

---

## Mykola Kostomarov as a Historian

*Thomas Prymak*

Mykola Kostomarov (1817–1885) made significant contributions to Ukrainian and Russian culture both as a writer and ethnographer and as a political ideologue and public figure. But he considered himself to be first and foremost a historian, and it is as a historian that he is best remembered. He was a formidable scholar indeed. His collected *Historical Monographs and Studies* [Istoricheskie monografii i izsledovani] fill some twenty-one volumes in eight bulky books, even though many of his seminal works are not included in this collection. Although Kostomarov's scholarly legacy was long ignored or deprecated by the Soviet historical establishment, he is today universally acknowledged as a major Ukrainian and Russian historian, and his works are being printed and reprinted both in Kyiv and in Moscow. His histories are once again widely read, and he has been fully "rehabilitated" in the leading Ukrainian and Russian historical journals.<sup>1</sup>

In view of Kostomarov's renewed popularity, it is fitting to ask about his place in the history of Ukrainian and Russian historiography. What was his approach to history and his methodology? Did his scheme of Russian history differ from the schemes of his predecessors, his contemporaries, and his successors? Were his terms of reference and his vocabulary conventional or original? What was the source of his enormous popularity? Exactly who was Mykola Kostomarov and what is his significance as a historian?

Kostomarov was born and raised in Voronezh province, near the Ukrainian–Russian ethnolinguistic frontier. His father was a Russian nobleman; his mother originally a Ukrainian serf. He was brought up, it seems, in the rationalist traditions of the eighteenth century, and at first paid little attention to the rich Ukrainian folk culture that surrounded him. But during his

university studies in Kharkov he became acquainted with the values and ideals of the romantic movement and immediately applied them to his personal experience. Under the influence of one of his professors, M.M. Lunin, who in turn was influenced by Herder and Sir Walter Scott, he became interested in history. His conversion to history and the Romantic movement was sudden and complete. Many years later he described it thus:

History was my most beloved subject. I read a great many history books of every type, reflected upon them and arrived at the following question. . . . Why is it that all the history books talk about the extraordinary historical characters, and occasionally about laws and institutions, but at the same time ignore the lives of the masses of ordinary people? The poor peasant, the working farmer, as it were, does not exist in history. Why does history not tell us about his way of life, his spiritual world, his feelings, and the means by which he expresses his happiness and his sadness? I soon became convinced that history must be studied not only from dead chronicles and writings but also among living people. Could it not be that the bygone ages are also reflected in the lives and memories of their heirs? It was merely necessary to seek, and certainly much would be found that scholarship had up to now overlooked. But where was one to begin? Naturally enough, with the study of my own Russian people. But in so far as I then lived in Little Russia I would begin with its Little Russian [that is, Ukrainian] branch. This idea turned me towards the reading of the monuments of the national heritage. For the first time in my life, I got hold of the Little Russian songs published by [Mykhailo] Maksymovych in 1827 and the Great Russian songs of [I.P.] Sakharov, and I began to read them. I was struck and then carried away by the sincere beauty of Little Russian popular poetry. I had never suspected that such eloquence, such depth and fresh feelings, could be found in the creations of the [common] people who were so close to me and about whom I unfortunately knew nothing.<sup>2</sup>

There are three basic points that Kostomarov makes in this passage: firstly, his love for history; secondly, his interest in the common people; and thirdly, his belief that folk songs, especially historical folk songs, were a potentially rich source for understanding the history of the common people. In other words, the historian Kostomarov was proposing a new methodology for Russian history; he was proposing to use an “ethnographic method” in his professional work.

The young man wasted no time in beginning. In his first dissertation for the master’s degree at Kharkov University, he used the published collections of Ukrainian historical songs that were available to him to elucidate the causes and nature of the Union of Brest (1596), by which the Orthodox Church in the old Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth accepted the Roman primacy while retaining its autonomous structure and traditional rites and

usages.<sup>3</sup> For political reasons unrelated to his ethnographic method, Kostomarov's dissertation was rejected before he could defend it, and it was officially burned on the university premises, but he was allowed to undertake a second dissertation on a new subject.

Undaunted by the unusual experience—even in the Russia of Nicholas I—of having his scholarship committed to the flames, Kostomarov selected a second topic which even more closely revealed his conversion to the Romantic movement. In his second dissertation, which was entitled *On the Historical Significance of Russian Popular Poetry*, Kostomarov once again turned to the experiences of the common people and argued that folk song could to some limited degree help establish a chronicle of historical events, could reveal general facts about the people's way of life, could be used as a source for the history of a language, and most importantly of all, was an excellent source for examining the people's view of itself; that is, folk song said something concrete about national psychology and national character. Although several of the Kharkov professors objected to Kostomarov's innovative emphasis upon the common people and social history rather than upon tsars, princes, and international relations, his thesis was accepted, and he successfully graduated.<sup>4</sup>

During the years that followed, Kostomarov continued to collect and to analyze folk songs and to use them in his historical work. For example, on the basis of such materials he authored an innovative book on ancient Slavic mythology<sup>5</sup> and began to reconstruct the social history of the great Cossack revolt against the Poles led by Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi. In 1847, however, he was arrested, imprisoned, and then exiled to Saratov for his participation in the illegal pan-Slavic Cyril-Methodian Brotherhood. Although Kostomarov managed to continue to write during his exile, he was forced to rely increasingly upon old chronicles, travellers' reports, and other published documents to complete his work, and this, of course, influenced his composition and style. He did, however, use the published corpus of historical songs and the folk material that he had already collected, and he enlivened his narrative with frequent dialogue, anecdote, and direct quotation from the chronicles. His use of new Polish material was especially remarkable, and when some ten years later his book *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi* was finally published, it was enthusiastically received by both professional reviewers and the general reading public.<sup>6</sup>

During those same years in Saratov, Kostomarov interested himself in the social history of that Volga province and gathered material for a history of revolt of the Russian Cossack leader Stenka Razin. Once again, folk materials played an important role in his major theme. Kostomarov's *Revolt of Stenka Razin* holds an honorable place as the first full monograph on popular revolt in the history of Russian historiography.<sup>7</sup>

The era of the Great Reforms saw Kostomarov teaching at St. Petersburg University and contributing historical compositions to the first journal of Ukrainian studies published in the Russian Empire. In a detailed cycle of historical articles in this journal, *The Foundation* [Osnova], Kostomarov outlined his general scheme of Russian history and articulated the contemporary problem of Ukrainian–Russian relations. He further elaborated his scheme in seminal writings on Novgorod and the *veche* system and on Muscovy and the beginnings of central government.

In all these writings two main themes emerged. First, there was a clear division between old Russian history and recent Russian history—that is, between the period of Kievan Rus' and the subsequent *udel*, or appanage, period, and the period which began with the Tatar conquest and the rise of Muscovy. The older period Kostomarov drew in bright colors as one of individual freedom, religious tolerance, and national concord. There were no firmly centralized state structures—there was in fact no real “state”—but rather decentralized forms. The “federal principle” was ascendant. The powers of the princes were limited, and the *veche*, or popular assembly, reigned supreme. This was true in “Southern Rus’,” to use Kostomarov’s exact vocabulary, but it was also true in “Northern Rus’.”

The Tatar conquest shattered this idyll of early Slavic happiness. As in Western Europe, so too in Rus' did foreign conquest bring statehood, centralized government, and oppressive rulers. First the Mongol khans and after them the Muscovite tsars established central rule in northeastern Rus'. The *veche* system and popular rule—Kostomarov probably did not dare to call it “republicanism” out of fear of the government censors—lived on in Novgorod, which, Kostomarov believed, had always been especially close to Southern Rus' by virtue of ethnic ties. But Muscovite aggression eventually put an end to the *veche* system of Novgorod, and the victory of statehood, central rule, and monarchy was assured. The new principles of autocratic rule, religious conformity, and national exclusivity came to the fore. The old principles of individual liberty and religious and national tolerance disappeared from Muscovy and the lands it conquered.<sup>8</sup>

But the old principles did not disappear elsewhere. They lived on in Southern Rus'—what Kostomarov’s contemporaries called “Little Russia” and what we today call “Ukraine”—most notably among the Zaporozhian Cossack brotherhood, which was headquartered in the middle of Southern Rus', and among the Don Cossacks, who lived in the southern borderlands of the Muscovite state. According to Kostomarov, the revolt of Stenka Razin and his Don Cossacks was a flashback to the golden liberties of earlier times. The principal facts of Ukrainian history also gestured back to these times. In fact, Kostomarov’s perception of the continuity between the

history of ancient Southern Rus' and Cossack history was so strong that it became the basis of the second great pillar of his historical thought, the existence of what he called "the two Russian nationalities."

Kostomarov gave the essence of his interpretation of Russian history in his pathbreaking essay "Two Russian Nationalities" and in a series of related books and articles. According to this interpretation, the ancient Rus' polity (*ruskii materik*) and the modern Russian people (*ruskii narod*) had never been an undivided, organic whole but had always been composed of more than one nationality (*narodnost'*). Ancient tribal differences had taken hold in various principalities, and by the fifteenth century the Slavic tribes of the territory that later became Russia (*Rossiiia*) had been grouped into four: Novgorod, Muscovy, Lithuania (that is, Belarus'), and Rus' (that is, the later Little Russia or Ukraine). These four nationalities were later reduced to two: Northern Rus' and Southern Rus'. This clear distinction, which Kostomarov traced back to the most ancient times, was formed by geography and historical circumstances and was revealed in the different characters of the two nationalities in question. Thus, according to Kostomarov, the Great Russians of the northeast were practical and materialistic with little poetry or love for nature, and the Little Russians of the south were impractical and poetic with a great love for nature. The Great Russians (*Velikorussy*) were stiff, formal, and intolerant, and this disposition gave rise to schisms and heretical sects of various sorts; by contrast, the "South Russians" (*Juzhnorussy*) were flexible and tolerant, and sectarianism did not appear in their land. The Muscovites were suspicious of foreigners and sealed them off; but Southern Rus' was filled with Poles, Jews, and Tatars and for centuries tolerated them well. The Great Russian had autocracy, the village commune, and the ability to found a state; the Southerner had personal freedom and individual ownership but was weak in the management of a state. The Northerners were autocratic, the Southerners democratic. But both peoples shared a common religion, a common book language, and, in the early days, a common ruling house, the house of Riurik. They needed each other and had qualities that complemented each other's. Together the two separate nationalities formed the Russian people, the Russian nation, and had made Russia what it was.<sup>9</sup>

Kostomarov's general scheme of Russian history differed greatly from the approach to Russian history prevalent in his day. Before Kostomarov, the unitary, conservative, monarchical, and state-centered scheme of Nikolai Karamzin (1766–1826) had dominated Russian historical thought. For Karamzin and most of his contemporaries a separate Ukrainian people simply did not exist. Stressing the old Muscovite genealogical claims to the heritage of Kievan Rus', Karamzin had traced the Russian state back

through Muscovy and the principality of Vladimir–Suzdal to Kiev. Karamzin was critical of Kievan freedom but was an admirer of the Muscovite tsardom and a supporter of the Russian autocracy. He thought that the Tatar conquest had actually strengthened the Russian autocracy and that this was good. With his emphasis upon state, politics, and religion, Karamzin had space in his presentation for only one Russian tsar, one Russian state, and one undivided Russian nation.<sup>10</sup>

Kostomarov's historical ideas were a direct challenge to Karamzin's scheme. Where Karamzin postulated one undivided Russian nation and traced the state in a direct line from Kiev to Moscow to St. Petersburg, Kostomarov did not. Rather Kostomarov divided what he called "contemporary Russia" into two distinct parts: Southern Rus', to which belonged the history of Kievan times and Cossack Ukraine, and Northern Rus', which eventually became centered on Muscovy. Moreover, where Karamzin saw Kievan Rus' with its personal freedom and loose political structure in a negative light and contrasted it to orderly, autocratic, and powerful Muscovy, which he saw in a positive light, Kostomarov painted the history of Kievan Rus' in bright colors and the history of Muscovy in darker ones. Where Karamzin thought the Tatar conquest beneficial because it strengthened autocracy and the state, Kostomarov thought of it in negative terms for exactly the same reasons. Karamzin was a partisan of the state; Kostomarov a partisan of the people.

However, in looking closely at the history and life of the people, Kostomarov discovered that this people was clearly divided into two easily discernible parts. Today we would call them Ukrainian and Russian; Kostomarov called them South Russian (*Iuzhnorusskii*) and Great or sometimes North Russian (*Velikorusskii* or *Severnorusskii*). In fact, Kostomarov's nomenclature was quite innovative in its day, for not all Russians—even some Russians of Ukrainian origin—would then agree that the "South Russians" actually formed a nationality of their own. But in his essay on the "Two Russian Nationalities" Kostomarov daringly applied his Herderian-derived ideas about national character to the Russian people and, in the eyes of the majority of his nationally conscious "South Russian" compatriots at least, convincingly demonstrated that these two Russian nationalities, each with its own specific character, did, in fact, exist.<sup>11</sup>

Of course, Kostomarov's ideas about the South and Great Russian nationalities differed in content as well as in nomenclature from present-day conceptions; that is, Kostomarov distinguished between nationality (*narodnost'*) and nation (*natsiia*) and claimed that the South Russians, or the Great Russians for that matter, formed only a nationality and not necessarily a nation. Rather, in Kostomarov's view it was the South and Great

Russian nationalities put together that formed the Russian "nation." Statements about the Russian "nation," however, are very rare in Kostomarov's works and are, in general, confined to his polemical rather than his historical writings.<sup>12</sup> In his historical corpus (as for example in the introductory pages of his masterpiece on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi) and in his illegal writings (as, for example, in *The Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People* and his letter to Alexander Herzen), Kostomarov clearly distinguished between Great and South Russian and put the latter on an equal plane with other recognized peoples of the world. Although today one might well stress the moderation and limited nature of Kostomarov's statements about the existence of an independent "South Russian" or Ukrainian nationality, in their own day these statements were a clear defense of the uniqueness of Kievan Rus', Cossack Ukraine, and Little Russia. They divided Russian history into two clear lines: one for the South, beginning in ancient times and continuing to the end of the Cossack era; and one for the North, beginning somewhat later and continuing into modern times. This was not, especially in vocabulary, the clear division of "Russian" history into a threefold ethnolinguistic "history of the East Slavic peoples" such as that proposed by the great Ukrainian historian, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, some forty years later. Hrushevs'kyi discarded Kostomarov's "South Russian" and "North Russian" within the context of "contemporary Russia" and used the clear-cut terms "Ukrainian," "Belorussian," and "Russian" within the context of the three "East Slavic" peoples, a vocabulary that makes more sense to most twentieth-century scholars. Nevertheless, Kostomarov's break with the unilinear, monarchical, and state-centered scheme of Karamzin was so profound that as late as the 1920s Hrushevs'kyi himself called it "a full revolution in the historical thought of Eastern Slavdom."<sup>13</sup>

If Kostomarov's approach to "Russian" history and his conceptualization were new and interesting in their day, so too were his subject matter and his style. Kostomarov was the first to write specialist monographs on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the great Cossack revolt against the Poles, the first to deal in depth with Stenka Razin and popular revolt in Russia, the first to praise openly Novgorod and the *veche* system, and the first to make extensive use of Polish and Western sources to write a full history of the Time of Troubles and the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Kostomarov's writings on Old Russian domestic life and Muscovite economic history were also very innovative, being pioneering works on Russian social history. Thus in his choice of topics as well as his conceptualization, Kostomarov clearly shifted the focus of Russian history away from tsars and rulers toward the history of the common people.

Kostomarov was equally innovative in his writings on Ukrainian history.

This comes out most clearly in his work on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, which was his masterpiece and which he revised time and again throughout his long career. Kostomarov differed from his "Little Russian" predecessors, country gentlemen who glorified the great Cossack leader who had cast off Polish rule, created a new Ukrainian landed class, and laid the foundation of an autonomous new polity, which historians now usually call the "Hetman state." He criticized Khmel'nyts'kyi and focused his attention upon the masses of Cossacks and common people who rose up against what he believed to be the social injustice, religious intolerance, and estate pride of the Polish gentry. Where his Ukrainian predecessors, the Cossack chroniclers and their gentlemen successors, praised the Cossack leaders or Hetmans and defended the autonomy of Little Russia on the basis of their historic rights derived from the Treaty of Pereiaslav (1654), according to which Ukraine turned to Russia, Kostomarov focused his attention upon language and people and thus boldly stepped forward into the modern world of ethnolinguistic rights and claims. In doing so, he became the first to formulate clearly the contemporary problem of Ukrainian-Russian relations. In his works on the successors of Khmel'nyts'kyi—Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, Iuryi Khmel'nyts'kyi, Petro Doroshenko, Ivan Mazepa, and others—Kostomarov maintained this focus and was critical of all those Ukrainian Cossack leaders who dared to take up arms against the integration of Ukraine into the Muscovite state. To what degree this criticism derived from his mistrust of Ukrainian statehood and to what degree it was necessary in order to get controversial Ukrainian subject matter past the tsarist censors is still an open question. The fact remains, however, that Kostomarov's prolific writings on Ukrainian Cossack history, which included his systematic collection of primary sources, practically created a new field, a field primarily defined by "national" rather than "estate" interests, a field we today call "Ukrainian history." His ideological and professional successor, the Kiev historian Volodymyr Antonovych, when considering this phenomenon, concluded: before him there was chaos; after him came order.<sup>14</sup>

Kostomarov's innovative conceptualization was a contributing factor, but not the sole reason for his enormous popularity among the general reading public in the Russian Empire: there was also the matter of his style. Kostomarov's penchant for telling an interesting story and bringing his subject matter to life was truly astounding. He achieved this by a close reading of chronicle, folklore, and contemporary source to extract from them everyday details, local color, and dialogue with which to garnish his story. In fact, his use of short direct sentences, dialogue, and direct quotation was systematic and pervasive. They invariably succeeded in bringing to



life the events and personalities portrayed in his histories. He developed this technique to such a degree that he quickly acquired the reputation of being Russia's leading "historian-artist."<sup>15</sup>

Of course, there were severe limitations to what Kostomarov could achieve by using these techniques. He could paint masterful portraits of various rebels, Cossacks, and popular figures, but he did not have the methodological and technical expertise to join them together into a synthetic history of Russia or of Ukraine. His principal attempt to write such a history of Russia, his *History of Russia in the Lives of Its Principal Figures*, was left incomplete at the time of his death and was a step back from the conceptualization he had earlier developed in his essay on the "Two Russian Nationalities."<sup>16</sup> His attempt to write a complete history of Ukraine on the basis of folk materials was similarly incomplete and not entirely successful.<sup>17</sup> Although the former is now once again widely read among the general reading public and the latter remains a rich source for the folklorist interested in history, neither had the intensity and the impact of his specialist monographs or his historical polemics. Kostomarov was a master painter of historical icons and an innovative ethnographer, but these icons based on chronicle or folklore were frozen in time as it were, without a past and without a future. That is, his histories lacked process and development and revealed the limitations of his method and his style.

There is one further point to be made with regard to Kostomarov's style. That point concerns his stress upon narrative at the expense of analysis, his consistent refusal to write inquiring introductions and incisive, summarizing conclusions—indeed, any conclusions at all—and his general reluctance to make historical judgments. To get Kostomarov's view on a question, it was, and still is, invariably necessary to read closely his entire work, and even then one is never quite positive about what he was actually saying and what its implications were for current politics. Contemporaries invariably thought that Kostomarov was letting the facts speak for themselves and was thus promoting historical objectivity. The entire process, however, was frustrating for his friends and his publishers, who at times could not make head or tail of what he was trying to say. On one occasion, his publisher simply refused to print one of his works until he had rewritten it with some kind of conclusion.<sup>18</sup>

However, with the passage of time this reticence on Kostomarov's part can be seen in an entirely different light: Kostomarov was a democrat and a patriotic Ukrainian writing Russian and Ukrainian history in an autocratic Russia which tried to censor systematically all historical materials. Indeed, how would it have been possible for Kostomarov openly to condemn the development of autocratic government or to praise Cossack revolts against this government? How would it have been possible for him to openly con-

demn Khmel'nyts'kyi's turn to Moscow or to praise Vyhovs'kyi or Mazepa's turn away from it? Given the censoring mechanisms of nineteenth-century tsarist Russia, such historical judgments would have been totally unprintable. As it was, Kostomarov was getting away with a lot by praising Novgorod and Cossack liberty and condemning individual tsars such as Ivan the Terrible or Peter the Great whenever he could. Whether consciously or unconsciously—and which, we cannot be absolutely certain—Kostomarov's great skill at weighing contradictory facts concerning controversial questions and weaving them into his narrative while simultaneously refusing to draw general conclusions was a response to the system of censorship within which he was writing. Of course, this system of censorship pales in comparison with the Soviet one which was to succeed it, but this did not mean that it did not exist. Even a casual perusal of the historian's autobiography reveals how much he suffered at the hands of the tsarist censors.<sup>19</sup> Kostomarov's unusual style, as well as his innovative conceptualization, was a product of nineteenth-century autocratic Russia, and of the Romantic age within which he lived and worked.

Kostomarov was, in fact, very much a man of his age. He was a leading representative of the Romantic movement in Ukrainian and Russian historiography and was clearly wedded to the principal assumptions of this movement. In subject matter, methodology, concept, style, and temperament he was a Romantic historian and was acknowledged as such by his contemporaries. A century ago, Volodymyr Antonovych compared him to the great French Romantic historian Augustin Thierry, and the comparison clearly has stood the test of time.<sup>20</sup>

National in his interests, democratic and egalitarian in his beliefs, ethnographic in his method, and engaging in his style, Kostomarov and his works are a monument to his age and place. The terms of reference and the vocabulary of his ideas about Ukrainian and Russian nationality, as well as his methodology, were not those of the twentieth century, nor could they be, but they succeeded in shifting the focus of "Russian" history from the rulers to the ruled and from diplomatics and international relations to social history. In the process, they were a tremendous impetus toward the creation of a new nineteenth-century field: "Ukrainian" history. Thus they were a definite step in the direction of modernity. Both present-day Ukrainian and contemporary Russian historiography owe him a great debt.

## Notes

1. For a long time, the fullest treatments of Kostomarov in English were those by Dmytro Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," in *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US*, vols. V–VI (New York, 1957), pp.

132–45, which was the most serious treatment, and Anatole G. Mazour, *Modern Russian Historiography*, 2d ed. (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958), pp. 152–57, which was more impressionistic. The most recent work on him is Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), which treats his “rehabilitation” on pp. xx–xxi. In Ukrainian see Iu.A. Pinchuk, *Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov* (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1992) and in Russian idem, *Istoricheskie vzgliady N.I. Kostomarova* (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1984). The fullest and most available edition of his collected works is *Sobranie sochinenii*, 21 vols. in 8 bks. (St. Petersburg: Stasiulevich, 1903–6; photoreprinted, The Hague: Europe Printing, 1968). Most of this collection is currently being reprinted under various titles by the Moscow firm Charli, 1994ff.

2. N.I. Kostomarov, *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, ed. V.A. Zamlinskii (Kiev: Izdatel'stvo pri Kievskom Gosudarstvennom Universitete, 1989), pp. 446–47.

3. The original text of Kostomarov's *O prichinakh i kharaktere Unii v zapadnoi Rossii* (Kharkiv, 1841), a few copies of which were preserved, is reprinted in *Naukov-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928), pp. 1–40. Later in life, Kostomarov revised his dissertation and had it printed under the title “Iuzhnaia Rus' v kontse XVI veka.” This work has been recently reprinted in *Istoricheskie proizvedeniia: Avtobiografiia*, pp. 108–97.

4. For the text of Kostomarov's second dissertation, which was entitled *Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii*, see M.I. Kostomarov, *Slov'ians'ka mifologhiia: Vybrani pratsi z folklorystyky i literaturnoznavstva* (Kiev: Lybid, 1994), pp. 44–200.

5. N.I. Kostomarov, *Slavianska mifologiia* (Kiev, 1847) is reprinted in *ibid.*, pp. 201–56.

6. N.I. Kostomarov, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: Kozhanchikov, 1859); revised edition reprinted in Moscow by Charli, 1994. For an analysis of the reception of this work, see Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography*, pp. 72–77.

7. For a recent edition, see N.I. Kostomarov, *Bunt Stenki Razina* (Moscow: Charli, 1994), which also contains a number of other works.

8. See, in particular, N.I. Kostomarov, “O znachenii Velikogo Novgoroda v russkoi istorii,” in *Sobranie sochinenii*, bk. I, vol. I, pp. 199–214; reprinted in the *Bunt Stenki Razina* collection, pp. 239–58, and idem, “Nachalo edinoderzhaviiia drevnei Rusi,” in *Sobranie sochinenii*, bk. V, vol. XII, pp. 5–94.

9. For the most recent edition of Kostomarov's “Dve russkie narodnosti,” see *Bunt Stenki Razina*, pp. 41–83.

10. On Karamzin as a historian, see J.L. Black, “Karamzin's Scheme for Russian History,” in *Eastern Europe: Historical Essays*, ed. H.C. Schlieper (Toronto, 1969), pp. 16–33, and idem, *Nicholas Karamzin and Russian Society* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975).

11. At this point it should be noted that Kostomarov actually attempted to change the Russian terms for the national names during his day. Thus he replaced the term “Little Russians” (*Malorossiany*) with the term “South Russians” (*Iuzhnorussy*), which was a clear break. This might have been an attempt to replace a historical and *legal-administrative* term, which was mostly applied to the lands of the formerly autonomous Hetmanate in Left Bank Ukraine but only very infrequently to Right Bank Ukraine and Galicia, with a new *ethnolinguistic* term which could be equally applied to all lands where the Ukrainian nationality lived. Or alternatively, it might have been an attempt to replace an originally innocuous national term which had gained pejorative overtones

over the course of a century or so, with a fresh new term that would give new *dignitas* to the Ukrainian people. Kostomarov was inconsistent in his use of the term "Ukrainians" (*Ukraintsy*) and in his essay on the two "Russian" nationalities rejected it because he thought that it displayed sharp regional overtones; that is, that it was primarily applicable to what today would be called central Ukraine but not to Galicia and other areas.

Similarly, Kostomarov rejected the traditional term used for "Great Russians" (*Velikorossiany*) and replaced it with the new term *Velikorussy* for which we also use the translation "Great Russians." Perhaps Kostomarov did this simply to parallel his innovative *Iuzhnorussy*. At any rate, the term did catch on and by the end of the nineteenth century there was a lengthy article under this heading in the foremost encyclopedia published in imperial Russia. See D.N. Anuchin, "Velikorussy," *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vol. X (St. Petersburg: Brokgauz-Efron, 1892; reprinted Yaroslavl', 1990), pp. 828–43, who acknowledges Kostomarov's role in the propagation of this term.

12. In fact, I have found only one reference to the Russian "nation" in his entire corpus. This was in a very conservative piece appealing to the ruling circles of imperial Russia to permit the unfettered printing of literature in the Ukrainian language. The appeal was unsuccessful. See N.I. Kostomarov, "Kniaz' Vladimir Monomakh i Kazak Bogdan Khmel'nitskii," in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 149–55.

13. M. Hrushevs'kyi, "Z publitsystychnykh pysan Kostomarova," in *ibid.*, p. x.

14. V.B. Antonovych [Antonovich], "N.I. Kostomarov kak istorik," *Kievskaiia starina*, XXI, 5 (1885): xxx–xxxii.

15. This term was first applied to Kostomarov by A.A. Kotliarevskii (O.O. Kotliarevs'kyi' in Ukrainian) who was reviewing his *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*. See Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography*, p. 74.

16. That is, it did not divide Russian history into two parallel lines: one for the South and another for the North. See N.I. Kostomarov, *Rusaskaia istoriia v zhizneopisaniakh ee glavneishikh deiatelei*, 3 bks. in 7 pts. (St Petersburg: Stasiulevich, 1873–88; photoreprinted Moscow: Kniga, 1990–91). This work, which was dictated from memory to a secretary, also contains many factual inaccuracies.

17. N.I. Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo pesenogo tvorchestva," *Sobranie sochinenii*, bk. VIII, vol. XXI. For a brief discussion of this work in English, see Thomas M. Prymak, "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography in the Nineteenth Century," *Russian History*, XVIII, 2 (1991), 163–86, especially 183–84.

18. Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography*, pp. 175–76. This work, *The Ruin* [Ruina], about the political chaos in Ukraine after the death of Khmel'nyts'kyi, is still the best work on the subject. Even in its revised form it did not really contain any conclusion. For the most recent edition, see N.I. Kostomarov, *Ruina* (Moscow: Charli, 1995).

19. See the discussions in Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography*, pp. 14–15, 68, 72, 84, 195–96.

20. Antonovych, "Kostomarov kak istorik," p. xxvii.