

## Preface

This study explores the political imagination of the East European intelligentsia in the 1830s–1840s; in particular, the patterns by which intellectuals *imagined* communities known as nations or nationalities. Put another way, this book deals with the representation of nation-ness in Eastern Europe, a vision and division of geographic, symbolic, and social space, which eventually resulted in the unmaking of some national projects and the making of others. I will explore the ways in which the modern Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian nationalities were mapped during the Romantic period, the territory of present-day Ukraine being the geographical setting of their encounter.<sup>1</sup> Yet this territorial setting, however important it could be for the analysis of the spatial imagination of the East European intelligentsia, does not define the entire *national* imagination or identity politics of major Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian intellectuals. The focus of this book are the *visions* of national community by intellectuals from different lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the contemporary Russian Empire rather than any specific territory per se. This is to say, the Polish-Ukrainian-Russian encounter was not limited to a specific territory but took place in a rather symbolic space of nationalist discourses. The territory of the interaction is less important than its discursive content.

In a sense, my work is another effort to trace the national reconstruction of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth within the framework of imperial Russia.<sup>2</sup> That reconstruction meant the making of the Ukrainian nationality (in imagined and institutional realms) and the

unmaking or refashioning of both the historic Polish and “all-Russian” national projects, even if contemporaries did not notice that at the time.

The general subject of my book is the mapping and representation of national communities in the political imagination of East European intellectuals—political thinkers, activists, literati, and scholars—who sought to carve out as much space and population for their nationalities as their imagination could embrace. Consequently, the making of one identity (for example, Ukrainian) inevitably resulted in the unmaking of others (Russian and Polish).<sup>3</sup> In the words of Aleksei Miller, the competing national projects reflected the superimposition of “Ideal Fatherlands” on each other.<sup>4</sup>

This study will address several questions: (1) What were the roles of language, religion, history, and institutions in shaping these national identities? (2) How did the presence of “neighboring” communities change the self-representation of a given community? (3) At which points did the imagined communities intersect, and where were their borders? (4) Finally, at which points were national communities “unmade”? I intend to explore the ways by which Russians, Ukrainians, and Poles, fuelled by the Romantic search for nation, mapped distinct but often overlapping identities.

In other words, I will analyze what the names “Ukraine,” “Poland,” and “Russia” (with their respective adjectives) meant for those who debated Romantic nationalism, and how the intelligentsia spoke about the communities it claimed to represent. The subject is not national identities *per se* (as reified objects) but only how they were imagined by the local intelligentsia. Hence, there were different versions of Russianness, Polishness, and Ukrainianness, constantly refashioned and negotiated under mutual interaction. I will not deal with personal identities but instead will focus on certain “fields” of political imagination where “imagined communities” were represented. The concept of a field of political imagination is understood to be a system of often unconscious “imaginings” or ideas about nation-ness and its boundaries, pertaining to a certain ideological circle within each national case—here, Russian, Polish, or Ukrainian.

With regard to methodology, this study covers several fields such as intellectual history, discourse analysis, and nationalism studies. I have used the methodological tools elaborated by Benedict Anderson, Pierre Bourdieu, and Rogers Brubaker. These include the concept of nationality as an “imagined community,” worked out by Benedict Anderson<sup>5</sup>; the concepts of “field” and the “struggle for representation” elaborated by Pierre Bourdieu<sup>6</sup>; and the idea of “nation-centered idioms,” or simply “idioms

of nationality,” borrowed from Rogers Brubaker.<sup>7</sup> The latter showed how certain cultural idioms—the ways of thinking and speaking about nationality—have shaped political/state interests in the realm of citizenship. In other words, the idea of nationality defined the perceptions of the “other” (minorities within an aspiring nation-state as well as neighboring nationalities). I have also used certain methodological tools and approaches developed by Andrzej Walicki, George Grabowicz, Roman Szporluk, and Paul Robert Magocsi. I owe the term *romantic nationalism* to Andrzej Walicki, who extensively studied the interaction of Romanticism and nationalism on the examples of Poland and Russia.<sup>8</sup> George Grabowicz successfully developed a comparative perspective on Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian literary developments which shaped the cultural expectations and identities of each other.<sup>9</sup> Roman Szporluk introduced the crucially important idea of competing national projects and showed how the making of one nationality meant the unmaking of others that treated the potential members of this “new” nationality as an integral part of their own, more established communities.<sup>10</sup> Finally, Paul Robert Magocsi pointed to the nineteenth-century mind-set trapped between exclusive national identities and a traditional hierarchy of multiple loyalties.<sup>11</sup>

Although of course there have been several studies that have explored aspects of Polish, Russian, or Ukrainian national thought, no other work—in English, Polish, Ukrainian, or Russian—has undertaken a comparative history of these respective national ideas during the Romantic period. My work explores precisely this comparative dimension, and especially analyzes how these three nationalisms were inextricably related to one another during this formative period. In some cases, I have specifically emphasized the difference of my views from those held by my senior colleagues (for example, in my polemics with Andrzej Walicki). One of the aforementioned scholars, Roman Szporluk, indeed placed the so-called “Ukrainian project” within a larger international framework of making and unmaking competing national projects<sup>12</sup>; his work, however important for my own argument, was an outline of stimulating ideas rather than a detailed account of a discursive exchange between Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian intelligentsias. The dynamics of that exchange was the main subject of my own research. The only other work which has purported to compare Russian, Ukrainian, and Polish Romantic sources was the doctoral thesis of George Grabowicz.<sup>13</sup> In his thesis and other writings, Grabowicz, a noted literary scholar, studied, quite exhaustively, the Romantic image of Ukrai-

nian Cossacks in three Slavic literary traditions; although I have shared the comparative focus with Professor Grabowicz, my goal in the present work has been to study the Romantic visions of nationality as they appeared in *nonliterary* sources, predominantly in political philosophy, literary criticism, political treatises, journalism, and so on.

I have dealt with the representation of imagined communities on two levels: first, in the realm of mental or philosophical geography; second, on the level of “nation-centered idioms.” I believe this is still a new approach in the field of nineteenth-century East European history, which has remained a quite conservative discipline. The focus on mental geography and nation-centered idioms allowed me to treat the three national cases as discursive formations rather than reified objects of traditional *essentialist* historiography. More simply put, I sought to address the question of how nationality was made in Eastern Europe. By comparing how “Russians,” “Ukrainians,” and “Poles” were imagined by Romantic intelligentsias, I have avoided a nationalist bias which tends to represent nationalities as somehow *preexisting* objects or as part of a natural order. What is more, by comparing three “national” cases, I prove that not only “nonhistoric” Ukrainians but also Russians and Poles themselves, who often boasted continuous national histories, were largely “constructed” during the nineteenth century. My research indeed has proved Szporluk’s point that the making of Ukrainians unmade the Russian and Polish historic nations, first at the level of imagination, then at political and institutional levels. Beyond this, I believe that my research has wider implications for students of modern Polish and Russian histories: the Ukrainian issue showcased the discursive nature of modern Russian and Polish identities as fields of competing visions of nationality, of various sociopolitical possibilities, and of lost opportunities. In my work I have tried to show how the geographic extent and ethnosocial content of nationality were changing depending on who was speaking on its behalf, and how the presence of the “other” influenced national self-representations. I also believe that my work will help scholars and the educated public to avoid unnecessary generalizations and stereotypes when dealing with modern Eastern Europe.

I would also like to clarify certain terms. Following Benedict Anderson, I consider nationality as an “imagined community,” imagined by its fellow-members “as both inherently limited and sovereign.”<sup>14</sup> With regard to the terms *nation* and *nationality* I prefer the latter when referring to a distinct ethnocultural community (with or without its own state). Many

sources, however, contain both words with different meanings: *nationality* often meant the essence or spiritual side of *nation* and referred to what made the people a really distinct community. In such cases I use both words. More often than not, the sources I consulted confuse the two words or use them interchangeably. I repeat the original terminology in direct quotations but use the word *nationality* in my comments. When sources use the word *nation* with reference to a state, I prefer the word *state* or *nation-state*; however, I use the word *nation* if it is part of a neologism, such as the “all-Russian nation” used by Aleksei Miller. Several omnipresent terms from primary sources are translated in direct quotations following Table 1.

Finally, nationality will not be treated as an “objective” or natural phenomenon but rather as a product of political imagination projected onto social and symbolic reality. In my own usage, *nationality* is rather a word than a thing, and it refers to an imagined community based on distinct linguistic, ethnic, cultural, and sociopolitical values. Those values distinguish nationality from such traditional entities as empire, caste, clan, social estate, and so on, which were differently imagined and institutionalized.

The time frame of this study encompasses the period of Romantic nationalism in Eastern Europe; that is, from the Polish November uprising of 1830–31 to the persecution of the Ukrainian Sts. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in 1847 (in the Russian case, the landmark is the political texts of Mikhail Bakunin from the same time). This study draws on a wide range of sources, such as journalistic articles, literary fiction, political philosophy, and political manifestos published or written during the 1830s–1840s in Polish, Russian, or Ukrainian. The sources reveal the geography or spatial dimension of imagined communities (their borders and intersections), their national and social “contents” including the extent of their *ex-* and *inclusiveness*, and the hierarchy of values that were entrenched in each case. The emphasis is on *primary* narrative sources; secondary literature is used only as an additional means, particularly when the primary

TABLE 1 Translations of key terms from primary sources

English	Polish	Russian	Ukrainian
nation	naród	narod, natsiia	narod, natsiia
nationality	narodowość, lud/ludy (pl.)	narodnost', natsional'nost'	narodnist', narod
people/folk	lud	narod, liud	liud, liudy

NOTE: The particular difficulty represents the Russian and Ukrainian word *narod*, which can be translated both as *nation* and as *people*. If it is provided with a clear political meaning, the term will be rendered in English as *nation*.

sources were unavailable or incomplete. Therefore, the bibliography and notes represent only the most important secondary sources.

All quotations are given in English translations, except when certain poetic works are quoted (in those cases, both original and English texts are provided). All translations are mine except for a few instances, where the translator is indicated in the note. Russian and Ukrainian personal names are transliterated from Cyrillic according to the Library of Congress system, with only minor changes. In addition, the spellings of personal names are rendered in the language of the nationality with which the person is usually associated. All place-names are transliterated into English according to the present-day phonetic spelling utilized in the countries where those geographical places are situated (unless there are common English equivalents, such as Dnieper River, Vistula River, Galicia, and Kyiv). In translated quotations, however, I leave the original spellings. For example, in sources written in Russian, Chernigov is used instead of Chernihiv; Peremyshl' instead of Przemyśl; or if the source is in Polish, Humań is used instead of Uman'.<sup>15</sup>

I want to thank my senior colleagues from the University of Toronto, where I was lucky to study and then teach: discussions with Paul Robert Magocsi, Wayne Dowler, and Piotr Wróbel helped me balance research material for the three “national” cases. Their expertise in Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish histories constantly encouraged me to question my own preconceived notions about East European history and to stay impartial. I thank Dr. Magocsi for his moral support and friendly advice ranging from nationalism issues in modern Europe to Mahler’s music and wine tasting. George Grabowicz of Harvard University not only was a diligent reader of my work but has also been my intellectual inspiration for years. I also owe a great deal to Taras Koznarsky of the University of Toronto, whose friendship and scholarly advice kept me going in the face of the many challenges of my new Canadian experience. Thanks to the Ukrainian Studies Fund and the Ihor and Oksana Humeniuk Ukrainian Fund I did part of my research at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, where I spent one of the most intellectually satisfying years of my life and had the privilege of discussing the subject of this book with the historians Roman Szporluk, Lubomyr Hajda, and Tomasz Stryjek, and with the philologists Ihor Papusha and Amelia Glaser. I am grateful to the Columbia University Department of History, the Harriman Institute, and particularly the Ukrainian Studies Program, for giving me the oppor-

tunity to finish my book while teaching in such a stimulating academic and urban environment.

I would like to express my particular thanks to Frank Sysyn of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and Larry Wolff from New York University for their invaluable academic advice, erudition, and assistance, both in Toronto and in New York. Without them my manuscript would never have reached a publisher. My book would have been impossible too without the enthusiastic support of Norris Pope of Stanford University Press and his editorial assistant, Sarah Crane Newman, whose patient advice guided me through the trickiest stages of academic book publishing. I am also very grateful to production editor Mariana Raykov and to Jeff Wyneken for his excellent copyediting. They both transformed an often tedious process for an author into a pleasure of new learning. Special thanks go to Michael Boguski, Jeff Buchner, Douglas Donegani (with his cats), Sarah Greene, and Dr. Steven Seegel, who (the people, not the cats) read portions of this text and whose friendship has inspired my entire work. I also want to thank my friends Anna Chukur, Luba Shmygol, and Halyna Chuba for their constant encouragement and personal concern. Finally, I thank Kateryna Ruban for her inspiration and patience during the last, most intense, stage of preparing the manuscript. Nevertheless, any shortcomings in the book are solely my responsibility.