

VIACHESLAV GREKOV*

Interpretation of the “Rus” Concept in the Ukrainian and Russian Historiography in the Russian Empire (1805–1860)¹

GREKOV, V.: Interpretation of the “Rus” Concept in the Ukrainian and Russian Historiography in the Russian Empire (1805–1860). *Slavica Slovaca*, 60, 2025, No 1, pp. 58–70 (Bratislava).

This study explores the interpretation of the concept of Rus in the works of historians from the Russian Empire between 1805 and 1860, with a particular focus on those affiliated with Dnieper Ukraine. The analysis identifies that 14 out of 93 historians studied the ancient history of Rus, Russia, or Ukraine. A distinctive feature of the historical scholarship of this period was the amateurism of many historians, most of whom were connected to two key social strata: the nobility and the clergy. Another notable characteristic was the blurring of boundaries within local ‘intellectual’ circles. Furthermore, the requirement to obtain permission from the Censor Committee to publish heavily influenced the interpretation of the concept of Rus. A defining feature of the historiography of this period was the use of contemporary concepts to describe the history of Rus. Terms such as Kyivan Rus and Southern Rus were notably prevalent, with the majority of historians associating the territory of Rus with the Kyiv region.

Rus, interpretation, historiography, Ukrainian studies, Dnieper Ukraine, the Russian Empire.

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 led to an increased relevance of studies on the ancient history of Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, and other former Soviet states. Particularly intense debates emerged surrounding disputed historical narratives, which were integral to the formation of national myths. Beyond academic scholars, these discussions frequently involved cultural figures and politicians. As a result, the discourse became ideologically charged and lacked rigorous academic argumentation.

One such controversial topics is the history of Rus, since both Ukraine and Russia trace the origins of their statehood to the same medieval state. This state is “Rus” (“Kyivan Rus” in historiography). In fact, the inability of academic and political elites of the Russian Federation to revise their attitude to the history of Rus was one of the reasons for Russia’s failure to abandon its imperial ambitions. Thus, the period of relative liberalization in academic, political, and public views in the Russian Federation during the first half of the 1990s was followed by a return to traditional imperialistic and authoritarian concepts of historical development, accompanied by a renewed perception of Russia’s and the Russians’ unique historical role in relation to the other states and peoples of the former Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. One of the manifestations of this new ideology was the idea of the “*Russkyi Mir*” (Russian World) as a single historical space, which is united by a common worldview and the Russian language. One of the cornerstones of this ideology is the perception of the Russian Empire

* Viacheslav Grekov, PhD, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2419-3444>, National Science Center “Kharkiv Institute of Physics and Technology”. Akademichna St. 1, 61108, Kharkiv, Ukraine. grekov_vd@ukr.net.

¹ This article is one of the outcomes of the research project “Interpretation of the “Rus” Concept in the Ukrainian and Russian Historiography in the Russian Empire (1805–1917)” supported by the Centre for Advanced Study Sofia under its Gerda Henkel Fellowships. I would like to thank Diana Mishkova, Igor Grekov, Andrii Pastushenko, and Svitlana Dovhalenko for invaluable discussions and helpful feedback.

and later Russian Federation as the main successor of Rus. This viewpoint legitimizes “the historical right” of the Russian Federation to capture (“return”) all the territories that, at any point in time, were part of Rus, Russian Empire or Soviet Union. It was this very viewpoint which justified Russia’s aggression and war in Ukraine. In this article, we will use the direct transliteration “Malorossiia”, “Velykorossiia” instead of “Little Russia” and “Great Russia”. The concept of “Russkyi” will be employed in the same cases as used by the authors.

In the last decades, the studies of building a modern Ukrainian nation have been experiencing a renaissance.² In particular, these studies bring to light the problematics of the past of the population of Dnieper Ukraine of the 18th–19th centuries. However, the perception of the connection between the age of Rus and modernity by historians of 1805–1860 has remained virtually unexplored. The factors that influenced this perception are also not sufficiently investigated. Another issue that has started to attract significant attention is the “Ukrainian” question in the Russian Empire and, in general, the role of the Empire in the development / fate of the empire’s national minorities.³ An important component of both of these topics is the identity and loyalty in the Ukrainian society of the 18th–19th centuries.⁴

The current research investigates the questions of identity and loyalty through the prism of interpreting the heritage of Rus in the works of historians of the 19th century. The source base of the current research consists of scientific articles and monographs by historians affiliated with Dnieper Ukraine that were published in the period 1805–1860. The source base includes works printed both on the territory of Dnieper Ukraine and in the other regions of the Russian Empire.

The article rests on a broad theoretical and methodological basis, which combines approaches and methods derived from conceptual history, the new imperial history, and anthropology. Each of these approaches provides an opportunity to investigate the history of the interpretation and the trajectory of the “Rus” concept in the chosen (formative) period at different levels of the functioning of this concept. The use of these approaches will enable: 1) the identification of the functions performed by the concept of ‘Rus’ in historical works, with particular attention to the cultural and political context, as well as the changes in its usage over time; 2) the exploration of the relationship between the core (the Empire) and the periphery (the Dnieper Ukrainian territory) in the development of ideas about and approaches to the interpretation of the ‘Rus’ concept; 3) the investigation of the factors (social, economic, political, etc.) that may have influenced the historical perspectives of specific historians within the Russian Empire, and the tracing the evolution of their views.

The Russian Empire liquidated the Cossack’s autonomies of Hetmanate, Sloboda Ukraine and annexed the Right Bank of the Dnieper in the last quarter of the 18th century. By 1835, the Govern-

² Kasianov, G. – Ther, P. (eds.): *A Laboratory of Transformational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*. Budapest, New York: Central European Press, 314 p.; Plokh, S.: *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 400 p.; Plokh, S.: *Ukraine or Little Russia? Revisiting an Early Nineteenth Century*. In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. Canadian Association of Slavists, 2006, Vol. 48, No 3/4, p. 335–353; Кравченко, В.: *Україна, Імперія, Росія: Вибрані статті з модерної історії та історіографії*. Київ: Критика, 2011. 540 с.; Грицак, Я.: *Нариси історії України: Формування модерної української нації XIX–XX століття*. Київ: Yakaboo, 2019. 656 с., etc.

³ Миллер, А.: *Украинский вопрос в Российской Империи*. Киев: Лаурис ММХІІІ, 2003. 416 с.; Миллер, А.: *Империя Романовых и национализм*. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2006. 248 с.; Semykoz, M.: *Russia-Ukraine relations: trapped into identity conflict*. Available online at https://www.academia.edu/523741/Russia_Ukraine_Relations_Trapped_into_Identity_Conflict, etc.

⁴ Верменич, Я.: *Конструювання української ідентичності: національні й регіональні проекти другої половини XIX – початку XX ст.* Київ: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2016. 356 с.; Поліщук, Ю.: *Українська і російська історіографія XVIII – середини XIX століть про витоки етнокультурної ідентичності українців*. In: *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України*, вип. 4–5. Київ, 2014, с. 197–215, etc.

ment of the Russian Empire finally abolished the remains of the “Cossacks” and the more ancient administrative and legal heritage. The representatives of the Cossacks and church elites were being partially included in the Imperial system. At that time, the Church played a leading role in the promoting and spreading of the state ideology. The period of second half of the 17th – first half of the 18th century is characterized by the division within the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. On one hand, we witness the creation of such works as “Kyivan Synopsys” (near 1676), where for the first time the kinship of the population of *Malorossiia* and *Velykorossiia* was advocated.⁵ Moreover, the works of Feofan Prokopovich, Ukrainian and Russian cleric, theologian and scientist, and one of the most famous representatives of Hetmanate of the first half of the 18th century, laid the historical foundation for the very existence of the Russian Empire.⁶ On the other hand, supporting the idea of the independent Cossack state existence, the representatives of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv took an active position during the Mazepa’s uprising and provided it with an ideological basis. The Commission of Ancient Acts, established by Peter I, located and expropriated ancient acts, chronicles and other historical sources on the territories of Hetmanate. Furthermore, in 1721, the publication of religious books in Ukrainian was considerably restricted. During the first half of the 18th century, the Empire reduced the industrial potential of the Dnieper region almost to zero and peasantized the region. At the end of the century, serfdom was restored.

In the 18th century, the complicated process of formation of national identities took place on the territories of Cossacks’ state and of the Russian Empire. On the territory of the Cossacks autonomies, several identities (Malorossiyan, Ukrainian, South-Russkyi) existed in parallel. In the course of time, these names changed meanings and territorial borders. We can notice the same situation in the Russian Empire. All inhabitants of the Russian Empire could be Russians, but not all of them were *Velykorossiians* or *Russkyjs*. In the late 18th – first half of the 19th century, a part of the former Cossacks *starshyna* demonstrated a growing interest in its past. The reason for this interest was the need to demonstrate their affiliation with the previous states’ ruling class to obtain the nobility status in the Russian Empire. This interest stimulated the process of nation-building. We can meet the word “nation” in the former Cossack *starshynas*’ letters in the early 19th century when they wrote about *Malorossiians*.⁷ While they perceived *Malorossiians* as a separate nation, they often did not deny the existence of the single Russkyi people. Such ideas had a significant religious basis.

The Censorship Committee played an important role in regulating the publishing activities in the Russian Empire and, therefore, printing scientific works. Censorship Committees were established at universities by the Censorship Statute I, employing professors and masters.⁸ Censors were not necessarily experts in the relevant fields of science, literature, etc. Ivan Knygin was a famous doctor in the Russian Empire and a professor at Kharkiv Imperial University. G. Uspensky’s book “An Experience of Narrating About Russkyi’s Antiquities” was censored by him.⁹

I identified 314 historians who worked on the territory of the Russian Empire in the period between 1805 and 1860. 93 of 314 historians were affiliated with Dnieper Ukraine, either because they were born on the corresponding territories or because they worked there. In particular, 46 historians were born, worked or died in the Dnieper Ukraine; 25 historians were born in the Dnieper

⁵ Киевский Синописис. Киев: Типография Киево-Печерской Лавры, 1823. 280 с.

⁶ Прокопович, Ф.: Правда воли Монаршей. Москва: 1722. 63 с. Available online at http://imwerden.de/pdf/feofan_prokopovich_pravda_voli_monarshej_1722.pdf

⁷ Горленко, В. П.: Из истории южнорусского общества начала XIX в.: письма В. И. Чарныша, А. И. Чепы, В. Г. Полетики и заметки к ним. In: Киевская старина. Киев: Типография Г. Т. Корчан-Новицкого, 1893, вып. LX, № 1, с. 41-76.

⁸ Кирієнко, О.: Загальна та військова цензура в Російській Імперії (XVIII – початку XX століття). In: Український історичний журнал, 2010, № 4, с. 85.

⁹ Успенский, Г.: Опыт повествования о древностях русских. Харьков: Университетская типография, 1818. 815 с.

Ukraine and parted from it later in life; finally, 22 historians arrived to the Dnieper Ukraine from other regions of the Russian Empire or from other countries. These data demonstrate the tendency toward the dilution of the local “intellectuals”, many of whom moved to St. Petersburg (13) and to Moscow (5). These data fit with the Russian Empire hiring policies that were established in the 17th – 18th centuries for attracting to their “service” the state and church figures and intellectuals from the territory. Scientists from the rest of Russia brought here Imperial ideology and attitudes, consciously or subconsciously. Only two historians in total moved to the Dnieper Ukraine from St. Petersburg or Moscow. It is notable that four out of 22 historians that moved to the Dnieper Ukraine were of foreign origin and came from beyond the Russian Empire.

Historians represented primarily two strata – nobility and clergy. In particular, 49 historians, more than 50% of all the historians affiliated with the Dnieper Ukraine, belonged to nobility. Seventeen of them, according to the records, represented Cossack families that were bestowed nobility. However, it can be inferred that the real number of historians with Cossack roots was higher. The assumption grounds on the fact that there were actually no representatives of nobility outside of Cossack estate on the territory of Cossacks autonomies. A stratum that completely lacked representation among historians was peasantry. While, on the whole territory of the Russian Empire, six historians came from the peasantry, no historians of peasant origin were recorded in the Dnieper Ukraine. The observation highlights the oppression of peasantry in the Russian Empire and the lack of social mobility for this stratum. Finally, it should be mentioned that it is hardly possible to make a complete picture of social stratum affiliation of historians within the target group, since the information about origin and education of historians affiliated with the Dnieper Ukraine is completely missing in 15 percent and 12 percent of cases, respectively. The situation is not unique. For comparison, the same indicators for historians affiliated with the rest of the Russian Empire make up 20 and 8 percent.

An important feature of the development of the historical science of the Russian Empire in the first half of the 19th – mid 19th century is the amateurism of its representatives. It seems that amateurism was a trend in science in general. The present study identifies historians as professional if they had specialized historical or philological education. Graduates of Theological Academies are also considered as professional historians due to a large number of subjects related to history. On the other hand, amateur historians could have other specialized education, for example, from a Faculty of Law, or no specialized education at all. According to these criteria, amateurs made up nearly 50% of historians both on the territory of the Dnieper Ukraine (47 out of 93) and in the rest of the Russian Empire (120 out of 221). As a result, the historical science of the Russian Empire was to a great extent formed by amateurs. This led to the establishment of false theories, incorrect processing of historical sources, etc.

Among all historians affiliated with the Dnieper Ukraine, 14 who investigated the ancient history of Rus, Russia, and Malorossiia are of particular significance to the present study. Historians who studied the local history, collected and published historical sources, such as scholar of the history of Poltava governorate P. Bodianskyi, were excluded from the scope of the current research. It can be suggested, according to these data, that Cossacks and contemporary history were more attractive to historians at that time.

Let us proceed to the analysis of the historical works and their authors from this list. The main biographical materials are presented in Table 1. Three historians arrived in the Dnieper Ukraine from the border regions of the Russian Empire – specifically, the Kursk, Bilgorod, and Voronezh governorates. However, at that time, ethnic Ukrainians made up a significant part of the population of these regions. Four historians published, collected, and analyzed historical sources related to the

history of Rus.¹⁰ A large part of the authors conducted studies of the history of Russia, Malorossiia (different names were used) since the ancient ages and to the 18th–19th centuries.¹¹ Tendencies of origin from two strata and amateurism observed among the list of 93 historians were also characteristic of the historians under investigation.

<i>NAME</i>	<i>DATES OF LIFE</i>	<i>PLACE OF BIRTH</i>	<i>PLACE OF DEATH</i>	<i>FAMILY STRATA</i>	<i>EDUCATION</i>	<i>ACTIVITY</i>	<i>AFFILIATIONS</i>
Butkov Peter	1775–1857	sloboda Osypove, Starobelz district, Sloboda-Ukraine governorate	St. Petersburg	Noble family	Amateur	Historian, statesman	Military and civil servant
Berlynskyi Maxym	1764–1848	v. Nova Sloboda, Putivl district, Kursk governorate	Kyiv	Priest's family of noble origin	the Kyiv Mohyla Academy / professional	Teacher, historian, archaeologist, archivist	Kyiv Main Public School
Bantysh-Kamenskyi Dmytro	1788–1850	Moscow	St. Petersburg	Noble family of Moldavian origin	Imperial Moscow University / professional	Politician, historian, archaeographer	Civil servant

¹⁰ Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, вып. XLIII, № 3, с. 193-210; Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, № 15, с. 209-218; Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, вып. XLIV, № 5, с. 3-19; Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, Вып. XLIV, № 6, с. 98-119; Каченовский, М.: Нестор. Русские летописи на древне-славянском языке. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1811, вып. 18, с. 127-149; Каченовский, М.: Нестор. Русские летописи на древне-славянском языке. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1811, вып. 19, с. 211-231.

¹¹ Берлинский, М.: Краткая российская история: Для употребления юношеству. Москва: Губ. тип. А. Решетникова, 1800. 152 с.; Успенский, Г.: Опыт повествования о древностях русских, с. d.

Markevych Mykola	Maksymovych Michael	Kulish Panteimon	Kostomarov Mykola	Kachenovskyi Michael
1804–1860	1804–1873	1819–1897	1817–1885	1775–1842
v. Dunaets, Gluhiv district, Chemihiv governorate	v. Tymkivshchyna, Poltava governorate	v. Voronizh, Gluhiv district, Chemihiv governorate	Ostrog district, Voronizh governorate (former territory of Sloboda Ukraine)	Kharkiv
v. Turivtsi, Pryluky district Chemihiv governorate	v. Myhailova Gora, Poltava governorate	v. Motronivka, Chemihiv governorate	St. Petersburg	Moscow
Cossack's elder family / noble	Noble family	Family of the former Cossack's starshyna (without status of noble)	Noble family	Bourgeois family of Greek origin
Amateur	Imperial Moscow University/ professional	Amateur	Kharkiv Imperial University/ professional	Kharkiv Collegium/ amateur
Historian, ethnographer, folklorist, poet	Historian, teacher (professor, rector), folklorist, philologist, poet	Writer, ethnographer, folklorist, translator, poet etc.	Teacher, historian, writer, poet, critic, publicist	Teacher (professor, rector), historian, journalist, literary critic
Military servant (1820-1824)	Kyiv Imperial University, publisher	Publisher	St. Petersburg and Kyiv Imperial Universities etc.	Imperial Moscow University

Uspenskyi Gabriel	Sementovskiy Mykola
1765–1820	1819–1879
Belgorod governorate	v. Semenogirka, Zolotonosha district, Poltava governorate
Kharkiv	Same
Priest's family	Noble family
Theological education; the Main Teacher's Institute/ professional	Nizhyn Lyceum/ amateur
Teacher (professor), historian	Civil servant, historian, writer, ethnographer, archaeologist
Kharkiv Imperial University	Civil servant

Table 1. Basic biographical data of the historians affiliated with Dnieper Ukraine in 1805–1860.

In 1800, M. Berlynskyi published one of the first textbooks on Russian history. In this work, he examined origins of the Russian state, tracing them to the Scythians, and emphasized that Scythia represented the oldest form of statehood on the territory of what is now Russia.¹² M. Karamzin made the same suggestion in his work “History of the Russian State”.¹³ His thesis regarding the existence of two Scythias is particularly interesting. M. Karamzin distinguished Little Scythia, located in the territory near the Don River and the Azov Sea, and Great Scythia, extended far to the East.¹⁴ This distinction allows for parallels to be drawn with the concepts of ‘Little’ and ‘Great’ Russia. Tracing Russian history to Scythians, M. Berlynskyi uses the name “Russia” for the Rus’ state before the 13th century. Instead, he uses the word “Rus” only as an ethnic name for the description of the Ilmen Slavs.¹⁵ M. Berlynskyi, in line with many other historians of the period under investigation, divided Rus’ state into two parts – Southern and Northern. He also introduced one more important concept – ‘Russkyi nobility’. In the chapter “Notes about Malorosia”,¹⁶ M. Berlynskyi uses this term to define the Orthodox elites of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth. The author also pointed out that the term “Ukraine” was used before 1654. This territory started to be called “Mala Rosia” after the Pereiaslav Council. However, such a division looks artificial in M. Berlynskyi’s performance, as well as he used both concepts to describe earlier events.

G. Uspenskyi’s book *An Experience of Narrating About Russian Antiquities* is among the most renowned and extensive works of its kind. The second edition was published in 1818. This study warrants particular attention due to its broad scope, addressing a wide range of issues such as the origin of the Russians, language, customs, clothing, and more. Additionally, it offers a radically different interpretation of the historical past.

¹² Берлинский, М.: Краткая российская история, с. д., с. 1.

¹³ Карамзин, Н.: История государства Российского, т. 1. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Н. Греча, 1818, с. 1-32.

¹⁴ Берлинский, М.: Краткая российская история, с. д., с. 1-2.

¹⁵ Берлинский, М.: Краткая российская история, с. д., с. 5.

¹⁶ Берлинский, М.: Краткая российская история, с. д., с. 93-105.

All this distinguishes the work “An Experience of Narrating About Russkyi’s Antiquities” from the contemporary, for its work by M. Karamzin, “History of the Russian State”. The ideas proposed by G. Uspenskyi were popular in the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth and Hetmanate in the 16th – the first half of the 18th centuries.¹⁷ The author suggested the idea that Sarmatian/Roksolan tribes resettled to the North, the Novgorod region, and Jutland. The tribes/nations of Chud, Ves, Mer, and others, with a few numbers of Slavs, appeared on their bases. They inhabited the territory from the Gulf of Finland to the Dvina River, White Sea and Ural. Rus and then Russia appeared exactly here¹⁸. At the same time, M. Uspenskyi used the concept “Varangian-Rus” to describe the events of the Rurik calling. He found Slavs in Asia Minor and later resettled to Europe in different ways and inhabited the territory from Kamchatka to Carpathia.¹⁹ Also, the author conducted the delimitation between “Russkyis” and “Slavs” both ethnically and linguistically. He noted that the Slavic language is a language of elites, and the *Russkyi* one is a language of plebs. Gradually, the Slavonic language spread to the north and appeared as the Slavonic-Russkyi or Slavonic-Russian language.²⁰ At the same time, G. Uspenskyi identified Rus and Russia. He used a modern term that appeared according to his point of view in the middle of the 17th century.²¹ Despite the certain opposition Ruses to Slavs, G. Uspenskyi considered the Great Kyiv Prince a prince of Russia.

The work “History of Malorossiia”²² by M. Markevych is interesting as an example of the interpretation of the “Rus” concept. The work is a 4-volume edition and contains the historical sources. The first volume described events from the middle of the 9th century to 1500. The geographical borders noted by M. Markevych were unusual. He limited Malarosia by rivers Slovechna, Dniester, Kleven, Orel, and Siverkyi Donets; also, the whole Galicia (Galichina) was included.²³ However, administratively, the Malorossiia governorate included the territory of the former Hetmanate (part of the Left Bank of Dnieper). The part of “Ukrainian” intellectuals of the 18th – first half of the 19th century identified/called exclusively the inhabitants of Hetmanate as *Malorossiians*. Thus, the geographical borders of *Malorossiia* were extended by M. Markevych. The author noted several trends regarding the interpretation of the “Rus” concept, which may contradict each other. M. Markevych noted that Askold and Dir were Ruses from Scandinavia. So, Ruses were presented as an ethnic group. Next, he noted that Oleg gave the name to the state – Rus. Furthermore, the “Rus” concept covered the territory under the control of Oleg and Sviatoslav and was primarily related to Kyiv. At the same time, this concept was never extended by M. Markevych on Suzdal and Volodymir, even after the looting of Kyiv by Andrii Bogolubskyi and the proclamation of Volodymir as a capital of the Great Principality. The author also used the concepts of “Southern Rus” and “Northern Rus”, which are purely cabinet as a concept of “Kyivan Rus”. These concepts could be found in the studies of many historians, for example, M. Kostomarov.²⁴ The author advocated the idea of the brotherly nation’s existence in his work. However, he recognised *Malorossiians* as an elder brother in contrast to the official historiography position. Along with the concept of “Malorossiia”, M. Markevych used the concept of “Russia”, including the region around Kyiv. This may indicate the author’s attempt to modernize ancient history and to combine it with contemporary Malorossiia

¹⁷ Гваньїні, О.: Хроніка Європейської Сарматії. Київ: Києво-Могилянська Академія, 2007. 1008 с.

¹⁸ Успенский, Г.: Опыт повествования о древностях русских, с. d., с. 1-2.

¹⁹ Успенский, Г.: Опыт повествования о древностях русских, с. d., с. 5.

²⁰ Успенский, Г.: Опыт повествования о древностях русских, с. d., с. 19-24.

²¹ Успенский, Г.: Опыт повествования о древностях русских, с. d., с. 19.

²² Маркевич, Н.: История Малороссии. Москва: Издание книгопродавца О. И. Хрусталева, 1842. т. I. 396 с.; Маркевич, Н.: История Малороссии. Москва: Издание книгопродавца О. И. Хрусталева, 1842. т. II. 694 с.

²³ Маркевич, Н.: История Малороссии, т. I., с. d., с. 3.

²⁴ Костомаров, Н.: Две русские народности. In: Основа. Санкт-Петербург: Типография П. Кулиша, 1861, № 3 (2), с. 33-80.

and Russia. It can also result from a need to obtain permission for publication by the Censor Comity. M. Markevych's work "History of Malorossiya" was censored by P. Korsakov, who received only a home education.

In 1842, D. Bantysh-Kamenskyi published the 3rd edition of the work "History of Mala Russia".²⁵ This edition expanded on the events on the territory of Malorossiya till 1654. The writing of the first edition of the book "History of Mala Russia" was a private initiative of Prince M. Repnin (Military governor of Malorossiya), in whose service was D. Bantysh-Kamenskyi. M. Repnin considered creating the History of Malorossiya as a certain alternative to M. Karamzin's work. The government of the Russian Empire commissioned the latter's work, and it was now looked at as an official history of Russia. M. Karamzin noted that the Rus land was mainly called the territory of contemporary Ukraine (Southern Russia).²⁶ D. Bantysh-Kamenskyi, in conjunction with M. Karamzin, utilized the term 'Russia' rather than 'Rus' to also designate the 'Ukrainian' ethnic territory. This reflects a process of modernizing historical events through the lens of contemporary perspectives. Such usage may have been intended to enhance the reader's perception of an ancient, 'imaginary' history. Additionally, it can be assumed that the choice of the term 'Russia' was influenced by the author's contemporary context. By the first half of the 19th century, a significant portion of the former lands of Rus had been incorporated into the Russian Empire, making it unproblematic for historians to apply modern concepts that did not exist at the time of the events described in Rus' history. Notably, this terminology was also extended to Galicia, despite the fact that it was not under Russian imperial control.

The historical-political work "History of Ruses"²⁷ is particularly interesting, as its content differs from most of the investigations of that time. The author of this work is exactly unknown.²⁸ "History of Ruses" is one of a few contemporary works that illustrate the historical continuity of Malorossiya in the far past and create a certain historical national myth. Many cultural figures, such as T. Shevchenko and M. Gogol, were influenced by the "History of Ruses".²⁹ The author of "History of Ruses" identified Rus and Malorossiya, which is a unique case in the historical literature of the first half of the 19th century. He attributed to the Slavic nation a rather large list located from the Danube River to the Caspian Sea, from the Black to the Baltic Sea, including Pechenegs and Polovtians.³⁰ Also, a line is drawn between the activities of the "Academy" in Kyiv during the time of Rus and its restoration at the time of P. Sahaidachyi's Hetmanship, who was called the Rus (Ruskyi) prince. The author traced the origin of Roses/Roksolans (Ruses) to Prince Ros. Muscovites and Moskals originated from the prince Musokh, who migrated over the Moscow River. Moreover, the author outlined the geographical borders of Rus. These borders were limited by such territories, from the Danube to Dvina, from the Black Sea to the Styr River, Sluch, Berezyna and Dinets and Sev Rivers. Thus, a transition occurred in the interpretation of the concept of 'Rus' from an ethnic to a state-territorial definition. Subsequently, this definition became increasingly ambiguous in the author's work. In discussing events following the Tatar invasion of the 13th century, the author applied the concept of the Rus principalities to Prince Ivan of Moscow, who 'united' many of the Rus lands.

These principalities were not included in the primary territory of Rus, and the author called these lands Moscow principality, and further, Velykorossiya. In parallel, he noted that Chervona

²⁵ Бантыш-Каменский, Д.: История Малой России. Изд. 4-е. Киев, Санкт-Петербург, Харьков: Южно-русское книгоиздательство Иогансона, 1903. 609 с.

²⁶ Карамзин, Н.: История государства Российского, т. 2. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Н. Греча, 1818, с. 231.

²⁷ Конинский, Г. (ред.): История Русов или Малой России. Москва: Университетская типография, 1846. 257 с.

²⁸ Плохий, С.: Діалог через кордони: українські історики у пошуках автора "Історії русів". In Мельник, Я. et alii (eds.): Україна на історіографічній мапі міжвоєнної Європи. Київ: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2014, с. 239-250.

²⁹ Ploky, S.: Ukraine or Little Russia, с. d.

³⁰ Конинский, Г. (ред.): История Русов или Малой России, с. d., с. 3.

(Red) and Bila (White) Ruses were united into Malorossiia, which included a number of Russkyi principalities. In the 14th century, Malorossiia came under the control of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The author used the concept of “Ruskyi nation” and equated Malorossiia with Rus.³¹

M. Kachenovskiy paid great attention to the study of historical sources, particularly chronicles and their critical research.³² In M. Kachenovskiy’s works, one can trace certain principles of concept using – “Russkyi” and “Russian”. Although, he did not always follow it. The author often used the concept of “Russkyi” for a description of ancient events and “Russian” for contemporary events or without clearly tied to the time. He actually connected the origin of the Russkyi state (the concept of “Rus” was not used at all) to Novgorod and Varangians in the article “What has been done in Russia for the enlightenment of people and for the glory of the Motherland since the Rurik’s time to Peter the Great”³³. It was replaced from North to South in Kyiv, where the region was much warmer.³⁴ M. Kachenovskiy was a supporter of the existence of a single Russkyi state before the beginning of the 13th century and considered the Russian Empire as a continuation of the Rurik’s state on the whole territory of the last. Also, he mentioned the existence of Red, White and Black Ruses.³⁵ In this work, M. Kachenovskiy noted that Russkyis were called *Moscowitians* after the Mongol invasion in Western primary sources.³⁶ Thus, the author limited the territory of the residence of the “Russkyis” by the Moscow principality and excluded all other lands out of brackets, which were under the control of Rus and in relation to which he used the concept of “Ruses” (Russkyi). M. Kachenovskiy’s articles “About sources for Russkyi history”³⁷ includes an interesting passage about languages.³⁸ He noted the existence of Swedish and Danish languages, which were traced from a general German language. French was also mentioned. All these languages have their own dialects. However, they can be combined into wider groups. At the same time, Russian, Polish, Ukrainian and others are dialects of a single Slavonic language which existed in the past. This opinion can illustrate the process of formation and functioning of the pan-Slavism idea among the intellectuals of the Russian Empire. For the Russian Empire, the first manifestations of the pan-Slavic ideology date from the beginning of the 19th century. The Slavophile movement in the Russian Empire appeared later, in the 1840s. Its representatives looked at the Russian Empire (its traditions, culture, political system, etc.) as opposed to Western Europe. The Slavophile movement in Dnieper Ukraine had its own specific focus on the role of Ukrainians (program documents of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius).

P. Butkov’s works written in 1840 and 1850 are interesting for our investigation.³⁹ He studied the authorship “Primary Chronicle” and considered the historical context of the chronicle’s creation.

³¹ Конинский, Г. (ред.): История Русов или Малой России, с. d., с. 4.

³² Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории, с. d.; Каченовский, М.: Нестор. Русские летописи на древне-славянском языке., с. d.; Каченовский, М.: Параллельные места в русских хрониках. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, вып. XLVII, № 18, с. 133-145.

³³ Каченовский, М.: Что сделано в России для просвещения народа и славы отечества от времени Рюрика до Петра Великого. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1806, вып. XXV, № 1, с. 3-20.

³⁴ Каченовский, М.: Что сделано в России для просвещения народа, с. d., с. 3.

³⁵ Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории, с. d., 1809, вып. XLIII, № 3, с. 193-194.

³⁶ Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории, с. d., 1809, № 5, с. 3.

³⁷ Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, вып. XLIII, № 3, с. 193-210; Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, № 15, с. 209-218; Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, вып. XLIV, № 5, с. 3-19; Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории. In: Вестник Европы. Москва: Университетская типография, 1809, вып. XLIV, № 6, с. 98-119.

³⁸ Каченовский, М.: Об источниках для русской истории, с. d., 1809, № 6, с. 109.

³⁹ Бутков, П.: Оборона летописи русской, Несторовой, от навета скептиков. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. имп. Российской Академии, 1840. 526 с.; Бутков, П.: Ответ на новый вопрос о Несторѣ, летописце русском. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Эдуарда Праца, 1850. 56 с.

Like many authors of the first half of the 19th century, P. Butkov used the term “Russia” to describe events of the period of Rus existence. This author conducted the modernisation of the historical past and its adaptation to modern realities. However, the term “Russkyi” was actively used in his works, contrary to M. Karamzin’s works. This may indicate the non-identity of these two concepts in the author’s view. It could be a manifestation of the author’s desire to follow the general trends of the historical science in the Russian Empire. P. Butkov, first of all, used the concept of “Ruses” as an ethnic name for Varangians. However, the usage of this concept is blurred enough. The first mention relates to Rurik’s name. The Rus lands are named after the Rurik family.⁴⁰ However, the author was inconsistent in the usage of the “Ruses” concept. It was applied to all Varangians regardless of family.⁴¹ After all, the “Russia” concept was the alternative to the “Rus” concept. The “Russia” concept acquired a state meaning and was associated with the lands under the control of Kyiv.⁴² The author dated a new ethnic concept of “Slavic-Ruses” back to the 11th century,⁴³ in parallel with “Russian” and “Russkyi”. Such a variety of the concepts used by the author illustrate a process of creating a certain stable tradition of the formation of a categorial apparatus. It had not been formed at the time of the work writing. P. Butkov used the concepts “Rus” and “Russia” as certain synonyms in the work “A Response to a New Question About Nestor, the Russkyi Chronicler”,⁴⁴ 1850. However, the concept of “Rus” was used primarily when quoting historical sources in contrast to the second, which was used for their further analysis.⁴⁵ The author used the derivatives of “Russia” to update the information for readers, for example, the Greek-Russian Church instead of the Greek-Rus.⁴⁶

M. Sementovskiy’s work is interesting from the point of view of the perception of the “Rus” concept.⁴⁷ M. Sementovskiy was involved in the study of the history of Kyiv, Cossacksdom and the Ancient Age. A brief history of Malorossiyan, Zaporizhzhya and Don Cossacksdom until the middle of the 17th century was included in the introduction chapter of the “Old of Malorossiya, Zaporizhzhya and Don”,⁴⁸ which was published in 1846. The author traced the origin of the Cossacks to Khazars and noted that in the middle of the 10th century, they lived on the territory of the Rus lands – Malorossiya and along Dnieper, Bug and Don Rivers. He paid attention to the fallacy of the theory of the Don Cossacks origin. This theory provided the idea of their origin from the band of Moscow’s peasant fugitives.⁴⁹ Thus, we can mark a certain confrontation between the Rus lands and Moscow in this place. He called the Cossacks “Rus knights” (Russkyi) and their leader (Hetman) – Rus prince. Also, he drew a line from Rus through *Malorossiya* to Ukraine in the 19th century. However, he also adhered to the general directions in the historical science of the Russian Empire and called Moscow Tzar – Rus (Russkyi).⁵⁰ The book “Catch of the Great Kyiv Princes”⁵¹ contains a number of different names, which can be identified to a certain extent. Kyiv Princes were called Rus’s (Russkyi), Kyivan, and heir state Kyivan principality the Great Kyiv principality. The concept of “Kyivan Rus” was also called. The concept of “Kyivan Rus” had been beginning to

⁴⁰ Бутков, П.: Оборона летописи русской, Несторовой, от навета скептиков, с. d., с. 4.

⁴¹ Бутков, П.: Оборона летописи русской, Несторовой, от навета скептиков, с. d., с. 7.

⁴² Бутков, П.: Оборона летописи русской, Несторовой, от навета скептиков, с. d., с. 8.

⁴³ Бутков, П.: Оборона летописи русской, Несторовой, от навета скептиков, с. d., с. 11.

⁴⁴ Бутков, П.: Ответ на новый вопрос о Несторѣ, летописце русском, с. d.

⁴⁵ Бутков, П.: Ответ на новый вопрос о Несторѣ, летописце русском, с. d., с. 2.

⁴⁶ Бутков, П.: Ответ на новый вопрос о Несторѣ, летописце русском, с. d., с. 2.

⁴⁷ Сементовский, Н.: Старина Малороссийская, Запорожская и Донская. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. И. Фишона, 1846. 64 с.; Сементовский, Н.: Сказание о ловах Великих Князей Киевских. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. И. Фишона, 1857. 18 с.

⁴⁸ Сементовский, Н.: Старина Малороссийская, Запорожская и Донская, с. d.

⁴⁹ Сементовский, Н.: Старина Малороссийская, Запорожская и Донская, с. d., с. 2.

⁵⁰ Сементовский, Н.: Старина Малороссийская, Запорожская и Донская, с. d., с. 2.

⁵¹ Сементовский, Н.: Сказание о ловах Великих Князей Киевских, с. d.

become popular. At the same time, M. Sementovskiy used the concept of “Russia” in description of the conversion to Christianity by Volodymyr in 988.⁵²

The scientific idea of the Southern-Rus (Southern Russkyi) and Northern-Rus (Northern Russkyi) nationalities existence began to be actively used in the middle of the 19th century. The idea of the existence of two Ruses: Southern and Northern Ruses, is purely a cabinet theory, as a concept of “Kyivan Rus” and “Suzdal Rus”. The last were proposed by M. Maksymovych.⁵³ Panteleimon Kulish (1819–1897) was one of those who used the concept of “Southern Rus” and “South-Russkyi nationality” in his works. First of all, P. Kulish is known as an ethnographer and scholar of Cossack history, but some of his works relate to the history of Rus. P. Kulish’s work “Notes on Southern Rus”⁵⁴ does not use the concept of “Russia” instead “Rus” in parts dedicated to the issues of the Rus history. At the same time, the author selected the Southern Rus region and Southern-Russkyi nationality. It is necessary to note that a clear definition of the concept of “nationality” did not exist in the middle of the 19th century. It was used to define both separate nations and a part of the nation with certain differences. The same usage can be observed in relation to the concepts of “dialect” and “language”.

Mykola Kostomarov (1817–1885) is considered one of the leaders of the Ukrainian national movement of the middle to the second half of the 19th century. His professional activity was connected to the work at the Universities of St. Petersburg and Kyiv. The majority of the works about the Rus history were published after 1860. Two works were devoted to the period of our investigation or early 1861. The work “Thoughts about the federal beginning of the ancient Rus”⁵⁵ was published in January 1861, so it was included in the current article. It is an exciting example of an attempt to combine the realities of the middle 19th century with the historical past. M. Kostomarov set both concepts “Rus” and “Russia”.⁵⁶ He tried to unite the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity of Eastern Slavic tribes. The concept of “nationality” was also used in his work, and the existence of a single Russkyi nation was noted.⁵⁷ M. Kostomarov used the concept of “Rus land” for the definition of the whole territory, which was under the control of Ruriks and at the same time for the territory around Kyiv.⁵⁸ However, he described that the Rus land had been formed around Polian-Ruses.⁵⁹ M. Kostomarov noted that, on the one hand, Eastern Slavonic nationalities had a lot of radical differences among themselves (for example, languages and beliefs); on the other hand, all these significant differences did not prevent them from being of a single Russkyi nation. Because the church language and ruling dynasty are the main factors for their unity, he also used the concepts of “Western”, “Eastern”, and “Southern” Rus, which are only theoretical concepts. M. Kostomarov published the book “Slavonic Mythology”⁶⁰ in 1846. The work was mainly devoted to the beliefs in the gods of Slaves and their comparison with the beliefs in other regions. He actually used a whole set of concepts connected to the “Rus” in his descriptions of Eastern Slavs’ beliefs. “Russkyi Slavs” is one of the most interesting concepts. Usage of this concept may illustrate that the author divided

⁵² Сементовский, Н.: Сказание о ловах Великих Князей Киевских, с. d., с. 2-3.

⁵³ Максимович, М.: Вибрані твори. Київ: Либідь, 2004. 360 с.

⁵⁴ Кулиш, П.: Заметки о Южной Руси, вып. 2. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. А. Якобсона, 1857. 195 с.

⁵⁵ Костомаров, Н.: Мысли о федеративном начале древней Руси. In: Основа. Санкт-Петербург: Типография П. Кулиша, 1861, № 1 (1), с. 121-158.

⁵⁶ Костомаров, Н.: Мысли о федеративном начале древней Руси, с. d., pp. 121-158.

⁵⁷ Костомаров, Н.: Мысли о федеративном начале древней Руси, с. d., с. 136.

⁵⁸ Костомаров, Н.: Мысли о федеративном начале древней Руси, с. d., с. 132.

⁵⁹ Костомаров, Н.: Мысли о федеративном начале древней Руси, с. d., с. 129.

⁶⁰ Костомаров, Н.: Славянская мифология. Киев: Типография И. Валнер, 1847. 113 с.

“Russkyis” into Slavs and non-Slavs. This is suggested by the fact that he did not specify whether Czechs, Poles, etc., belong to the Slavs.⁶¹ At the same time, he mentioned Baltic Slavs.⁶²

M. Maksymovych is the author of a large number of academic works on ethnography, philology and the history of Ukraine. His academic works on the ancient history of Rus are difficult to analyze qualitatively in a short article and requires a separate study. M. Maksymovych argued the historical heredity of *Malorossiyan* / Ukrainian and Rus history. Such an idea was a novelty for an academic community at that time. The vivid discussion about the Rus heritage is reflected in the correspondence between M. Maksymovych and M. Pogodin.⁶³

In conclusion, it was found that 93 historians were affiliated with Dnieper Ukraine between 1805 and 1860. However, only approximately 15% of them were engaged in the study of the history of Rus and its sources to any significant extent.

Amateurism was a characteristic feature of the historical science of this period. Historians without professional high education made up nearly 50 %. At the same time, the blurring of the local intellectual environment was observed due to the replacement of their representatives to another region of the Empire and the arrival of new personnel to Dnieper Ukraine from outside. The total number of them made up nearly 50%.

The “Rus” concept was used only in some historical works of the first half – middle 19th century. The vast majority of historians used the concept of “Russia”. It can be the impact of the state ideology, education and censorship institutions. Historians of Dnieper Ukraine sometimes used the concepts of “Rus land” “Rus” and associated them mainly with the territory of *Malorossiya*. There was an opinion of the Northern and Southern Russia/Rus existence.

In the first half of the 19th century, most historians tried to adhere to the state ideology, which took shape in the second half of the 1830s. Such an adherence might have been inflicted by censorship or self-censorship. At the same time, opinions on more specific scientific issues could have reflected the real views of the historians.

These trends in the historical science were based on radical changes in the political, ideological, social and cultural life of the Russian Empire and, as a consequence, of the Ukrainian lands. These changes could be described as a complex system of influences and interactions that predetermined the subsequent socio-political development.

Interpretation des “Rus” – Konzepts in der ukrainischen und russischen Historiographie im Russischen Reich (1805–1860)

Viacheslav Grekov

In der vorliegenden Studie wurde die wichtige Frage des Konzepts der Interpretation des Wortes “Rus” in den Werken der Historiker des Russischen Reiches in den Jahren 1805–1860 behandelt. Diese Historiker waren mit der Dnieper-Ukraine verbunden. Es wurde festgestellt, dass 14 von 93 Historikern die antike Geschichte Russlands, Rus oder der Ukraine untersuchten. Der Amateurismus der Gelehrten und die Zugehörigkeit der meisten von ihnen zu zwei Schichten – Adel und Klerus – waren die charakteristischen Merkmale der Geschichtswissenschaft. Ein weiteres verbreitetes Phänomen war die Verwischung der lokalen “intellektuellen” Kreise. Ein weiterer Faktor, der die Interpretation des Rus-Konzepts beeinflusste, war die Notwendigkeit, eine Genehmigung zur Veröffentlichung durch das Zensurkomitee einzuholen.

Die Verwendung zeitgenössischer Konzepte zur Beschreibung der Geschichte Rus ist ein charakteristisches Merkmal der Studien von 1805–1860. Künstliche Konzepte wie *Kyivan Rus* erfreuten sich großer Beliebtheit. Die überwiegende Mehrheit der Historiker ordnete das Territorium Russlands der Region Kiew zu.

⁶¹ Костомаров, Н.: Славянская мифология, с. д., с. 17, 59, 61, 64.

⁶² Костомаров, Н.: Славянская мифология, с. д., с. 38.

⁶³ Письма М. Погодина к М. Максимовичу с пояснениями С. И. Пономарева. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Академии Наук, 1882. 143 с.