

## Volodymyr Antonovych

### Ukrainian Populist Historiography and the Cultural Politics of Nation Building

*Bohdan Klid*

Volodymyr Antonovych made fundamental contributions to the development of Ukrainian scholarship in the second half of the nineteenth century. As a historian, he wrote pioneering works on the social history of Right-Bank Ukraine and on Lithuanian Rus'. He was, as well, a founder of archeology in Ukraine. As professor of Russian history at St. Vladimir University in Kyiv, he was a mentor for a generation of historians and founded a historical school. Antonovych was also instrumental in the establishment of Ukrainian scholarly publications and institutions. In civic and public life, Antonovych was an acknowledged leader of the populist Ukrainophile intelligentsia in Russia, and his impact on the cultural politics of this group was often decisive.<sup>1</sup>

One could not, however, have easily predicted such a remarkable destiny for Antonovych, for his cultural and social backgrounds were rooted in the *szlachta* (Polish gentry) of Right-Bank Ukraine.<sup>2</sup> It was only following a dramatic intellectual odyssey in search of an identity and commitment to a cause during his years as an adolescent and young man that Antonovych rejected his Polish nationality and social class.

According to official records, Volodymyr Antonovych was born on Jan-

uary 6, 1834, in Makhnivka, county of Berdychiv, Kyiv gubernia.<sup>3</sup> His mother, Monika Górska, was married to Bonifacy Antonowicz. Both were of landless *szlachta* (gentry) background. However, Monika had not lived with her husband for some time when she met Volodymyr's biological father, Janos Dzhidai, the son of a Hungarian revolutionary.<sup>4</sup>

Monika, who was responsible for Antonovych's early education, strived to bring him up as a Polish patriot and gentleman. Dzhidai, who lived in Odesa, took over responsibility for Volodymyr's upbringing in 1844. In Odesa, in addition to receiving a solid secondary-school education, Antonovych did much independent reading, often under the direction of his father, who was a freethinker and democrat. His readings included the works of the eighteenth-century French encyclopedists and philosophers, "under the influence of whom," Antonovych later wrote, "my views were formed."<sup>5</sup>

In 1850, Antonovych moved to Kyiv, where he enrolled in St. Vladimir University Faculty of Medicine. After completing his medical studies, and following his mother's death in 1855, he again enrolled at the university, this time in the Historical-Philological Faculty, from which he graduated in 1860.

While it can be said that Antonovych left Odesa a convinced democrat, his search for an identity, a profession, and a cause to which he could devote his life was completed while at the university. It was during these years that he read what was available in Ukrainian historiography and learned about the Cyrillo-Methodian Society, a secret organization of young Ukrainian intellectuals centered in Kyiv in 1845-47, who advocated the peasantry's liberation from serfdom, popular education, and a democratic union of Slavic states, in which Ukraine would be an autonomous polity.<sup>6</sup>

Antonovych's study of history coincided with the political thaw and initiation of reforms of Alexander II. By the late 1850s, Polish students at Kyiv University had become politically active. Antonovych was widely known at this time as leader of a Polish Ukrainophile student group known as *khlopomany* (peasant lovers).<sup>7</sup>

Antonovych's search for identity also led him to ethnographic fieldwork. Toward the end of the 1850s and in 1860, he and other *khlopomany* spent their summers traveling about the Ukrainian countryside dressed in peasant garb. It was during these "going to the people" excursions that Antonovych became a Ukrainian populist.<sup>8</sup>

The *khlopomany* were radicals within the Polish student body at Kyiv University because their Ukrainophilism was linked to the defense of the peasantry's social interests. This social Ukrainophilism put them on a collision course with the Polish *szlachta*, who had great influence in society and on the local and gubernia administrations. It was not until preparations for the 1866

Polish insurrection had begun in earnest, however, that Antonovych had to face the question of choosing between two causes and identities.

The crisis came in the fall of 1860, when it became clear that the majority of Polish students would support the resurrection of historical Poland—to include the three Right-Bank gubernias of Volhynia, Podillia, and Kyiv—as well as mute their criticisms of the *szlachta* in the interests of national solidarity. Antonovych and his closest followers decided then to break with the Poles and form their own Ukrainian group.<sup>9</sup>

This split coincided with the activation of Ukrainian students at Kyiv University, which was in great part stimulated by and was a reaction to the activities and politics of the Polish students. Claims by Polish students to Right-Bank Ukraine aroused national passions and led to fierce arguments between Ukrainian and Polish students. By the fall of 1861, Ukrainian student groups from Left-Bank Ukraine, who had been involved in promoting popular education as teachers in Sunday schools, merged with Antonovych's *khlopomany* to form a semiclandestine organization—the Kyiv *Hromada* (Commune).<sup>10</sup> Antonovych became a leading member of the Kyiv *Hromada*, which soon became the organizational and intellectual nucleus of the Ukrainian national movement in Russian-ruled Ukraine. He remained active in the politics of the Ukrainian intelligentsia until late in life.

Antonovych formalized his break with Polish society in a polemical article, “My Confession,” which was published in January 1862 in the Ukrainophile journal *Osnova*.<sup>11</sup> Written in response to being labeled a turncoat for betraying the Polish cause in Ukraine, Antonovych not only gave his reasons for defecting, but also expounded on his views on nationality, politics, history, society, and culture. The ideas expressed in the article were accepted by his Ukrainophile contemporaries as a political and cultural credo.

In his essay, Antonovych accused the Poles of aiming to destroy the Ukrainian nation through forced assimilation and of defending the social and economic domination of the *szlachta*, who were unwilling to treat the peasants as humans. He wrote that Poles in Ukraine had but two choices: “Either one was to love the people among whom one lived, become imbued with its interests, . . . compensate the people for the evil done to it,” or leave Ukraine for lands inhabited by ethnic Poles to avoid being labelled “a colonist and a planter.” Because he had chosen to stay in Ukraine and work for the benefit of its people, he concluded: “I am a turncoat and proud of it, just as I would be proud in America if I had turned from a planter into an abolitionist, or in Italy, if I had become enlightened and from a papist had become an honest and hardworking servant of the national cause.”<sup>12</sup>

Antonovych clearly saw his role, then, as a proponent of the national and social liberation of the Ukrainian people, a process he placed within a

European and North American historical context. Similar anticolonial views, as they related to Polish rule in Ukraine, are abundantly found in Antonovych's historiography.

Volodymyr Antonovych's early historical writings were associated with his work in the Kyiv Archeographic Commission, which was established in 1843 in part for political purposes: to collect and publish documents that would show that the Right-Bank lands were not Polish but Russian. Despite this overtly political mandate, the commission became an important institution of Ukrainian scholarship.<sup>13</sup>

Mykola Ivanyshev, a jurist, historian, and chief editor of the Commission, was instrumental in establishing its credentials as a scholarly institution. In the late 1850s, he began publishing the first volumes of *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii (AluZR)*. These collections of thematically organized documents, prefaced by monograph-length introductions, were taken, for the most part, from Right-Bank Ukraine's municipal and court record books (*aktovi knyhy*) of the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries.<sup>14</sup>

Antonovych was Ivanyshev's student, and he began working in the Central Archive of Old Acts at Kyiv University in the late 1850s, where the *aktovi knyhy* were kept.<sup>15</sup> Ivanyshev was also instrumental in hiring Antonovych in 1862 as editor of the third series of *AluZR* on the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks.<sup>16</sup> Following Ivanyshev's resignation as chief editor in 1863, Antonovych was chosen in his place and served in this position to 1880.<sup>17</sup> Ivanyshev's influence on Antonovych was especially evident in the direction of his research and the sources with which he worked. He also influenced Antonovych's views on the peasant communes' traditions of self-government.<sup>18</sup>

The other historian who had a great influence on Antonovych's historiography was Mykola Kostomarov. Kostomarov's sympathetic treatment of the common people and critical approach to rulers, leaders, the traditional upper classes, and states must have confirmed Antonovych's own populist views. Importantly, Kostomarov, in his writings, tied the medieval town assemblies of Rus' (*viche*) to the ideals of democracy and self-government, treated Rus' as a federation, wrote that Ukrainian Cossacks were the continuators of the Kyivan Rus' heritage, and indicated that there was continuity in the national ideals and sociopolitical organizations of Ukrainians from medieval Rus' to the Cossack period.<sup>19</sup> In his writings, Antonovych continued to build on these ideas but went beyond Kostomarov's romanticism towards positivism, which was characterized by a more critical approach to the use of documents and a focus on internal, social history.

During Antonovych's tenure as chief editor of the Kyiv Archeographic

Commission, twelve volumes of *AluZR* were published, seven of which he compiled and edited himself.<sup>20</sup> Antonovych also compiled and published important documents outside of the *AluZR* series.<sup>21</sup> In addition, he wrote articles and reviews, many of them commentaries to documents, most of which appeared in the journal *Kievskaiia starina*.

While working on the commission, Antonovych also prepared to enter the teaching faculty at St. Vladimir's University. In 1870, he was appointed lecturer of Russian history at the university and in 1878, professor.<sup>22</sup> He continued teaching until 1901.

At the university, Antonovych taught courses in medieval and early modern Russian history, some of which were treated as surveys of Ukrainian history. He also introduced specialized courses on sources in Ukrainian history.<sup>23</sup> Antonovych also headed and organized collections of the university's archeological and numismatic museums.<sup>24</sup>

Antonovych's greatest legacy as a professor was that he was a mentor to a group of historians who made valuable contributions in Ukrainian and Belarusian historiography. Antonovych encouraged his students to write regional histories, which, taken together, created the basis for a synthesis of medieval Ukrainian history.<sup>25</sup> It was not fortuitous that his best student, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, wrote the first scholarly synthesis of medieval and early modern Ukrainian history, the ten-volume *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*.<sup>26</sup>

Antonovych also wrote popular history. In 1883, he co-authored a collection of biographical sketches of historical figures of Ukraine.<sup>27</sup> In 1897, a popular history of the Ukrainian Cossacks, based on a series of private lectures he delivered to students at his home in 1895–96, was published in Austrian-ruled Ukraine.<sup>28</sup> Antonovych also promoted the publication of writings on Ukrainian history in Austrian-ruled Galicia in the semipopular series *Rus'ka istorychna biblioteka*.<sup>29</sup>

In addition to his historical writings, Antonovych co-authored an introduction and commentaries to a collection of historical songs of the Ukrainian people, which remains an important source in Ukrainian ethnography.<sup>30</sup> In the 1870s, he began archeological work and wrote as well in the fields of historical geography and numismatics.<sup>31</sup>

Antonovych also promoted the establishment of scholarly institutions and combined these activities with the achievement of Ukrainophile goals. In 1873, the Kyiv *Hromada* succeeded in chartering the Southwestern Section of the Russian Geographical Society, which, during its brief period of existence to 1876, did much to promote Ukrainian scholarship.<sup>32</sup> In 1882, Antonovych was instrumental in establishing the outstanding journal of Ukrainian studies, *Kievskaiia starina*.

Tsarist suppression of Ukrainophile activities, however—the first time in

1863, and the second in 1876—made it virtually impossible to build scholarly institutions in Russian Ukraine that would promote Ukrainian studies. To circumvent this, Antonovych and other *Hromada* members, beginning in the 1870s, began to establish close ties to and aid their compatriots in Austrian-ruled Galicia to build Ukrainian institutions there. In the late 1880s, Antonovych was instrumental in negotiating cultural concessions for Ukrainians from Polish ruling circles in Galicia.<sup>33</sup> Among the concessions was an agreement to establish a chair of East European (de facto Ukrainian) history at L'viv University, which was filled by Hrushevs'kyi in 1894. He was also involved in reform of the Galician-based Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1892, turning that institution into an unofficial Ukrainian academy of sciences.

#### Antonovych's Philosophy of History

While his scholarly work became more focused on politically neutral topics in archeology and numismatics toward the end of his career, Antonovych never lost interest in contemporary affairs and could never be labeled a detached scholar. His engagement was reflected not only in Ukrainophile activities but also in his historical writings.

In his inaugural lecture as professor of Russian history in 1878, Antonovych tried to square the circle between engagement and objectivity in historiography. The historian, he wrote, should strive for objectivity, maintaining a critical view of the past based on a thorough study of facts. Although objectivity was most difficult to achieve when writing on one's own nation, even strong patriotic feelings could be reconciled with objectivity, Antonovych continued, as long as these were based on conscious convictions. "I am convinced," he wrote, "that, remaining objective, rejecting a priori conceptions and passions, the historian not only does not repudiate his rights to his personal convictions and sympathies, but, on the contrary, forges and fixes them on a solid factual background by way of strict scholarly analysis."<sup>34</sup>

Antonovych linked the study of the past with patriotic civic activity in the present: "Each educated representative of the Russian nation in the southern Russian lands [Ukraine] will for a long time to come continue—through peaceful, civic activities—that struggle which his forefathers began with arms in their hands. This last episode of the people's struggle will end that much sooner and will be that much more successful the more each Russian citizen of that land will be filled with the conviction of the righteousness of his nation's cause, based on a conscientious study of the historical fate of his people."<sup>35</sup>

For Antonovych, then, the study and writing of history were inseparably linked to one's convictions and served as a guide to civic action. According to Hrushevs'kyi, Antonovych's scholarly interests were not easily separable from his social and political interests. Impulses for scholarly work came largely from them, and in return, his scholarly work confirmed those views he held on contemporary affairs.<sup>36</sup>

In his writings on Ukraine, Antonovych interpreted events and the actions of individuals and social groups in the context of his views on universal history, which he viewed in quasi-Hegelian terms as the development of certain principles or leading ideas, including their interrelations and struggles with one another. He believed that each nation was guided in its actions through history by its own leading idea. Following the appearance of this idea on the historical stage, it was subjected to various influences; at times it was thwarted, at others it developed rapidly and flowered. The coming to fruition of this idea was the historical process itself, which was also related to achieving consciousness.

Antonovych maintained that the carriers of leading ideas were social groups, not individuals. This was why social history—to Antonovych the study of social groups and their interrelations—was so important. Antonovych believed that the social life of a nation was dependent on the leading idea, but also on the consciousness of the people, their cultural level and education. Only after the people had reached a high level of culture, including a well-developed system of popular education, could the leading idea be realized. Attempts to implement the idea prior to this would inevitably end in failure.<sup>37</sup>

### **Antonovych's Interpretations of Ukraine's Past**

In his writings on Ukraine, Antonovych based his conclusions on the thesis that the communal principle was the dominant or leading idea in its history. According to Antonovych, the communal principle in Ukraine was based on the ideas of participatory democracy and equality of social status. Throughout their history, Ukrainians were never able to fully realize their ideal, but always, even if instinctively, moved toward it.<sup>38</sup>

In his writings, Antonovych tried to identify this idea as it manifested itself in history. In the Kyivan Rus' era, the communal principle was manifested in the *viche*, in religious life by the election of church officials, and in the village communes by people's assemblies or courts (*kopni sudy*). The communal idea, Antonovych concluded, was most vividly expressed in the Cossack period. The Ukrainian nation saw the fulfilment of their ideals in Cossackdom, especially in the Zaporozhian Sich, where communal tradi-

tions were most closely kept and where the people believed that the ideal social and political order existed. People there could put into practice "their ancient *viche* instincts: here all were free, equal in rights, [and] here there were no estates other than the Cossack [estate]. All positions, both secular and religious, were held by elected people, and all matters were decided by the will of the assembly—the Cossack *rada* or the village commune."<sup>39</sup>

According to Antonovych, there were three forces within medieval Rus' that struggled among themselves to assert preeminence: the commune, the prince's retinue (*druzhyina*), and the prince himself. The prince's retinue was a force diametrically opposed to the commune, and it represented the power of the individual and his striving to rise above others. The struggle between these two groups and principles, in their various forms, constituted, according to Antonovych, the main theme of Ukraine's history.<sup>40</sup>

According to Antonovych, the Mongol conquest froze Ukraine's social development but did not destroy communal ways of life. Wealthier aristocrats fled central Ukrainian lands to the north and west, and Ukraine's "center of life" was transferred to Galicia and Volhynia. With some exceptions, only the communal settlements remained in the central regions. While they paid a tribute to the Mongols, the communes, Antonovych concluded, still retained their rights of self-government.<sup>41</sup>

Antonovych was a pioneer in the study of Lithuanian rule, which he viewed as benevolent towards Ukrainian communal life. Resistance to the Lithuanian takeover of Ukraine in the fourteenth century, he noted, came only from the princes and aristocrats; the communes were either indifferent or welcomed Lithuanian rule.<sup>42</sup>

Antonovych wrote approvingly that the Lithuanian state at first fell under Rus' influence. Although Lithuania had adopted a feudal military-political structure to fight off German crusaders, Antonovych noted that Old Rus' traditions of equality were still dominant. This ideal fit in well in the new order, which allowed for social mobility, rewarding gifted individuals and state service. Communes continued to govern themselves through their assemblies, and towns retained rights of self-government until the Magdeburg laws were adopted. In the villages, communes governed themselves and were able to retain land ownership, which rights were sanctioned by law. The principle of self-government continued to exist within religious institutions as well, where the hierarchy was chosen at assemblies (*sobory*).<sup>43</sup>

Although he treated Lithuanian rule sympathetically, Antonovych noted that the state was based on a military-feudal principle, which came into conflict with the old communal order, largely over landownership.<sup>44</sup> Conflicts grew more acute following Lithuania's union with Poland. Antonovych concluded that Prince Jogaila's (Jagiello's) acceptance of the Polish crown and his at-

tempts to introduce the Polish political, religious, and social order into Lithuanian Rus' contradicted normal development and forced the Ukrainian people to waste its energies defending its "national spirit."<sup>45</sup>

In his analyses of Lithuania and Poland, Antonovych distinguished sharply between the two. The Polish knights evolved out of the old Slavic commune, and therefore accepted the idea of the equality of its members, but combined this with the Germanic feudal–aristocratic idea in its relations to the nonmilitary estates, which Polish historians labelled *szlachta* democracy.<sup>46</sup> The Polish political and social order in the mid-sixteenth century, he concluded, was characterized by the equality of members of the *szlachta*, their control over the monarchy and unconditional powers over the peasantry.<sup>47</sup> The dominant principle behind the organization of the Lithuanian state was German feudalism. A noble estate was formed, but distinctions between the lower orders of the nobility and the rest of society were not rigidly cast.<sup>48</sup>

Antonovych stressed that there was a great difference in the position of the peasantry in the two states. In Poland the peasantry had been enserfed, whereas in Lithuania, peasants remained, by and large, owners of land and free into the sixteenth century. These differences constituted one of the major distinctions between the two states prior to the 1569 Union of Lublin. With its promulgation, the peasantry, unable to fight enserfment on the political level, fled to open steppe lands.<sup>49</sup>

Under Lithuanian rule, because of the constant dangers from Tatar raids, members of communes took up arms and became skillful warriors. Lithuanian princes made arrangements for tribute and military services from the communes; in return, communes received lands and rights of self-government. Peasants fleeing from Polish landowners strengthened the communes. These free, partially militarized communes, Antonovych concluded, were the first Ukrainian Cossack communities. They eventually received broad powers of self-government, including the right to elect their own officers.<sup>50</sup>

Whereas Antonovych speculated that the Lithuanian and Ukrainian principles could have become reconciled with one another, this certainly was not possible between the Polish and Ukrainian leading ideas. Following the Union of Lublin, which led to the incorporation of Lithuanian–Ukrainian lands into Poland and the introduction of Polish law, Ukrainian social structures were threatened. The Cossack estate was not recognized in Poland, which forced the Cossacks into opposition. Noblemen began to enserf peasants, which led to their fleeing to the steppes. Communes also lost the right of self-government when their members became enserfed. Tensions increased when the Polish crown gave lands to the *szlachta* in Ukraine that were already settled by Cossacks and free peasants.<sup>51</sup>

Following the Union of Brest of 1596, a religious dimension was added to the struggle between the Cossack and *szlachta* estates. The Ukrainian people, Antonovych concluded, opposed the union because it changed the church from one controlled by the community to one that was autocratic.<sup>52</sup>

In its essence, Antonovych viewed the struggle between the Ukrainian Cossacks and the Polish *szlachta* as one between the democratic-communal and aristocratic-individualistic principles. Early Cossack risings of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were unsuccessful because they were fought for Cossack rights only. Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's revolt succeeded because he called the enserfed peasants to arms, promised them Cossack status, and agreed to chase the *szlachta* out of Ukraine.<sup>53</sup>

Antonovych explained the inability of Ukrainians to realize their communal ideals following Khmel'nyts'kyi's victories over the Poles largely by cultural factors. One could not blame Khmel'nyts'kyi, Antonovych wrote, for not being able to establish institutions and laws in line with the people's communal aspirations. Khmel'nyts'kyi, he concluded, was a man of his time and a product of the low cultural level of the people. The people followed him and rose to drive out the hated *szlachta*, but were not ready for political life, and did not as yet understand what could be built in place of the old system. They were, therefore, not able to gain their rights or implement their ideals.<sup>54</sup> Antonovych continued that one could understand, therefore, why at critical moments Khmel'nyts'kyi was indecisive, and why he failed to establish an independent state.<sup>55</sup>

True to his populist convictions, Antonovych was critical of the hetman on one crucial point: his treatment of the peasantry and rank-and-file Cossacks. When the revolt began, the peasantry soon swelled the ranks of the Cossacks. Antonovych wrote that Khmel'nyts'kyi instituted "an outright injustice" in ordering these new Cossacks to return to their previous dependent status following the uprising.<sup>56</sup>

This criticism raises the question of Antonovych's overall treatment of the Cossacks. While he idealized the Cossacks, Antonovych also recognized that they constituted a separate estate, some of whose members, especially the officers, promoted their own narrow, estate-based interests, opposing those of the commoners.

In Antonovych's view, the estate interests of the Cossack officers were assimilated from the *szlachta*. While the officers fought with the commoners against the *szlachta*, their aim was to become a landowning estate based on the Polish model. While the commoners rejected a society of estates, their low cultural development prevented them from formulating their goals concretely.<sup>57</sup>

The absence of a high level of culture, Antonovych postulated, was the

underlying reason why the “individual egoism” of estate interests held sway over the communal cause among the Cossacks. He noted the concrete manifestations of this “egoism” in the attempts of Cossack officers to obtain *szlachta* privileges, in the actions of government administrators to seize lands for themselves, and in the attempts to force ordinary Cossacks into the commoner’s estate in order to enserf them.<sup>58</sup>

In comments on the aftermath of the Khmel’nyts’kyi period, known as “The Ruin,” Antonovych again stressed cultural factors. Soon after Khmel’nyts’kyi’s death, two parties crystallized in Ukraine. The first wanted to build a society on the Polish model, form a privileged estate like the *szlachta* from the officers, and join a reconstituted Polish federal state. The people opposed this goal. However, the second party, based on support of the rank-and-file Cossacks, soon abandoned them and decided to emulate the first group, but with the support of the Muscovite state. Battles between the two were fought not over principles, but for or against individuals and their interests. These struggles were typical of a low level of cultural development, where “egoistic forces” held sway over the common cause. “The Ruin,” Antonovych concluded, was the result of the low level of culture among the Ukrainian masses and its leaders.<sup>59</sup>

During “The Ruin,” Cossack officers began to coalesce into a noble estate. Antonovych viewed this as a negative phenomenon, emphasizing the dishonest and rapacious nature of the process, such as when Cossack officers seized lands from ordinary Cossacks and peasants and then had these confiscations confirmed by the government. The new Cossack nobility, he concluded, neglected to defend the autonomy of the country and the democratic wishes of the people, caring only for their own personal interests.<sup>60</sup>

Antonovych placed great weight on the cultural factor in history to interpret events and evaluate the actions of the commoners as well as of great men in Ukrainian history. In his judgments of individuals, Antonovych always sided with those whom he felt promoted the well-being of the commoners. This is evident in his comparison of two Ukrainian leaders of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries—the Cossack colonel Semen Palii and Hetman Ivan Mazepa.

Despite his characterization of Mazepa as a sincere patriot and talented politician, Antonovych’s assessment of him was ambivalent. He noted that Mazepa was educated in Poland, where his social and political ideals were formed. Thus, Mazepa based his support on the Cossack officers and promoted the process of their transformation into a landowning nobility.<sup>61</sup>

Mazepa’s policies resulted in many peasants and rank-and-file Cossacks fleeing to Right-Bank territories, where independent Cossack regiments were being established, the best-known under Colonel Palii. These regi-

ments were, Antonovych approvingly noted, organized on democratic principles, and their leaders "had as their goal not the enrichment of themselves but the people."<sup>62</sup> According to Antonovych, Palii was the last Cossack leader who achieved solidarity with the people's social and political goals, and was honored by the people: whereas Palii was called "Cossack father," Mazepa was hated.<sup>63</sup>

Following the suppression of the Cossacks in Right-Bank Ukraine, popular armed resistance to Polish rule continued in the form of the *haidamaka* uprisings. On the one hand, Antonovych saw this as a new form of the Cossack movement. On the other hand, he recognized its negative qualities that manifested themselves in vengeful, arbitrary, violent acts. But, Antonovych concluded, one could not expect much from the masses because of their low cultural development, which was a consequence of *szlachta* policies.<sup>64</sup>

Although critical of the *haidamaky*, Antonovych placed the blame for the uprisings squarely on the shoulders of the *szlachta*. They were, he concluded, captives of their own narrow estate, religious, and national interests, too egoistic and shortsighted to make concessions to the people and open the door to progress in Poland. Antonovych concluded that by denying all human and civic rights to the masses, the *szlachta* brought upon themselves a great tragedy.<sup>65</sup>

The source of the tragedy, Antonovych insisted, was to be found in the abnormal structure of Polish society. The peasant masses were enserfed, deprived of land and all elementary rights, and exposed daily to abuses by the *szlachta*. In addition, the Polish state persecuted their religion and did not provide for any type of elementary education. The masses, then, were ready to explode at any time. This outburst, in the absence of civic development and a humane education, expressed itself in extreme cruelty and bloody acts. While the masses could be excused for this violence, Antonovych concluded, the cruel, repressive measures taken by the *szlachta* against the rebellious peasantry could not.<sup>66</sup>

Antonovych's scholarly writings on Ukrainian history ended with the *haidamaka* uprisings. However, in private lectures given to students at his home in 1895–96 which were later published, he commented on more recent and contemporary developments.

Antonovych stressed that the characteristic trait of eighteenth-century history was the rebirth of stateless nations. This process, Antonovych believed, took place in a way that was universally valid, the first step being the demand for cultural rights in order to protect the emerging nation's culture by law. The first nationality to begin this struggle among the Slavs were the Czechs, from whom the movement spread to other Slavs.<sup>67</sup>

In Ukraine, the Cyrillo-Methodians were the first to combine cultural

tasks with political goals, although weakly and unclearly stated. With the introduction of a constitutional regime in Austrian Ukraine, Ukrainians there gained the opportunity to fight legally for their national rights. Antonovych predicted that the winning of national rights in Russian Ukraine would come later, but that the national movement would spread among the masses and cultural rights would be won. Self-interest, he noted, was forcing the great powers to make concessions to the emerging nationalities whenever they raised demands grounded in contemporary, universally valid, progressive principles.<sup>68</sup>

#### Antonovych's Views on the State

Antonovych's critical views of elites were carried forward in his treatment of the state. He was especially critical of the role of the Polish state and of Polish historiography, which had failed to incorporate European progressive ideas and to be critical of its own past.<sup>69</sup>

Antonovych's critiques exposed the imperial ideology underlying the works of most Polish writers on Ukraine. These writers, he wrote, believed that the Polish state, supported by the *szlachta*, had a great cultural mission in Ukraine: to civilize the Rus' regions that fell within Polish borders. In a devastating indictment of this thesis, Antonovych concluded that the Polish *szlachta* "did not represent culture and order, but sooner the backwardness and the cultural aberration of Polish society itself."<sup>70</sup>

Hrushevs'kyi wrote that Antonovych held a negative attitude toward even the idea of the state. It was based on: historical Ukrainian opposition to domination by foreign states; assimilation of the traditional distrust of the Polish *szlachta* toward a strong state power; opposition to the authoritarian Russian state that was shared by many liberals and radicals of the Russian intelligentsia; and the ideas of the Cyrillo-Methodians and Russian Slavophiles, especially of the opposition of state and society.<sup>71</sup>

Hrushevs'kyi's conclusions seem one-sided. Antonovych was certainly skeptical of state power and critical of the role the state had played as an instrument of traditional elites, yet, he also expressed the desire that the state play a positive role in history.

In a critique of Polish writings on Ukraine, Antonovych wrote that the state represented one of the higher forms of public life. Contemporary European states were institutions that protected not only the material well-being of society but moral values as well, such as freedom of conscience and full intellectual development. The state, he argued, should be judged in light of the presence or lack of just and impartial relations toward its citizens, without regard to social group, nationality, or an individual's position in society.<sup>72</sup>

Antonovych should not be viewed, therefore, as implacably anti-statist, but rather as a severe critic of the state, which is compatible with his uncompromising views on elites. His attitude toward the state could be described as ambivalent.

In a polemical essay published posthumously in 1928, Antonovych postulated the possibility of the existence of a federal multinational state, provided that state would guarantee universal rights and defend the equality, including the national equality, of its citizens. A federal state, he noted, would be weak if the dominant nationality took on the role of conqueror and proprietor towards others, and tried to realize the utopian goal of forcibly assimilating the other peoples within that state.<sup>73</sup>

Antonovych's attitude toward the formation of an independent Ukrainian state was also ambivalent. Hrushevs'kyi wrote that Antonovych, having negative views on the state, found it easier to accept the statelessness of the Ukrainian nation in the past as well as in the present as a positive trait. Ukrainians were, in his view, not interested in forming a state of their own. This anti-statist position, Hrushevs'kyi wrote, ran through all Antonovych's writings, in which he counterposed a free and vibrant society of communes to state institutions, which strangled and oppressed society.<sup>74</sup>

Indeed, Antonovych did not believe that the nonexistence of Ukrainian statehood in the past was important. He also did not regard the establishment of an independent state as a paramount task of the Ukrainian movement. Questions of cultural standards and of cultural tasks were of far greater importance to him.

Antonovych was consistent in applying exacting standards toward Ukraine's elites and their state-building efforts. He exhibited little sympathy for Ukraine's most talented political leaders, such as Prince Danylo of the Galician-Volhynian principality, or Hetman Mazepa, because they went against the masses.<sup>75</sup> Antonovych praised the Cossacks as defenders of the national rights of Ukraine as long as they also defended the principle of the equality of its members and encouraged the liberation of the peasant masses from serfdom. However, the moment that the Cossacks, especially the officers, began to build a new social order and state based on the social and economic privileges of the Cossack officers, he turned from being an apologist of the Cossacks into their critic.<sup>76</sup>

As an antithesis to the idea of the state, Antonovych proposed the idea of the *hromada* and the ideals for which it stood in Ukrainian history. For Antonovych and other Ukrainian populists, the ideas of wide-ranging democracy and social equality of the historical Ukrainian communes served as a source of inspiration and guide for their activities as leaders of and participants in the Ukrainian national movement.<sup>77</sup>

## Conclusions

In his writings, Antonovych expressed views that were clearly anti-imperial and anticolonial. Yet, he was able to work professionally in imperial Russia's scholarly and quasi-scholarly government institutions and used them to promote and build Ukrainian scholarship. Antonovych's scholarly work and activities were tied especially closely to two imperial institutions: St. Vladimir University and the Kyiv Archeographic Commission. His relationship with Russian authorities and the Russian state, however, was never more than a marriage of convenience for him and was never free from tension. The authorities distrusted him as a known Ukrainophile, and there were occasions when he was nearly relieved of his duties as professor or exiled.<sup>78</sup>

One must agree with Hrushevs'kyi's assessment that the inspiration and source of Antonovych's scholarly work lay in his sincere love of the Ukrainian people, with whose revolutionary, albeit still instinctive and elemental uprisings against feudalism and privilege he sympathized. He idealized what he saw as their high cultural and social instincts and their struggle for the establishment of a just society. He was so captivated by these enviable characteristics that he was ready to forgive this nation its less admirable characteristics, both in the present and in the past, which he saw as caused by their low level of consciousness, culture, and education. All the defeats suffered by the Ukrainian people he also attributed to their lack of cultural and political education.<sup>79</sup>

Antonovych can be classified as a Ukrainian populist historian in a broader East European populist school of historiography: in Polish historiography it was represented by Joachim Lelewel; in Russian historiography by Afanasii Shchapov and Vasili Semevskii; in Ukrainian historiography by his predecessor and older contemporary Mykola Kostomarov, as well as by his contemporary Oleksander Lazarevs'kyi.<sup>80</sup>

In Ukrainian historiography Antonovych can be seen as a transitional figure. The ideas of romantic populism clearly influenced his writings, but so did the writings of the French rationalists and encyclopedists, and he was also strongly influenced by positivism.<sup>81</sup> Both Antonovych and Lazarevs'kyi represented a new generation of historians, reared on rationalism and positivism, who used statistics, paid attention to economic developments, and based their work on strict documentation.<sup>82</sup>

Within the framework of Russian historiography, Antonovych was a regional historian. However, in Ukrainian historiography he is known as the creator of a national-democratic conception of Ukrainian history. In Antonovych's philosophy of history, the historical process was a struggle between ideas, in which nations, largely through social groups, were the

carriers of these ideas. In many of his works, Antonovych tried to show that the Ukrainian people had their own national ideal for which they fought throughout their history.<sup>83</sup> The Ukrainian historical process, therefore, was an organic one of centuries-long duration, centered around a leading idea.<sup>84</sup>

As a leader of the Ukrainian populist intelligentsia, Antonovych saw that his primary task and that of his contemporaries in the Kyiv *Hromada* was to continue and participate in the movement to realize these ideals. This involved, first and foremost, the achievement of cultural goals, which explains why *hromada* members focused largely on cultural work. In the early 1860s, they participated in activities linked to popular education, such as teaching in Sunday schools or preparing popular educational materials. When tsarist authorities banned the use of Ukrainian in popular education and took repressive measures against the *hromady*, the members continued their cultural work in scholarship, in teaching, in literature and in other ways, such as work in the *zemstva*. In the evenings, *hromada* members, often at Antonovych's home, worked with students on the compilation of a Ukrainian dictionary and a historico-geographic dictionary.

The achievement of cultural goals, then, was the foundation that was needed for Ukrainians to be able to realize their cherished communal ideals. Statehood, in and of itself, Antonovych believed, was not a goal that Ukrainians should strive for as important. These policies, and their underlying ideology, were later labeled as apolitical Ukrainophilism by younger generations of Ukrainian activists and intellectuals.

Yet Antonovych's cultural work as well as that of his compatriots had political consequences and did lay the groundwork for Ukrainian statehood. The Ukrainian national movement, which Antonovych had tried to keep focused on cultural work, was becoming a mass movement by the early twentieth century, complete with political parties, which advocated autonomy and even independence for Ukraine. Following the 1905 revolution and shortly before his death in 1908, Antonovych became convinced that the time had come to support the political struggle.<sup>85</sup> Fittingly, when the Russian Empire began to collapse in 1917, it was his best student and Ukraine's foremost historian, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, who emerged to lead Ukraine to autonomy and then independence.

## Notes

1. The best study on Antonovych is still D. Doroshenko, *Volodymyr Antonovych: Ioho zhyttia i naukova ta hromads'ka diial'nist'* (Prague: Vydavnytstvo Iurii Tyshchenka, 1942). See also V. Ulianovs'kyi, "Syn Ukrainy (Volodymyr Antonovych: hromadianyn, uchenyi, liudyna)," in V.B. Antonovych, *Moia spovid': Vybrani istorychni ta publitsychni tvory* (Kyiv: Lybid', 1995), pp. 5–76. For a Polish conser-

vative view, see Fr. Rawita-Gawroński, *Włodzimierz Antonowicz: Zarys jego działalności społeczno-politycznej i historycznej* (Lviv: Gebethner i Ska w Krakowie, 1912).

2. See the two studies on the Polish nobility in Right-Bank Ukraine by Daniel Beauvois: *Le Noble, le serf, et le révizor: La noblesse polonaise entre le tsarisme et les masses ukrainiennes (1831–1863)* (Paris: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines, 1985); and *La bataille de la terre en Ukraine 1863–1914: Les Polonais et les conflits socio-ethniques* (Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1993).

3. One of Antonovych's students, Vasyl' Liaskorons'kyi, wrote that Antonovych was actually born in Chomobyl' in 1830. See his "V.B. Antonovich (Nekrolog)," *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, 1908, New Series, Part 15, pp. 51–52, note 1.

4. V. Antonovych, "Memuary," in his *Tvory*, vol. 1 (only volume published) (Kyiv: Vseukraïns'ka Akademiia Nauk, 1932), p. 10.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 40.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 60–61. On the Cyrillo-Methodian Society, see George S.N. Luckyj, *Young Ukraine: The Brotherhood of St. Cyril and Methodius, 1845–1847* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1991).

7. On the activities of Polish students at the University of St. Volodymyr in the second half of the 1850s, and especially on the *khlopomany*, see chapter 2 of my Ph.D. dissertation, *Volodymyr Antonovych: The Making of a Ukrainian Populist Activist and Historian* (University of Alberta, 1992), pp. 45–66.

8. Antonovych described his newly found appreciation of the virtues of the peasantry as follows: "The people appeared before us not as described by the *szlachta*, but as they really were. We noticed their very strong natural logic and highly developed popular ethics, which manifested itself in their willingness to help and in a friendly attitude to all who were in need." Antonovych, "Memuary," pp. 45–46.

9. See B. Poznanskii, "Vospominaniia," *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*, 1913, no. 3, pp. 20–21.

10. On the events leading up to the formation of the Kyiv *Hromada*, see chapter 4 of my Ph.D. dissertation, *Volodymyr Antonovych*, pp. 119–75.

11. "Moia ispoved'" was reprinted in Antonovych, *Tvory*, pp. 100–15.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 113–14.

13. On the commission, officially called *Vremennaia Komissiia dlia razbora drevnikh aktov pri Kievskom, Volynskom i Podol'skom General Gubernatore*, see O.I. Zhurba, *Kyivs'ka arkhheohrafichna komisiia 1843–1921* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1993).

14. On Ivanyshev, see A.V. Romanovich-Slavatinskii, *Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' N.D. Ivanisheva* (St. Petersburg, 1876). Ivanyshev's greatest legacies to Ukrainian historiography were that he organized the gathering and preservation of *aktovi knyhy* as well as devised the publications plan for *AluZR*, based largely on these documents.

15. See I. Kamanin, "Trudy V.B. Antonovicha po istorii Kozachestva," *Chteniia v Istoricheskome Obshchestve Nestora-letopistsa*, 1909, book 21, section 1, no. 1–2, p. 44.

16. See M. Tkachenko, "Arkheohrafichni studii Volodymyra Antonovycha," *Ukrains'kyi arkhheohrafichniy zbirnyk*, 1930, vol. 3, p. 332.

17. Antonovych was relieved of his position in 1882 for Ukrainophile activities. See the September 16, 1882, memorandum of M.V. Iuzefovych to Governor-General Drentel'n in Zhurba, *Kyivs'ka arkhheohrafichna komisiia*, pp. 153–54.

18. See N.D. Ivanishev, "O drevnikh sel'skikh obshchinakh v iugozapadnoi Rossii, *Russkaia beseda*, 1857, vol. 3, book 7, section 2, pp. 1–57. Antonovych was also influenced by the Polish historian Joachim Lelewel, who wrote much on the Slavic commune. See M. Hrushevs'kyi, "Z sotsiial'no-natsional'nykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," *Ukraina*, 1928, book 5, pp. 9, 12, note 1.

19. On Kostomarov, see Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).

20. These volumes were: *Akty ob unii i sostoianii pravoslavnoi tserkvi v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii vo 2-oi polovine XVII iv XVIII st. (1648–1798)* (Kyiv, 1871); *Akty o kazakakh, 1500–1648 gg.* (Kyiv, 1863); *Akty o kazakakh, 1679–1716* (Kyiv, 1868); *Akty o gaidamakakh (1700–1768)* (Kyiv, 1876); *Akty o proiskhozhdenii shliakhetskikh rodov v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii (1442–1760 gg.)* (Kyiv, 1867); *Akty otносиashchiesia k istorii gorodov i mestecek v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii (1432–1798 gg.)* (Kyiv, 1869); *Akty o krestianakh v XVIII st. (1700–1799)* (Kyiv, 1870).

Following his dismissal as chief editor, Antonovych completed two more volumes: *Akty o zaselenii Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii (1386–1700 gg.)* (Kyiv, 1886), Introduction by M.F. Vladimirskii-Budanov; *Akty o mniomom krest'ianskom vosstanii v Iugo-Zapadnom kraie v 1789 g.* (Kyiv, 1902).

21. Some of the more important are: volume IV of *Letopisi Samuila Velichka* (Kyiv, 1864); *Gramoty velikikh kniazei Litovskikh s 1390 po 1569 god* (Kyiv, 1868) (co-compiled and edited); *Sbornik materialov dlia istoricheskoi topografii Kieva i ego okresnostei* (Kyiv, 1874) (Sections I and III); *Sbornik letopisei, otносиashchikhsia k istorii iu.-z. Rossii* (Kyiv, 1888); *Memuary, otносиashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi Rusi* (Kyiv, 1896).

22. These appointments followed the successful defense of his M.A. thesis, "Posledniia vremena kazachestva na pravoi storone Dnepra po aktam c 1679 po 1716 god," and Ph.D. dissertation, "Ocherk istorii Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo do smerti Ol'gerda." See Ulianovs'kyi, "Syn Ukrainy," pp. 26–27.

23. Some of these courses appeared as lithographic editions of student notes: *Istoriia Litovskoi Rusi* (1877 and 1882); *Istoriia Galitskoi Rusi* (1879); *Istochniki dlia istorii Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (1884).

24. See V. Danylevych, "Prof. V.B. Antonovych ta Arkheolohichni Muzei I. N. O.," *Zapysky Kyivs'koho Instytutu Narodn'oi Osvity*, 1928, book 3, pp. 7–20, and Fedir Sliusarenko, "Numizmatychna pratsia prof. V.B. Antonovycha," *Pratsi Ukrain'skoho Istorychno-Filologichnoho Tovyarystva v Prazi*, vol. I, 1939, p. 190.

25. The regional histories written under Antonovych's direction by his students resulted in a series of monographs on Ukrainian and Belarusian lands of the Kyivan and Lithuanian Rus' periods. These include works by: O. Andriiashev (Volhynian lands); D. Bahalii (Siverian lands); V. Danylevych (Pins'k lands); M. Dashkevych (lands ruled by the Bolokhovian princes); M. Dovnar-Zapol'skyi (Krivechian and Dregovichian lands); P. Holubovs'kyi (Siverian lands), M. Hrushevs'kyi (Kyiv lands); O. Hrushevs'kyi (Turov-Pins'k lands); V. Liaskorons'kyi (Pereiaslav lands); I. Lynnychenko (Galician lands); N. Molchanovs'kyi (Podillian lands).

26. On Hrushevs'kyi, see Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

27. V.B. Antonovich and V.A. Bets, *Istoricheskie deiateli iugo-zapadnoi Rossii v biografiakh i portretakh*, no. 1 (Kyiv, 1883). He also co-authored a series of popular lectures with P.Ia. Iarmashevskii, *Publichnye lektzii po geologii i istorii Kieva* (Kyiv, 1897).

28. *Besidy pro chasy kozats'ki na Ukraini* (Chernivtsi, 1897).

29. See Oleksander Barvins'kyi, *Spomyny z moho zhyttia*, vol. 2 (L'viv: Ia. Orenshtein, 1913), pp. 317–18.

30. *Istoricheskie pesni malorusskogo naroda s obiasneniiami V. Antonovicha i M. Dragomanova*, 2 vols. (Kyiv, 1874–75).

31. In the 1890s, he completed three important archeological studies: *Raskopki v strane drevlian* (St. Petersburg, 1893); *Arkheologicheskaiia karta Kievskoi gubernii* (Moscow, 1895); and *Arkheologicheskaiia karta Volynskoi gub. s kartoi, ukazatelem imen geograficheskim, predmetnym* (Moscow, 1900). For an assessment of Antonovych as archeologist, see Valeriia Kozlovs'ka, "Znachinnia prof. V.B. Antonovych v

ukrains'kii arkheolohii," *Zapysky Vseukrains'koho arkheolohichnoho komitetu*, 1931, vol. 1, pp. ix–xxi. On Antonovych's work in historical geography, see Leonyd Dobrovol'skyi, "Pratsia V.B. Antonovycha na nyvi istorychnoi heohrafi," *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu Ukrains'koi akademii nauk*, 1926, book 9, pp. 185–207. On his work in numismatics, see Fedir Sliusarenko, "Numizmatychna pratsia prof. V.B. Antonovycha," *Pratsi Ukrains'koho Istorychno-Filologichnoho Tovarystva v Prazi*, 1939, vol. 2, pp. 183–91.

32. On the Kyiv branch of the Russian Geographical Society, see Fedir Savchenko, *Zaborona ukrainstva 1876 r.*, rep. ed. (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970).

33. On the Polish-Ukrainian compromise, see Ihor Chornovil, "Pol'sko-ukrains'ka uhoda 1890–1894 rr.: geneza, perebih podii, naslidky" (Candidate's dissertation, Institut ukrainoznavstva im. I Kryp'iakevycha Natsional'noi akademii nauk Ukrainy, 1994).

34. "Vstupna leksiia V. Antonovycha, vstupyvshy na kafedru rus'koi istorii," *Tsentral'na naukova biblioteka*, Fond 1, no. 7895, l. 6.

35. *Ibid.*, ll. 9–10.

36. Mykh. Hrushevs'kyi, "Volodymyr Antonovych: Osnovni idei ioho tvorchosty i diial'nosty," in Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Volodymyr Bonifatiiovych Antonovych 1834–1908–1984* (New York: LOGOS, 1985), pp. 13–14.

37. See V. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, 3d ed. (Winnipeg-Dauphin, Manitoba, 1971), p. 1 (reprint of *Besidy pro chasy kozats'ki na Ukraini*). See also O. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych v ukrains'kii istoriohrafi," *Ukraina*, 1928, book 5, pp. 20–21; and M.V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii, "Istoricheskie vzgliady V.B. Antonovycha," *Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora-letopistsia*, 1909, book 21, section 1, nos. 1–2, pp. 31–32.

38. Fascination with old Slavic communal institutions and their contemporary forms was widespread among nineteenth-century Russian and Ukrainian intellectuals. Antonovych's praise of Ukrainian communal traditions falls within this broad spectrum. However, in Antonovych's view, as well as those of other Ukrainian populists, the Ukrainian commune (*hromada*) differed substantially from the Russian commune (*obshchina* or *mir*).

The greatest difference between the two, according to Kostomarov, was that the Ukrainians owned property as individuals, whereas in Russia, the commune, not individuals, owned land. See his "Dve russkii narodnosti," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, book 1, vol. 1, rep. ed. (The Hague: Europe Printing, 1967), pp. 60–62. This view is also expressed in a manifesto co-authored by Antonovych and other Kyiv *Hromada* members in 1862. See "Otzyv iz Kiev," in D. Bahalii, ed., *Materiialy dlia biografi V.B. Antonovycha, z pryvodu dvadtsiatoi richnytsi z dnia ioho smerty* (Kyiv: Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk, 1929), p. 41.

39. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, p. 45. See also his "Proizvedeniia Shevchenka, soderzhanie kotorykh sostavliaet istoricheskie sobytia," in *Tvory*, pp. 155–56.

40. V. Antonovich, "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh 1500–1648 god.," *AluZR*, part 3, vol. 2, pp. 2–3; "Izsledovanie o gorodakh iugo-zapadnago kraia," in *Monografii po istorii Zapadnoi i Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 1 (only volume published) (Kyiv, 1885), p. 136.

41. Antonovich, "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh," pp. 9–11. See also his "Kiev, ego sud'ba i znachenie s XIV po XVI stoletie (1362–1569)," in *Monografii*, pp. 224–27.

42. Antonovich, "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh," pp. 11–14.

43. Antonovich, "Kiev, ego sud'ba i znachenie," pp. 229, 232, 253–55, 261. See also his "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh," pp. 14–18.

Antonovych stressed the communal character of cities in Kyivan Rus' and showed the progressive decline of towns in Ukraine under Lithuanian and then Polish rule. The granting of Magdeburg rights to the towns, he concluded, represented the victory of the

feudal military order over the communal. See his "Izsledovanie o gorodakh iugo-zapadnago kraia," in *Monografii*, pp. 138, 165–66, 185. See also S. Tomashivs'kyi, *Volodymyr Antonovych: Ioho diial'nist' na poli istorychnoi nauky* (L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1906), pp. 32–33.

44. Antonovich, "Izsledovanie o gorodakh," pp. 136–38.

45. Antonovich, "Kiev, ego sud'ba i znachenie," p. 230.

46. V. Antonovych, "Predislovie," in *AluZR*, part 6, vol. 2 (Kyiv, 1870), pp. 1–4.

47. *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8.

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 8–10.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6, 11–18, 24–27.

50. Antonovych summed up his thesis as follows: "The Cossacks are none other than that which remained of the old Slavic communes, which appear with military features, called forth by local conditions, with a new name, originating in those same military-like conditions." See his "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh," p. 117.

51. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, pp. 23–29, 38, 40–43.

52. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh," pp. 37–38, 41. See also his "Ocherk sostoiianiia pravoslavnoi tserkvi v Iugo-zapadnoi Rossii s poloviny XVII do kontsa XVIII stoletia," in *Monografii*, p. 282.

53. V. Antonovych, "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoii storone Dnepra (1679–1716)," *AluZR*, part 3, vol. 2, pp. 23–24. The historian O. Hermaize wrote that, in Antonovych's view, the Cossacks' struggle was supported by the peasants and townspeople, who recognized the Cossacks as carriers of the national idea. Therefore, the Cossack–Polish wars were deeply rooted historical conflicts, representing a struggle between two national principles. See his "V.B. Antonovych v ukrains'kii istoriografii," p. 26.

54. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, pp. 109–11, 120–21. See also his "Kharakteristika deiatel'nosti Bogdana Khmel'nitskago," pp. 103–04.

55. Antonovich, "Kharakteristika deiatel'nosti Bogdana Khmel'nitskago," p. 102.

56. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, p. 124.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 112–14. See also his "Soderzhanie aktov o kozakakh na pravoii storone Dnepra," pp. 24–25.

58. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, p. 6.

59. *Ibid.*, pp. 136–40.

60. *Ibid.*, pp. 152–56.

61. See his "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh na pravoii storone Dnepra," pp. 69–70. See also his *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, pp. 156, 158–59.

62. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, pp. 161–62.

63. Antonovich, "Soderzhanie aktov o kazakakh na pravoii storone Dnepra," pp. 61, 72.

64. V. Antonovich, "Izsledovanie o gaidamachestve po aktam 1700–1768 g.," *AluZR*, part 3, vol. 3 (Kyiv, 1876), pp. 1–5.

65. *Ibid.*, pp. 1–2. See also his "Proizvedeniia Shevchenka," p. 157.

66. See Antonovych, "Otvety g. Korzonu," in *Tvory*, pp. 234–35.

67. Antonovych, *Korotka istoriia kozachchyny*, p. 230.

68. *Ibid.*, pp. 230–31. See also his "Istorychni baiky p. Mariiana Dubets'koho," p. 212.

69. Antonovich, "Pol'sko-russkie sootnosheniia XVII v. v sovremennoi pol'skoi prizme," in *Tvory*, p. 162. See also his "Istorychni baiky," p. 212.

70. Antonovich, "Pol'sko-russkie sootnosheniia," pp. 162, 176.

71. Hrushevs'kyi, "Volodymyr Antonovych," pp. 18–19.

72. Antonovich, "Pol'sko-russkie sootnosheniia," p. 164.

73. Antonovych, "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," in *Tvory*, p. 248.

74. Hrushevs'kyi, "Volodymyr Antonovych," p. 19.

75. Antonovich, "Kharakteristika deiatel'nosti Bogdana Khmel'nitskago," pp. 102–3.

76. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, "Z sotsial'no-natsional'nykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," *Ukraina*, 1928, book 5, pp. 13–14.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

78. Antonovych wrote that he was questioned by the authorities regarding his Ukrainophile activities on twelve different matters in a two-year period in the early 1860s. See his "Memuary," p. 54.

79. Hrushevs'kyi, "Volodymyr Antonovych," p. 17. See also his "Z sotsial'no-natsional'nykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," p. 8.

80. On Lazarevs'kyi, see V. Sarbei, *Istorychni pohliady O.M. Lazarevs'koho* (Kyiv: Akademiia nauk Ukrain's'koi SSR, 1961).

81. Hrushevs'kyi, "Z sotsial'no-natsional'nykh kontseptsii Antonovycha," p. 12.

82. Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych v ukrains'kii istoriografii," pp. 27, 30–31.

83. *Ibid.*, pp. 21–22, 29.

84. See Antonovych, "Pohliady ukrainofiliv," p. 246. See also Hermaize, "V.B. Antonovych," pp. 30–31.

85. Doroshenko, *Volodymyr Antonovych*, pp. 156–57.