separatists – peasant-lovers' had first expressed themselves in the sphere of primary education. When this outlet had been taken from them, they had conceived the idea of translating the Bible into Ukrainian. On this foundation, they believed, they would 'find it easy to build the separate identity of the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian life, and eventually the Ukrainian nationality'.<sup>1</sup>

When the third department asked Vasil'chikov's successor as governor-general of Kiev, Nikolai Annenkov, to comment on these views, his response was to take them very seriously. Although he was not of the opinion that the 'Little Russian party' in Kiev possessed a formal organization or that it was pro-Polish (for, 'on the contrary, the party strives to resist Latino-Polish intrigue'), he held that Ukrainians and Poles were both trying, for different reasons, to awaken in the minds of unprivileged Ukrainians memories of the country's independent past. Where primary education was concerned, Annenkov adopted a position similar to that of the landowner Stepan Eremeev. Ordinary Ukrainians, he believed, understood standard Russian better than the inhabitants of several provinces of Russia. He therefore felt that the publication of educational literature in Ukrainian, and especially of the Bible, ought to be prohibited; books of this kind would constitute 'a powerful weapon in the hands of the Little Russian party. Their aspirations may not be the same as the aspirations of Polish revolutionaries, but they still represent a distinct and powerful threat to the peace of the state.'<sup>2</sup> As Valuev referred explicitly to Annenkov in his memorandum of July 1863, it is reasonable to suppose that the governor-general's comments and the letter from the Kiev Censorship Committee were the proximate causes of the ban which ensued.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Miiakovskii, "Kievskaiia gromada", p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 142-3; *Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie na Ukraine v 1863-1864gg.*, ed. G. Marakhov et al. (Kiev, 1964), pp. 44-7.

Annenkov's acknowledgement that Ukrainophiles in Kiev were not pro-Polish supports the central proposition to which this article is devoted: that although certain anti-Ukrainophile inhabitants of Ukraine insisted, in late 1862 and the first half of 1863, on presenting St Petersburg's Ukrainian problem as a sort of 'wholly owned subsidiary' of its Polish problem, certain imperial officials perceived additional and more important reasons for keeping Ukrainians in check. Poles played a larger part in the letter Valuev received from the Kiev Censorship Committee than in the memorandum he wrote for the tsar. The minister's memorandum depicted a Ukrainian problem which was connected with the empire's Polish problem but could be distinguished from it. Although Valuev repeated the Kiev censors' charge that people who believed in the possibility of a broadly based Ukrainian nationality were tools of the Poles, he did not make the Kievans' words his own. He did not invent, nor did he pretend to invent, his memorandum's most famous phrase ('there was not, is not, and cannot be any special Little Russian language'). Rather, he gave it in reported speech. The form of his words indicates that he sensed the falsity of arguments which attributed Ukrainophilism entirely to subversion on the part of Poles. He set such arguments in the broader context of a shift in the outlook of ethnically conscious Ukrainian intellectuals. Some of these intellectuals had turned from writing for each other to producing teaching aids for their uneducated fellow-countrymen. In Sunday schools, some of them had put the teaching aids to use. Despite the fact that on two occasions, in 1860 and 1862, Ukrainophiles had fallen foul of the empire's police, Ukrainophilism had survived. Further steps had to be taken. At the back of Valuev's mind lurked the spectre of a Ukraine inhabited not by two vocal Slavic peoples (Russians and Poles), but by three (Russians, Poles, and Ukrainians). The severity of the minister's edict on Ukrainian-language publishing reflected the degree of his concern. Having sensed the possibility of a broadly based Ukrainian identity, he was determined to prevent it becoming a reality.

*University of Newcastle upon Tyne*