

Heorhii Potulnytskyi

**POSITION OF UKRAINE BETWEEN
POLAND AND RUSSIA IN THE
NARRATIVES OF FRENCH AND
GERMAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY
FROM THE END OF THE 18th
CENTURY UNTIL THE END
OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR:
TOWARDS THEORETICAL,
METHODOLOGICAL, CONCEPTUAL,
AND SOURCE ASPECTS¹**

Intellectual history, as viewed by modern researchers, is closely connected with various historical disciplines, among which one may name historiosophy, conceptual history, political history, history of discourse, and so forth as the fields characterized by the utmost importance.² There are many diverse definitions of this term of which the most preferable one was defined by outstanding Harvard scholar Omeljan Pritsak (1919–2006), who viewed intellectual history “as the study of codified and systematized thought organized in philosophical, political, and other theories and expressed in a societal context”.³

Focusing primarily on political, philosophical, and historical trends of French and German intellectual history, this paper explicitly addresses several defining factors. First, it was in French and German historical

¹ The author expresses his deep gratitude to John Kennedy Institute Research Grant (Freie Universität, Berlin) and the Prussian Cultural Heritage Scholarship Fund (Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz) for the opportunity to work at the State Library in Berlin and other libraries in France and Germany, where he found published groups of sources which made it possible to write this article. Most of the works in this study were presented in the Ukrainian discourse for the first time.

² See: Riccardo Bavaj. *Intellectual History*. P. 2. URL: http://docupedia.de/zg/Intellectual_History?oldid=84627.

³ Refer to Pritsak Omeljan. Prolegomena to Ukrainian Intellectual History: the First Period, 1805–1860s. *Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies held at Harvard Universities*. Cambridge, Mass., 1975–1976. No. VI. P. 47.

and political thought that there was a long research tradition of studying Ukraine and Ukrainians as a separate ethnic group with their language, culture, and history. In France and Germany, this tradition lasted throughout the eighteenth century.⁴ It was revived under the influence of the Great Polish Emigration to the French Republic and continued in the Second Empire in the middle of the nineteenth century during the reign of Napoleon III,⁵ as well as in Prussia at the same period.⁶ The next stage in French and German discourses related to Ukraine started in the 1880s and lasted until the end of the First World War. In France, it had

⁴ See: Потульніцький Г. В. Українське козацтво в творчості Жана Бенуа Шерера та Августа Вільгельма Гупеля (на основі аналізу «Літопису Малоросії...» та нарису «Про козаків»). *Наукові записки* : збірник праць молодих вчених та аспірантів Інституту української археографії НАН України. Київ, 2011. Т. 22. С. 121–129; Idem. Козацький чинник в дипломатичній та інтелектуальній діяльності французьких еліт (1729–1789). Автореф. ... канд. істор. наук. Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства НАН України. Київ, 2015. 20 с.; Idem. Українофільські та русофільські тенденції щодо козацького питання у науковій спадщині французької інтелектуальної еліти у другій половині XVIII століття. *Славістична збірка*. Вип. 4. Збірка статей за матеріалами Четвертих Міжнародних наукових Соханівських читань (Київ, 17 листопада 2017 р.). Київ, 2018. Вип. 4. С. 214–226.

⁵ Delamarre C. Un peuple europeen de quinze millions oublie devant l'histoire. Paris, 1869; Idem. Carte ethnographique demonstnant la pluralite des langues, des literatures et des peuples Slaves. *Bulletin de la Societe de geographique*. 1868. Juli – Dec. 314 p.; Mars Victor de. La Pologne, ses anciennes provinces et ses veritable limites. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1863. Т. 45. P. 497–527; Viquesnel A. Les Polonais, les Ruthenes et les Lithuaniens. Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire de l'Eglise, Ruthene, le groupe des Cosaques petits-russiens. Lyon, 1865; Idem. Coup d'oeil sur quelques points de l'histoire generale des peuples slaves et de leurs voisins les Turcs et les Finnois. Paris, 1861; Martin H. Russie et l'Europe. Paris, 1866; Robert C. Des origins slaves. Paris, 1852. 216 p.

⁶ Blasius J. H. Reise in Europäischen Rußland in den Jahren 1840 und 1841. Theil 2. Reisen in Süden. Braunschweig 1844; Haxthausen A. Studien über die innere Zustände, das volksleben und insbesondere die ländlichen Einrichtungen Russlands. Berlin und Hannover, 1847. 584 S.; Dr. Ernst Hermann. Die kleinrussischen Kosaken. *Geschichte der russischen Staates*. Hamburg 1846. Bd. III. S. 602–627; Kohl J. G. Reisen in inner von Rußland. Die Ukraine, Kleinrußland. Dresden ; Leipzig, 1841. 400 S.; Mauritius A. Literatur – und Kultur Epochen seit dem Jahre 1831 in kurze dargestellt. Posen, 1843. 210 S.; Idem. Der Panslawismus. Eine Improvisation als Sendschreiben an der Grafen Adam Gurowski. Leipzig, 1843. 47 S.; Petzholdt A. Reise im westlichen und südlichen europäischen Rußland im Jahre 1855. Leipzig, 1864. 455 S.

already begun during the period of shifting priorities in French foreign policy towards Eastern Europe and Russia during the Third Republic.⁷ In Germany, the third of examined discourses developed in the works of Professor Eduard von Hartmann, a prominent philosopher who began to study issues pertaining to Ukraine in the late 1880s and also worked as an adviser to the chancellor Otto von Bismarck.⁸ Furthermore, the discourse in question is to be found in the works of several Hartmann's followers, who continued his research in the early twentieth century and during the First World War.⁹

⁷ The works of some well-known French scholars were devoted to Ukraine in the context of Polish and Russian history. See, for example: Baye J. de. *Kiew la Mere des Villes Russes*. Paris, 1896. 46 p.; Idem. *En Petite-Russie, souvenirs d'une mission*. Paris, 1903. 46 p.; Guenot Charles. *Les Zaporogues*. Paris, 1881. 224 p.; Leger L. *Nouvelles etudes slaves histoire et litterature*. Paris, 1886; Leroy-Beaulieu Anatole. *L'Empire des tsares et les Russes*. Paris, 1881–1889. T. I–III (edition douisieme 1897–1898); Niessel H.-A. *Les Cosaques: etude historique, geographique, economique et militaire*. Paris, 1898. 470 p.; Reclus Elisee. *La Nouvelle Geographie universelle, la terre et les hommes*. Paris, 1878; Tissot V. *Ukraine*. Kiew. Precede d'une notice par Charles Simond. Paris, 1897. 32 p.; Vogue E.-M. de. *Le fils de Pierre le Grand*. Mазеppа. Un Changement de regne. Paris, 1884. 363 p.

⁸ Hartmann Eduard. *Tagesfragen*. Leipzig, 1896; Idem. *Rußland in Europa. Die Gegenwart*. Berlin, den 7. Januar 1888. Bd. XXXIII. No. 1; Idem. *Zwei Jahrzehnte deutscher Politik und die gegenwärtige Weltlage*. Leipzig, 1889; Idem. *Rußland in Asien. Die Gegenwart. Wochenschrift für Literatur, Kunst und öffentliches Leben* / hrsg. Theofil Zolling. Berlin, den 24 December 1887. Bd. XXXII. No. 52.

⁹ Naumann Friedrich. *Die Nationalitäten Mitteleuropas. Friedrich Naumann Werke*. Köln und Opladen, 1964. Bd. 4; Idem. *Tschechen und Polen. Ibidem*; Weber Max. *Deutschland unter den europäischen Weltmächten*. 22 October 1916; Weber Max. *Gesammelte politische Schriften*. Tübingen, 1971; Penck Albrecht. *Polen. Eine Anzeige. Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*. 1918. No. 3/4; Idem. *Die Ukraine. Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*. 1916. No. 7; Idem. *Politisch-geographische Lehren des Krieges. Meereskunde. Sammlung volkstümliche Vorträge zum Verständnis der nationalen Bedeutung von Meer und Seewesen*. 1915. No. 9. Heft 10; Hoetzch Otto. *Rußland: Eine Einführung auf Grund seiner Geschichte von 1904 bis 1912*. Berlin, 1913; Idem. *Der Deutsche Kampf im Osten. Rede am 5. Februar 1915*. Berlin, 1915; Rohrbach Paul. *Bismarck und wir*. München, 1915; Idem. *Russisches*. Berlin, 1915; Idem. *Der Kampf um Livland. Deutsch-Russisches Ringen durch sieben Jahrhunderte. Weltkultur und Weltpolitik: Deutsche und Österreichische Schriftenfolge*. Deutsche Folge 11 / hrsg. Ernst Jäckn. München, 1917.

The second statement concerns both the German historiographical account of this issue¹⁰ and French historical thought.¹¹ Although German and French historiographies has raised the problem of Ukrainian image research from the German perspectives, the above-mentioned authors confined themselves either to listing and chronological systematization of works published by German or French historians, or to individual research heritage of separate scholars, to name but a few. They neither studied individual trends of German and French intellectual history and how their representatives highlighted the problems of Ukraine nor analysed the vision of the phenomena of a nation, state, territorial boundaries, national and regional identity by the prominent representatives of these trends through the Ukrainian example. Furthermore, they did not pay attention due regard to the Ukrainian case while analyzing the views of the leading representatives on the issues relating to a national and regional identity of Ukraine, or the relations of Ukraine with Russia, Poland, and other states.

In terms of methodology, the author's intention is to elaborate on the issue stated in the title of this paper premised on a comparative analysis of views on Ukraine and its position on the map of Europe while considering the works of the representatives of three 'real generations' of researchers (using Karl Mannheim's terminology) in French and German intellectual history.¹²

The fundamental idea which Mannheim put forward in his formulation of the theory of generations was to understand the "generational

¹⁰ See: Borowsky Peter. Paul Rohrbach und die Ukraine. Ein Beitrag zum Kontinuitätsproblem. *Deutschland in der Weltpolitik des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. Fritz Fisher zum 65. Geburtstag / hrsg. I. Geiss und Bernd Jürgen Wendt. Düsseldorf, 1973. S. 437–462; Kappeler A. Ukrainian History from a German Perspective. *Slavic Review*. 1995. Vol. 54. No. 3. P. 696–697; Idem. Die Ukraine in der deutschsprachigen Historiographie. Kappeler Andreas. *Der Schwierige Weg zur Nation*. Wiener Archiv für die Geschichte des Slawentums und Osteuropas. Bd. XX. Wien, 2003. S. 54–70.

¹¹ See: Kuk L. Cyprien Robert, slavisant angevin et la Grande emigration polonaise. *Annales de Bretagne et de pays de l'Quest*. 1992. T. 99. No. 4. Pp. 505–515; Joukovsky A. Prosper Merimee et la question Ukrainienne. *L'Ukraine et la France au XIX-e siecle: actes du colloque, organise a la Sorbonne les 21 et 22 mars 1986*. Paris ; Munich, 1987. P. 21–32; Idem. Les publications-sources francais au sujet des Cosaques ukrainiens, de Beauplan a Merimee. *Les cosaques de l'Ukraine. Role historique: representations litteraires et artistiques*. Actes du 5-e colloque international franco-ukrainien. Paris, 1995. P. 25–34.

¹² See: Mannheim Karl. The Problem of Generation. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. London, 1952. Pp. 302–304.

location” in the social world, which is determined by its role in the cultural process. As Mannheim posits, the individuals belonging to the same generation are characterized by a common position in social and historical course, which limits them to a special array of potential experiences and confines them to a certain inherent type of thinking and experience, as well as a characteristic type of historically determined actions.¹³ Mannheim’s viewpoint was directly related to his concept of “styles of thought”, in which he analyzed group patterns of thinking generated by the corresponding social and cultural environment inherent in each generation.¹⁴

This paper argues that the study of works written by the representatives of each of the three generations makes it possible to indicate, to a certain extent, the differences in their theoretical, terminological, and conceptual perceptions of the Ukrainian issue and find the position of Ukraine in the distinctive narratives of the French and German intellectual history of the period under discussion. A distinctive attribute of this paper’s generation-focused structure is that it concentrates on the characteristic features of scientific schools of thought and practices of each generation. First and foremost, this paper examines the direction, the dominant issues of works, the sources of information, the position of Ukrainian discourse between Russian and Polish ones, etc.

The scientific paradigm or approach which this paper adheres to depends on the nature of the issue under analysis and consists of two sets of interrelated questions: a) the main one described above; b) the contextual one which is subordinate to the main one. In consonance with this approach, the context, i.e. the foreign relations of France and Germany, on the one hand, and the scientific ties of foreign scientists with French and German ones, on the other hand, are considered comprehensively. Therefore, each section which presents the views of representatives of a separate generation of researchers who wrote about Ukraine in French and German intellectual history is preceded by a contextual analysis which reveals the foreign policy and intellectual prerequisites for the growth of interest in Ukraine in French and German historical and political thought in a certain period of history.

¹³ See: Mannheim Karl. The Problem of Generation. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. London, 1952. P. 291.

¹⁴ See: Мангайм К. Ідеологія та утопія (пер. з нім.). Київ, 2008. С. 19.

Methodologically, the contextual issue is addressed based on implementing conceptual conclusions to the interaction of concrete and generalizing conclusions in the study of the history of a particular period, elaborated by the famous English theoretician of history Gordon Leff.¹⁵ This generalization in history gains gravity not due to the comprehension of a range of individual original events, but also due to the internal logic of each element.¹⁶

On the grounds of this approach, each of the three discourses from the late eighteenth and until the early twentieth centuries is to be presented with a brief introduction of the historical and geopolitical context in which most of the analyzed works emerged. For the first discourse, the coverage of political premise focuses on the main stages of the Franco-Russian conflict in North-Eastern Europe in the context of trends in European politics from 1762 until 1789 and the role of Ukrainian proponents of autonomy in their relations with German political circles in 1789 and the 1790s. The second discourse concentrates on France's foreign policy towards Eastern Europe and Russia during the reigns of Louis-Philippe I and Napoleon III. Furthermore, it covers the opposition in Prussian court and its pro-Ukrainian leanings in the court of Frederick William IV. The third discourse dwells on the geopolitical plans of the German Empire towards Ukraine from the 1880s to the end of the First World War and the shift of priorities in French foreign policy towards Eastern Europe and Russia during the Third Republic.

The elaboration of the intellectual premise requires drawing attention to the study of the heritage of Polish émigrés in France in the 1830s and 1860s (for the second stage) and the activity of Ukrainian diaspora and contacts of Ukrainian, French, and German scientists in the 1870s and 1910s (during the third period). In this instance, it should be noted that some French, Polish, and Ukrainian historians have studied the political and scientific heritage of Polish émigrés in France in the first half of the nineteenth century, which also influenced the development of Ukrainian Studies in French intellectual history. Of the utmost significance were the ideas of Franciszek Duchinsky (1816–1893), Michael Czaikowski (1804–1886), and other scholars who had a momentous influence on German and especially French historical and

¹⁵ Leff G. *History and Social Theory*. London, 1969. Pp. 79–80.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* P. 57.

political thought of that period,¹⁷ as well as the activity of Ukrainian immigrants and researchers in France and Germany in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, namely Mykhailo Drahomanov, Ivan Luchytskyi, Volodymyr Piskorskyi, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, and Maksym Kovalevskyi, who established mutual productive contacts with German and French scientists who researched Ukrainian history and literature of that time.¹⁸

However, it should be noted that the researchers mentioned above focused their attention predominantly not on the influence of Polish and Ukrainian diaspora and researchers on the creation of Ukrainian studies in French and German intellectual history or a comparative analysis of pertaining ideas and concepts, but rather on the perceived image of European peoples in the works of Polish immigrants, in particular the images of Ukrainians, as well as Russians and Turks, or on the issues of studying the views of these emigrants on ethnicity, race, civilization, the idea of the unity of Ukrainians and Poles, etc. A similar statement could also be made about the lack of proper historiographical studies on the influence of scientists from Ukraine who were immigrants or researchers in France and Germany in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In particular, no paper addresses the perception and image of Ukraine and the interpretation of Russian and Polish issues in this context by their French and German colleagues.

¹⁷ See: Борщак І. Україна в Парижі. Францішек Духінський. *Україна*. 1953. Ч. 9. С. 701–709; Grabski Andrzej Feliks. *Historiografia i polityka*. Warszawa, 1979; Rudnytsky Ivan L. Michal Czajkowski's Cossack Project During the Crimean War: An Analysis of Ideas. Rudnytsky Ivan L. *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*. Edmonton, 1987. Pp. 173–186; Idem. Franciszek Duchinski and His Impact on Ukrainian Political Thought. *Ibid.* Pp. 187–203; Nowak Andrzej. Miedzy carem a rewolucja. Studium politycznej wyobrazni I postaw Wielkiej Emigracji wobec Rosji. 1831–1849. Warszawa, 1994; Nowak Joanna. Gente Ruthenus, natione Polonus. Rusini w refleksji Wielkiej Emigracji. *Sprawy Narodowościowe*. 2003. Seria nowa. 23. P. 43–62.

¹⁸ See: Portal R. Russes et Ukrainiens. Paris, 1970; Joukovsky A. Mykhailo Hrouchevskyi. Sa vie et son oeuvre. Paris, 1997. 167 p.; Прицак Омелян. Історіософія та історіографія Михайла Грушевського. Київ ; Кембрідж, 1991. 78 с.; Новікова О. О. В. К. Піскорський. Біографічний нарис. Піскорський В. К. *Вибрані твори та епістолярна спадщина*. Київ, 1997. С. 17–44; Лучицька М. В. Спогади. *Українознавчі студії та мемуари Івана і Марії Лучицьких (кінець 19 – початок 20 ст.)* / упор. Новікова О. О. Київ, 2007. С. 235–347; Потульницький В. А. Зарубіжні відрадження молодих науковців Київського університету Святого Володимира у 1870-ті рр. як засіб формування історика. *Ейдос*. Альманах історії та теорії історичної науки. Київ, 2016/2017. Вип. 9. С. 177–195.

Following this approach, in the process of elaborating on the context, attention should be focused not only on the relations of France and Germany with the respective states, i.e. Russia, Poland, and Ukraine, but also on the internal political situation in the countries under analysis, as well as interpersonal relations between politicians, scientists, and cultural luminaries, who had a significant influence on the course of the studied events. These numerous connections and interpersonal relationships constitute an important factor which unites the events which took place in the foreign and domestic affairs of French and German sociopolitical and cultural life. This approach requires the analysis not only of the political and diplomatic aspects of Ukrainian-French and Ukrainian-German relations, but also of the main factors which influenced the attitude of the French and German governments to the Ukrainian issue between the 1770s and 1790s, 1850s and 1860s, as well as 1870 and 1918. Considerable attention is paid to the individual factors and the influence of particular politicians and public figures on the policy of France and Germany towards Ukraine and Ukrainians.

It is also worth mentioning that during the years of Ukrainian independence, many Ukrainian historians have prepared and defended several PhD theses devoted to certain conceptual aspects of the problem, in particular, the cultural relations of Ukraine and France in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the cultural, educational and scientific activity of Ukrainian emigrants in the French Republic during the inter-war period and the French policy towards Ukraine and its western Galicia region in 1918–1923.¹⁹ Furthermore, several Ukrainian researchers have

¹⁹ Кураєв О. О. Культурні зв'язки України і Франції у другій половині 19-го – на початку 20 ст. (1851–1917) : дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Спец. 07.00.03. «Загальна історія». Київ : Інститут історії України АН України, 1992. 162 с.; Городня Н. Д. Політика країн Антанти та США щодо державності України (1917–1919) : автореферат дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Київ, 1995. 24 с.; Череватюк В. Б. Громадська, культурно-освітня та наукова діяльність українських емігрантів у Франції в 20-х – 30-х рр. 20 ст. : дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Інститут української археографії. Київ, 1996. 197 с.; Довгань Ю. Л. Політика Франції, Великої Британії та США щодо національної державності України в 1917–1920 рр. у вітчизняній та українській зарубіжній історіографіях : дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Київ, 2006. 186 с.; Бочан П. О. Україна в поглядах німецьких і французьких вчених, послів і мандрівників 17–19 ст. : дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Чернівецький університет ім. Федьковича. Чернівці, 2008. 199 с.; Тичка Г. М. Східна Галичина у політиці Франції (1918–1923) : дис. ... канд. істор. наук. Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка. Львів, 2018. 168 с.

prepared in-depth works on both French ²⁰ and German ²¹ discourse on Ukraine over the past decades.

While considering the issues addressed in this paper, it is also important to show how the “Ukraine” concept of the authors studied fits into their vision of the “Germany” and “France” concepts, the role of France in Europe during the reign of Napoleon III and Germany during Bismarck’s period, in particular, the French and contemporary German pursuits in Eastern Europe. It is equally important to determine which of the studied intellectuals used only the Polish and Ukrainian issue as a viewpoint which opposes the Russian issue, e.g. German perception of Ukrainians as a “federal-democratic” and “egalitarian” nation opposed to the Asian-Mongol authoritarian power further to the East. In addition, it should be pointed out which of these authors was imbued with altruistic ideas of the liberation of Poland and Ukraine from the Russian rule.

The main subject of the research is French and German historical, political, and philosophical history of ideas with a focus on “Ukraine” concept during the so-called ‘long’ nineteenth century. The scientists and politicians whose legacy is examined in this paper worked, on the one hand, in three distinct periods in the history of Imperial and Republican France, which unfolded from the end of the eighteenth until the beginning of the twentieth century, and, on the other hand, the Prussian monarchy and the German Empire in the same period of history. Therefore, the methodology mentioned above serves as a basis for this paper in its aim to reproduce and analyze views of several representatives of each of the three generations of French and German intellectual history, who touched upon certain problems of Ukrainian history,

²⁰ See the works by the researcher Oksana Ivanenko: Іваненко О. Українська тема у французькій публіцистиці, мемуарній та художній літературі першої половини 19 ст. *Міжнародні зв'язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки*. Київ, 2006. Вип. 15. С. 433–436; Idem. Співробітництво Університету Св. Володимира з науково-освітніми центрами Франції в галузі гуманітарних наук (друга пол. 19 – поч. 20 ст.). *Ibid.* 2007. Вип. 46. С. 121–129; Idem. Українсько-французькі взаємини в сфері науки та освіти другої половини 19 – поч. 20 ст. *Український історичний журнал*. 2008. № 4. С. 148–161.

²¹ See: Кураев О. О. Українська проблематика в німецькій літературі першої половини 19 ст. *Україна в історії Європи* / за ред. С. Віднянського. Київ, 2020. С. 40–83; Idem. Politische und wissenschaftliche Aspekte der Entstehung deutscher Ukrainekunde des XX Jh. (1905–1916). *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*. 2002. No. 1. S. 94–101.

culture, politics, ethnography, etc. in their works, taking a direct part in each of the three historical discourses. The following paragraphs of the paper look at these three generations in more detail.

The first generation. This paper distinguishes two fundamental political and intellectual factors which determined the emergence of discourse about Ukraine in the French and German intellectual history at the end of the eighteenth century. First of all, one can name the Franco-Russian conflict in North-Eastern Europe while speaking about the context of trends in European politics from 1762 until 1789, and, secondly, the covert activity of Ukrainian autonomists in relations with German politicians in the 1789–1790s, which was the reason for the dissolution of the Ukrainian autonomous Cossack Hetmanate state at the end of the eighteenth century and the corresponding steps of the Ukrainian aristocratic elite aimed at its restoration.²²

French scientists and politicians who launched the Ukraine-centered discourse approximately at the end of the eighteenth century constitute the first of the three generations studied in this paper. Among the French intellectuals who studied the countries of Eastern Europe in the second half of the 18th century, two viewpoints were developed in relation to the Ukrainian Cossack state: a) Ukrainophilic, which was represented by the historian and translator Nicolas-Gabriel Le Clerc (1726–1798) and the historian Jean-Benoît Schérer (1741–

²² For details, see: Потульницький Г. Світова та вітчизняна історіографія кінця 19 – початку 21-го ст. про місію українського поета Василя Капніста до Берліна у квітні 1791 р. *Наукові записки: збірник праць молодих вчених та аспірантів Інституту української археографії НАН України*. Київ, 2012. Т. 25. С. 292–299; Idem. Українофільські та русофільські тенденції щодо козацького питання у науковій спадщині французької інтелектуальної еліти у другій половині XVIII століття. *Славістична збірка*. Вип. 4. Збірка статей за матеріалами Четвертих Міжнародних наукових Соханівських читань (Київ, 17 листопада 2017 р.). Київ, 2018. Вип. 4. С. 214–226; Idem. Теоретико-методологічні аспекти проблеми легітимації ідеї козацької державності в менталітеті Французького королівства XVIII століття. *Наукові записки: збірник праць молодих вчених та аспірантів Інституту української археографії НАН України*. Київ, 2013. Т. 27. С. 132–141; Idem. Річ Посполита в контексті антиросійської політики Франції в епоху правління Людовіка XV (1715–1774). *Історичныя шляхі, узаемадзеянне і узаемаупльывы беларускаго народа і суседзяў: зборнік науковых артыкулаў*. Гомель, 2014. С. 15–19.

1824);²³ b) Russophillic, which was represented by the historian and translator Pierre Charles Lévesque (1736–1812).²⁴ While Le Clerc and Schérer defined the Cossacks as a separate ethnic group capable of independent political and cultural development, then their main opponent Lévesque, on the contrary, did not perceive the Ukrainian language and culture as something to exist outside the much more pervasive and influential Russian context.²⁵

At the same time in Germany, as in France, some authors vividly reflected Russophillic views in their work about Ukraine, as well as historians who professed Ukrainophillic views on the problem of the position of Ukraine and the identity of its people. For instance, Russophillic stance was displayed by August Wilhelm Hupel (1737–1819), a German author who wrote a lengthy essay on Ukraine and the Ukrainian Cossacks in 1790.²⁶ In Hupel's description of the policy of the Polish government towards the Cossacks, he tried to consider this complex issue from several frames of reference. He supported the Polish reforms aimed at decreasing the number of Cossacks and depriving them of their privileges due to his opinion that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was forced to take these steps because of 'trickery and abuse of rights' on

²³ Le Clerc N.-G. Histoire physique, morale, civile et politique de la Russie Ancienne. Paris (Chez Froullé), 1783. Vol. I–III; Scherer J.-B. Annales de la Petite-Russie, ou histoire des Cosaques-Saporogues et des Cosaques de l'Ukraine ou de la Petite-Russie, depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours. Paris : Chez Cuchet, 1788. T. I. 328 p.; Idem. Annales de la Petite-Russie, ou histoire des Cosaques-Saporogues et des Cosaques de l'Ukraine ou de la Petite-Russie, depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours. Paris : Chez Cuchet, 1788. T. II. 387 p.

²⁴ Levesque P.-Ch. Histoire de Russie, tirée des chroniques originales, de pièces authentiques, & et des meilleurs historien de la Nation. Paris, 1782. T. 1; Yverdon, 1783. T. II–V; Idem. Histoire des différens peuples soumis à la domination des Russes ou suite de l'histoire de Russie. Paris : Chez Debure l'ainé, 1783. T. I. 537 p.; T. II. 500 p.; Mazon A. Pierre-Charles Levesque – humaniste, historien et moraliste. *Revue des Études slaves*. Paris, 1963. Vol. 42; Somov V. Pierre-Charles Levesque, protégé de Diderot et historien de la Russie. *Cahiers du Monde russe*. Paris, 2002. Vol. 43. No. 2–3.

²⁵ For details, see: Потульницький Г. Українофільські та русофільські тенденції щодо козацького питання у науковій спадщині французької інтелектуальної еліти у другій половині XVIII століття. *Славістична збірка*. Вип. 4. Збірка статей за матеріалами Четвертих Міжнародних наукових Соханівських читань (Київ, 17 листопада 2017 р.). Київ, 2018. Вип. 4. С. 214–226.

²⁶ Hupel A. W. Von der Kosaken. Nebst andern kürzen Aufsätzen. Der nor-dischen Miscellaneen 24stes und 25stes Stück. Riga : J. F. Hartnoch, 1790. 284 S.

part of the Cossacks. In line with his reasoning, Hupel saw the Cossacks as a direct threat to the integrity of the state, since “their incursions were impetuous and could provoke new wars”.²⁷ Concurrently, however, the researcher condemns the unfair seizure of Cossack lands by a wealthy aristocratic social class of Polish magnates, increased taxation of the Ukrainian population and their forced conversion into the Catholic faith. As a result, writes Hupel, the Cossacks had not only sufficient reasons to defend their land, but were forced to do so.

He approaches the policy of the Russian Empire towards the Ukrainian Cossacks from a completely different viewpoint. In the first chapter of his work, Hupel writes that Russian monarchs previously were the legitimate rulers of Ukraine and the March Articles, a treaty signed in 1654 after the Pereyaslav Council between Moscow and the Cossack elite, only returned the Ukrainian Cossacks to their old rulers. This idea continues in the text describing the events of the Khmelnytsky Uprising of 1648–1657, a rebellion of Cossacks and peasantry against Polish rule: “...he [*Bohdan Khmelnytsky – H. P.*] did not find a better way to ensure the security of himself and his people than to unite again with the people from whom the ancestors of the Cossacks descended, namely, to bow to the tsars of Russia, who already had a reasonable right to Little Russia”.²⁸

Hupel also justifies the disbanding of the Zaporozhian Sich, thereby denying Schérer’s statement that the Russian government made a mistake when it dissolved this autonomous polity in 1775. According to Hupel, this step of the Russian Empire was substantiated, as “the Cossacks often changed their rulers, and did display proper loyalty and obedience to any of them”, to which he adds that the Cossacks were known for their lack discipline, a trait which caused problems on the border of the empire.²⁹

The essence of Hupel’s essay can be summarized by the following quote, which also concluded his work: “our century, especially its last three decades, irrefutably show that the Cossacks, after their structure based on privileges and their abuse was significantly changed, became useful, good, calm (even, if I may say so, satisfied and happy) members of the state”.³⁰ These words clearly demonstrate not only the desire to

²⁷ Ibid. S. 197–198.

²⁸ Ibid. S. 200.

²⁹ Ibid. S. 209–212.

³⁰ Ibid.

justify the steps taken by the Russian government in order to stamp out the Ukrainian Cossacks, but also to show that the Cossacks as a strong force no longer existed and would not exist in the future.

On the other end of the spectrum, pro-Ukrainian sentiments were expressed by Johann Christian von Engel (1770–1814), another German-speaking researcher of that period. A graduate of the Universities of Presburg and Göttingen, Engel gained substantial knowledge of Eastern European history from his work on primary sources. His dissertation, published in 1790, was specifically devoted to the Ukrainian Cossacks.³¹ Engel was working on it at the time when the last partition of Poland took place, and so his research on the fate of this state, to the decline of which the Cossacks had made a crucial contribution, brought his attention to the history of Ukraine as well. In his work, he compares the Cossacks with both Spartans and Knights of Malta, and even advocates for the military superiority of the Cossacks in comparison with the Maltese.

In 1792, Engel's lengthier work devoted to the history of Eastern European Galicia was published.³² In his monograph, Engel examines Galicia while taking into account hereditary succession instead of nationality, and disputes with imaginary contenders for the Principality of Halych, such as Russia, Poland, and Lithuania, defending the hereditary rights of the Hungarian crown to rule over it.³³ The second volume, which was written by Engel for the multi-volume global history and published in the same year as his work on the history of Galicia, dealt with the history of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Cossacks.³⁴ In his research, Engel clearly expresses the idea that Ukrainians and Russians are

³¹ Engel J. Chr. *Commentario de republica militari seu comparatio Lacedaemoniorum Creetensium et Cossaccorum*. Göttingen, 1790.

³² Engel J. Chr. *Geschichte von Galitsch und Wladimir bis 1772. Verbunden mit Auseinandersetzung Verteidigung der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Besitzrechte auf diese Königreiche*. Wien, 1772. B. 1–2. In a slightly altered form, this work made a part of multi-volume series on global history, which was initiated by the Learned Society of German and English Scholars in 1790 under the title 'Fortsetzung der Allgemeinen Welthistoriae durch Gesellschaft von Gelehrten in Deutschland und England ausgefertigt' (Eng. Continuation of General Global History: Prepared by the Learned Society of German and English scholars). It appeared as a separate volume of this history, named as the "Geschichte von Halitsch und Wladimir". Halle, 1796. S. 399–685.

³³ Engel J. Chr. *Geschichte von Galitsch und Wladimir bis 1772*. S. 677–685.

³⁴ Engel J. Chr. *Geschichte der Ukraine und Ukrainische Kosaken*. Halle, 1796.

two different peoples, although he emphasizes that they had the same religion and that the origin and language of the two peoples were not much different.³⁵ Whereas the history of Ukraine of the centralized Kyivan or later disunited feudal periods for Engel are not to be treated on their own, but within the scope of a larger Rus' history, the history from the fourteenth century and onwards, when the western territories of Rus' began to become a part of Lithuanian nobility, is considered from a completely different point of view. When addressing the question of the emergence of the Cossacks and their relations with Poland, Engel writes: "the Ukrainian Cossacks were a calm people: at first, they responded to the insolence of the Polish nobility and clergy only by a quietly escaping away; but when they saw that the Polish wanted their destruction, they, naturally, took the situation into their own hands in order to protect themselves against the unbearable yoke of the Polish saber. Thus, who should be deemed to be right: the Cossacks or the Polish state that they once defended...?".³⁶ Engel condemns the Polish policy towards the Cossacks and all Ukrainian people, which led to the Uprising of Bohdan Khmelnitsky, a person he highly appreciates as the creator of the first Cossack state.³⁷ He also describes Ivan Mazepa as a Ukrainian patriot and believes that Moscow managed to exploit the Ukrainian Cossacks more efficiently than Poland did because when Moscow was certain that it could do without the help of Cossacks, it began to dismantle their independence until it was no more.³⁸

The second generation. This discourse, which directly dealt with the position of Ukraine between Russia and Poland, is represented by the second generation of French and German historians. In contrast to the previous chapter on the discourse of the end of the eighteenth century, examined by the author of this paper in a number of his other works, this section covers its subject to a limited extent, since only further thorough research will allow ascertaining previously outlined inherent trends, features, and comparisons.

The foreign policy and intellectual prerequisites for a creation of the image of Ukraine in the French and German intellectual history in a half of the nineteenth century were determined by three factors of international politics of that time period: (1) restoration of the anti-Russian

³⁵ Ibid. S. 194.

³⁶ Ibid. S. 308–309.

³⁷ Ibid. S. 3, 190, 211.

³⁸ Ibid. S. 288.

sentiment in French foreign politics during the reign of Louis Philippe I and especially Napoleon III; (2) political plans for the partition of Russia and liberation of Ukraine and Poland, which were conceived and attempted to be implemented by the then powerful opposition of the aristocrats with Ukrainophilic disposition in the Prussian court of Friedrich Wilhelm IV; (3) depiction of the image of Ukraine as a common homeland of Ukrainians and Poles in the creative and political works of the Great Polish Emigration in France in the 1830s, which had a decisive influence on the development of Ukrainian studies primarily in French, but also to a large extent in German intellectual history.

The second generation includes French scientists and politicians of the Second Republic and Second Empire, who revived the discourse about Ukraine in the period from the 1840s to 1860s, a move made mainly due to the foreign policy plans of Napoleon III. In addition, the second generation includes politicians and historians who held leading positions in French politics and historiography during the 1840s and 1860s period of the July Monarchy and the Second Empire. On the one hand, it was constituted of French scientists, among whom we distinguish the pro-Polish direction, represented by such figures as Jules Michelet (1798–1874), Victor de Mars (1817–1866), and Cyprien Robert (1807–1865).³⁹ However, the majority of scientists belonging to the second-generation were pro-Ukrainian, e.g. Auguste Viquesnel (1800–1867) and Henri Martin (1810–1883).⁴⁰ On the other hand, among the

³⁹ Cheve Ch. F. La Pologne: sa constitution, son histoire et ses decemdrements. Paris, 1861. 191 p.; Idem. Histoire complete de la Pologne depuis ses premiers origines jusqu'a nos jours. Paris, 1863. T. 1. 264 p.; Robert C. Des origins slaves. Paris, 1852. 216 p.; Idem. La Conjuraton du panslavisme et l'insurrection polonaise. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1846. T. 13. P. 1110–1127; Idem. Le monde slaves, son passe, son etat present et son avenir. Paris, 1852. T. 2. 370 p.; Idem. Les deux panslavismes. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1846. T. 16. P. 452–483; Idem. Les deux panslavismes. Situation actuelle des peuples slaves vis-a-vis de la Russie. Paris ; Leipzig, 1847. 63 p.; Mars Victor de. La Pologne, ses anciennes provinces et ses veritable limites. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1863. T. 45. P. 497–527.

⁴⁰ Martin Henri. Russie et l'Europe. Paris, 1866; Idem. Les Napoleon et les frontieres de la France. Paris, 1874; Idem. From druidic traditions to republican politics. *Journal of Contemporary History*. 1972. No. 7.3. Pp. 53–64; Viquesnel A. Les Polonais, les Ruthenes et les Lithuaniens. Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire de l'Eglise, Ruthene, le groupe des Cosaques petits-russiens. Lyon, 1865; Idem. Coup d'oeil sur quelques points de l'histoire generale des peuples slaves et de leurs voisins les Turcs et les Finnois. Paris, 1861; Marmie X. Le pays des Cosaques. *Du Danube au Caucase: voyages et litterature*. Paris, 1854. P. 335–385.

figures who belong to the second generation were senators of the Second French Empire, who also held pro-Ukrainian views, e.g. Theodore Casimir Delamarre (1797–1870), Hippolyte Carnot (1801–1888), and Prosper Mérimée (1803–1870).⁴¹

Delamarre, an editor of the influential *La Patrie* magazine during the Second Empire and a close friend of Napoleon III, petitioned the French Senate in 1868 to implement a reform in teaching global history courses in French educational institutions, primarily universities. In his address, published in 1869 under the title “Fifteen Million-Strong European People that the History has Forgotten”, Delamarre calls the Russian Empire a country of invaders, mentioning primarily Ruthenians, Lithuanians, and Poles among the subjugated peoples.⁴² After noting that the Ukrainian people had not been eradicated, Delamarre defines Ukrainians as separate and independent people, whose history “does not coincide with the history of Poland, and even less with the history of Muscovite Russia; it has its traditions, its language and character”.⁴³ The politician notes, “Belarusians, Little Russians, and Poles are genuine Slavs, forcibly annexed by Muscovites at various periods to their empire and appropriated their Rus’ denomination in order to assume a European pretense”.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Carno H. Corps legislativ. *Journal Officiel de l'Empire Francais*. 1868. 18 Juillet. No. 200; Delamarre C. Qu'est ce qu'un Russe ? : etude ethnographique d'apres Viquesnel. Paris, 1871. 48 p.; Idem. Un peuple europeen de quinze millions oublie devant l'histoire. Paris, 1869; Idem. Carte ethnographique demonstrent la pluralite des langues, des literatures et des peuples Slaves. *Bulletin de la Societe de geographie*. 1868. Juli – Dec. 314 p.; Merimee P. Bogdan Chmielnicki. Faxsmile de l'edition originale. Paris, 1865; Idem. Les Cosaques d'Ukraine et leurs derniers atamans. *Le Moniteur Universe*. 21–23 Juni 1854; Idem. Les Cosaques d'Ukraine et leurs derniers atamans. *Melanges historiques et litteraires*. Paris, 1855. P. 61–89.

⁴² Delamarre C. Un peuple europeen de quinze millions oublie devant l'histoire. Paris, 1869. Taken from: Evain E. Le Probleme de l'independance de l'Ukraine et la France. Paris, 1931. P. 77.

⁴³ Ibid. P. 79.

⁴⁴ Ibid. P. 87. It should be noted that Delamarre's statements were greatly influenced by the race theory of Franciszek Duhinsky, a Polish emigrant with ukrainophile views (1816–1893). Refer to: Потульніцький В. Український консерватизм в 19 – на початку 20 ст. *Український археографічний щорічник*. Київ, 2001. Вип. 5/6. С. 80–112; Nowak Joanna. Kontrowersje wokół Franciszka H. Duchńskiego zapomnianego polskiego historyka i etnografa. *Sprawy Narodowościowe*. 2000. P. 115–123; Wrzesińska Katarzyna. Ariowie i Turańczycy. Poglądy Franciszka H. Duchńskiego na temat rasy i cywilizacji. *Sprawy Narodowościowe*. 2015. Seria nowa. 46. P. 46–63.

The prominent French writer Mérimée was another famous political figure of the Second Empire interested in the search for the position of Cossack Ukraine between Poland and Russia. He believed that the transition of the Cossacks under the rule of the Russian Empire greatly contributed to a significant increase in the imperial strength and influence and at the same time led to the decline of Poland. According to Mérimée, it was the mistreatment of Cossacks that eventually led to the decline of the Cossack autonomy itself, and to the downfall of the Polish state.⁴⁵ He portrays Bohdan Khmelnytsky as a wise politician who knew how to manipulate people and was a person largely responsible for the bestowal of the Polish crown upon John II Casimir head. Such king of Poland was useful to Khmelnytsky since he gave the Ukrainian hetman a free hand to act at his own discretion while being a guarantee that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would exist as a weak state, for the king only nominally ruled the Cossack Ukraine, which was under the leadership of Khmelnytsky.⁴⁶

In addition to such politicians as Delamarre and Mérimée, the pro-Ukrainian sentiment among the French intellectuals of the Second Empire was shared by Viquesnel and Martin, well-known historians and ethnographers of that time. Viquesnel was interested in Duchinski's theory and wrote several works on the origin of the Ruthenians, Poles, and Muscovites, e.g. research in which he draws a distinction between the three peoples.⁴⁷ In another work, Viquesnel presents his differentiation of the four Russias or Rus' (he did not distinguish between these two notions), calling these Ruses Norman, Slavic, Finnish and Turanian (i.e. Tatar-Finnish), respectively. All these periods followed each other in the history of Russia, gradually repealing and nullifying the Slavic element in its history.⁴⁸

Identical ideas were expressed by Martin, an outstanding pro-Ukrainian French historian, academician, and author of the multi-volume history of France. Martin, who recognized the difference between

⁴⁵ Merimee P. Les Cosaques d'Ukraine et leurs derniers atamans. *Melanges historiques et litteraires*. Paris, 1855. P. 89.

⁴⁶ Merimee P. Bogdan Chmielnicki. Facsimile de l'edition originale. Paris, 1865. P. 83–84.

⁴⁷ Viquesnel A. Les Polonais, les Ruthenes et les Lithuaniens. Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire de l'Eglise, Ruthene, le groupe des Cosaques petits-russiens. Lyon, 1865.

⁴⁸ Viquesnel A. Coup d'oeil sur quelques points de l'histoire generale des peuples slaves et de leurs voisins les Turcs et les Finnois. Paris, 1861. Quated from the addition to the book of Martin Henri. *Russie et l'Europe*. Paris, 1866. P. 394.

Ukrainians and Russians and, conversely, the kinship of Ukrainians with the Poles due to the membership of the last two in a common European civilization, notes that “the Slavs of the Dnieper and Dniester are of the same origin as the Slavs of the Vistula River”.⁴⁹ The historian was concerned about the fate of Europe, noted that its only enemy is Moscow, and remarked that Ukraine and Poland were the first victims on its path of conquest. Their territory transformed into stepping stones for further Russian expansion to the West, and the Baltic and Black seas were turning into mere lakes within Russia. Because of this danger, Martin urged France and Germany to think not about their Rhine border, but about the border lying on the Dnieper, a river he perceived as the actual European border.⁵⁰

Other French intellectuals also participated in the French discourse on Ukraine at the same time as Ukrainophiles, with the former expressing Polonophilic sentiments in the context of describing Ukrainian-Polish relations. For instance, French historian and member of the editorial board *Revue des Deux Mondes* Robert (1807–1865), who was close to the Polish diaspora, calls the Ruthenians an ally of Poland and notes the ethnic proximity of Galician Ruthenians to the Poles, on the one hand, and to the Ukrainian Cossacks, on the other.⁵¹ He provides historical information on the part the Cossacks played in the history of the growth of Polish might in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, advocates the idea that the Ukrainian-Polish brotherhood has to be embraced, emphasizes the need of consolidation of Poles and Ukrainians in the name of the common struggle aimed at the liberation from Russian imperial oppression.⁵²

Michelet was another author who clearly expressed Polonophilic tendencies. He describes Ukrainians not as an independent people, but as a branch of the Polish nation, emphasizing that the separation of Ukrainians from the common Polish root came only after Ukrainian

⁴⁹ Martin Henri. *Russie et l'Europe*. P. 54.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* P. 282.

⁵¹ Robert C. *Le monde slaves, son passe, son etat present et son avenir*. Paris, 1852. T. I. P. 59.

⁵² Robert C. *La Conjuraction du panslavisme et l'insurrection polonaise*. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1846. T. 13. P. 1110–1127. Refer about the peculiarities of Relations between Ukraine and Poland as it is Presented in Historiographical Heritage of Robert to the article of French historian L. Kuk: Kuk L. Cyprien Robert, slavisant angevin et la Grande emigration polonaise. *Annales de Bretagne et de pays de l'Quest*. 1992. T. 99. No. 4. P. 505–515.

became a part of the Eastern Orthodox Church.⁵³ He labels the Ukrainian Cossacks as the destroyers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth since he believed that their transition to the Russian side was the main detrimental factor, which eventually led to the death of the country, “when the Polish Republic handled its enemy [*Moscow – H. P.*] a sword that was destined to fatally wound it”.⁵⁴

Victor de Mars, editor of *Revue des Deux Mondes* magazine and also Polonophile, emphasized that in the Middle Ages Ukrainians willingly expressed the desire to have their lands included under the Polish crown. In his opinion, during the existence of a state common to both Ukrainians and Poles, there was “equality between the Ruthenian and Polish noblemen within the common state”.⁵⁵ Polish possession of Ukrainian territory was not some type of a land grab, since the acquisition was made in compliance with the legal principles of that time, and the four-century period of Polish rule that lasted until 1772 was “the most legitimate and favorable [*for Ukrainians – H. P.*] rule”, as opposed to the time when Ukraine became a part of the “Empire of Russian tsars”.⁵⁶

Meanwhile, in Germany, the Ukrainian issue was raised by a group of Prussian politicians and diplomats, who formed the opposition in the Prussian court, which was led by Moritz August von Bethmann-Hollweg (1795–1877). His court group included prominent representatives of the German aristocracy and the Junkers, a class of Prussian landed nobility.⁵⁷ During the Crimean War, they put forward a plan developed by scientists and politicians from their environment to thrust Russia away from the Black Sea, which was supposed to lead to the partici-

⁵³ Michelet J. *La Pologne martyre*. Paris, 1863. P. 205.

⁵⁴ Michelet J. *Pologne et Russie. Legende de Kosciusko*. Paris, 1852. P. 23. About the vision of Michelet refer to: Луняк Є. З плеяди творців нації. Мішле, Костомаров, Грушевський. Видатні історики в романтичних життєписах. Ніжин, 2010. 165 с.

⁵⁵ Mars Victor de. *La Pologne, ses anciennes provinces et ses véritables limites. Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1863. T. 45. P. 523–524.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* P. 527.

⁵⁷ This group began to gain influence both in the press, founding the liberal weekly ‘*Preussisches Wochenblatt zur Besprechung politischer Tagesfragen*’ (Eng. Prussian Weekly on Contemporary Political Issues), published in Berlin between 1851 and 1861, and recruiting supporters in court and political circles with the help of their members’ large fortunes. Refer to: Бисмарк О. Мысли и воспоминания. Москва, 1940. Т. 1. С. 80.

pation of Prussia in the Crimean War. The plan was aimed at the partition of Russia, i.e. the separation of its eastern provinces and Ostsee (*later called Baltic – H. P.*) governorates from it, the creation of Great Russia and Little Russia out of the remaining territories, and the restoration of Poland.⁵⁸

These plans were not implemented due to the uncertain stance of the Prussian king Frederick William IV, who supported the plans of Bethmann-Hollweg's party, but did not venture to implement them for political reasons. They were based on the ideas of German historians and political thinkers of that time, especially on a theory developed by a Prussian baron von Haxthausen. As early as 1843, the baron had been granted permission from tsar Nicholas I and made a trip to the Russian empire, where he visited various Ukrainian provinces, the Crimea, Odesa, and published a three-volume interpretive work based on the results of the trip he made from 1847 until 1852, in which he investigated the domestic situation of the Ukrainian provinces by conducting a comparative analysis with lands populated by Russian majority to the east.⁵⁹ He drew particular attention to the great importance of the Ukrainian foothold for the future goals of Prussian politicians in relation to Eastern Europe.⁶⁰

Besides Haxthausen, other German researchers also wrote on the Ukrainian issue during the same period. The tendencies to be found in their works were essentially identical to the French discourse of that time with its division into Polonophiles and Ukrainophiles. In addition to the aforementioned Haxthausen, Ukrainophilic views were shared by such scholars as Johann Georg Kohl, Alexander Petzholdt, and Johann Heinrich Blasius. They defined the role and position of Ukraine in European history and politics, as well as attempted to include Ukraine into the context of German geopolitical interests. For example, Kohl notes the continuity of the state-building tradition of Ukrainians from the Kyivan Rus' till the Cossack era, distinguishes the people of Little Russia from Russians by expressing his opinion that the Ukrainians of Galicia and the Dnieper region are one people, while at the same time

⁵⁸ Rohrbach Paul. *Um des Teufels Handschrift. Zwei Menschenalter erlebter Weltgeschichte*. Hamburg, 1953. S. 58–60.

⁵⁹ See: Haxthausen A. *Studien über die innern Zustände das Volksleben und insbesondere die ländlichen Einrichtungen Russlands*. Hannover, 1847. Bd. I–II; Hannover, 1852. B. III.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* S. 171, 196, 306.

noting the difference between Galician Ukrainians (Ruthenians) and Poles.⁶¹

Blasius, a professor at the Collegium Carolinum in Braunschweig, was another German scholar who distinctly declared his Ukrainophilic views. In his descriptions of Ukraine, he provided a comparative description of Ukrainians and Russians, where he described the former as free liberty-loving people in contrast to the Russians under serfdom.⁶² Petzholdt was the third of the Ukrainophiles under discussion who developed his approach to the Ukrainian issue and relied on the works of Kohl and Blasius, his predecessors. His characterization of Ukrainians, whom he distinguishes from both Russians and Poles, is based on the materials compiled during his travels across Ukraine which started in 1847 and were later published in Leipzig in 1864.⁶³

On the other hand, the Polonophilic course in the German discourse of the 1840s and 1860s was represented by such researchers as Anton Mauritius and Friedrich Bodenstedt. Like their French contemporaries Robert, Jules Michelet and de Mars, the German academic outlook formed under the influence of members of the Great Polish Emigration, whose writings had a major influence on their work and their representation of the image of Ukraine. Mauritius was a German columnist with a degree in linguistics and the first of the Polonophiles. As far back as in 1843, he estimated the Polish movement as the one that should also pave the way for the liberation of Ukrainians. After noting that at a period “when Europe’s vision was focused on the Slavic East, “Polish officers should conspire ‘in order to liberate the nobility, while taking into account the interests of the people as specified in the Constitution of 3 May”,⁶⁴ Mauritius emphasizes that these were such Polish writers as Józef Bohdan Zaleski (1802–1866), Seweryn Goszczyński (1801–1876) and Michal Grabowski (1804–1863) who characterize the Ukrainian identity in the apt and insightful way. Mauritius opposes

⁶¹ Kohl J. G. Reisen in inner von Rußland. Die Ukraine, Kleinrußland. Dresden ; Leipzig, 1841. 400 S.

⁶² Blasius J. H. Reise in Europäischen Rußland in den Jahren 1840 und 1841. Theil 2. Reisen in Süden. Braunschweig, 1844; Idem. Reise in Europäischen Rußland. Vergleichende Analyse der Klein und Grossrussen. *Das Ausland*. 29 April 1843. Nr. 119; Idem. Die Ukraine. *Op. cit.* 11 April 1845. Nr. 101.

⁶³ Petzholdt A. Reise im westlichen und südlichen europäischen Rußland im Jahre 1855. Leipzig, 1864. 455 S.

⁶⁴ See: Mauritius A. Literatur-und Kultur Epochen seit dem Jahre 1831 in kürze dargestellt. Posen, 1843. 210 S.

them to Russian authors, in particular, Alexander Pushkin and the stance he took in his poem titled *Poltava*.⁶⁵ The pro-Polish course in relation to Ukraine is also taken by the German linguist in his attempt to harmonize and regulate the interests of the Ukrainian Cossacks and the Polish nobility. After noting that despite the fact that Ukrainians have their history of fighting for independence and trying to delineate their territory and borders, they must put Polish political aspirations and interests above theirs, thus promoting an idea that the Poles should be granted a priority in a state with two peoples.⁶⁶

Another Polonophile and philologist, Bodenstedt believed that the work on the conceptualisation and study of Ukrainian culture was a common task of both Polish and Ukrainian writers by calling such Poles as Adam Czarnocki (1784–1825), Józef Bohdan Zaleski (1802–1866), Michal Grabowski (1804–1863), and Tadeusz Lada Zablocki (1811–1847) promoters of Ukrainian poetry alongside with such Ukrainians as Mykhaylo Maksymovych (1804–1873) and Oleksandr Chuzhbinsky (1816–1886).⁶⁷ However, despite the crucial influence of Polish culture and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a common homeland of Ukrainians and Poles on the formation of Ukrainian cultural traditions, he characterizes Ukrainians as a people that “has hidden its national character and its own originality”.⁶⁸

The third generation. The statement about the limited extent of the examination of 1840s–1860s discourse in the previous chapter also fully applies to the narratives of French and German intellectual history of the third generation, a group which belongs to a period between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. A possible further study of this subject is expected to lead to a discovery of themes, trends and features inherent in these narratives.

The foreign policy and intellectual prerequisites for the development of the image of Ukraine in new circumstances of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in French and German intellectual history are also characterized by the three following features: (1) a shift of priorities in French foreign policy towards Eastern Europe and Russia

⁶⁵ Ibid. S. 45.

⁶⁶ Ibid. S. 48, 52. Refer also to: Idem. *Der Panslawismus. Eine Improvisation als Sendschreiben an der Grafen Adam Gurowski*. Leipzig, 1843. 47 S.

⁶⁷ Bodenstedt F. *Die poetische Ukraine. Eine Sammlung kleinrussischer volkslieder*. Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1845. S. VII–VIII.

⁶⁸ Ibid. S. X.

during the Third Republic, when previously antagonistic France turned into an ally of the Russian empire; (2) geopolitical plans of the German Empire in relation to Ukraine from the 1880s, which were developed during and under the leadership of chancellor Otto von Bismarck and continued by the supporters of his policy during the preparation for the First World War and after the actual conflict started; (3) the scientific and cultural relations of Ukrainian and Russian emigrants with France on the one hand and Ukrainian researchers with the German intellectual environment of that time on the other. These three factors had a decisive influence not only on the development of the third of the discourses covered in this paper but also on the first fundamental difference (as compared to the previous two narratives) between French and German intellectuals regarding the interpretation of the role and significance of the Ukrainian issue in European politics.

French intellectuals who studied the Ukrainian issues in the 1870s and 1890s and at the beginning of the twentieth century compose the next generation of scholars whose heritage is analyzed in this paper. This generation differs from the previous one by the presence of leading French scientists in its ranks and almost complete absence of politicians. The Ukrainian narrative in France during the period of the early Third Republic was promoted by several well-known French historians, writers, and scholars in Slavic studies. As in the section on the discourse of the late eighteenth century, in the third generation, we distinguish both representatives of the Russophilic trend, e.g. the famous scholar in Slavic studies Louis Léger (1843–1923) and the ethnographer Joseph de Baye (1853–1931),⁶⁹ as well as representatives of the Ukrainophilic movement, e.g. such historians and writers as Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu (1842–1912), Victor Tissot (1844–1917), and Marie-Eugène de Vogüé (1848–1910).⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Leger L. Russes et Slaves, etudes politiques et litteraires. Hachette, 1890; Idem. La monde slave, etudes politiques et litteraires. Hachette, 1902. Idem. Les anciens civilisations slaves. Voyages et litterature. Paris, 1991 (douisieme edition). 124 p.; Baye J de. Kiew la Mere des Villes Russes. Paris, 1896. 46 p.; Idem. Les Fibules de l'epoque barbare speciales a l'Ukraine et leurs prototypes. Caen, 1908. 13 p.; Idem. En Petite-Russie, souvenirs d'une mission. Paris, 1903. 46 p.; Idem. En Nouvelle-Russie, souvenirs d'une mission. Paris, 1900. 32 p.

⁷⁰ Leroy-Beaulieu Anatole. L'Empire des tsares et les Russes. Paris, 1881–1889. T. I–III (edition douisieme, 1897–1898); Idem. Etudes russes et europeennes. Paris, 1897; Idem. La France, la Russie et l'Europe. Paris, 1888; Idem. La Russie et la crise russe. Rouen, 1907; Idem. La pays et les habitants. Paris, 1890; Tissot V. Ukraine.

Professor Leroy-Beaulieu, the famous French historian of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who held correspondence with Bismarck and studied Russian and Ukrainian issues, in his works notes that the key differences between both peoples are explained by their belonging to two different environments, i.e. that of Moscow and Lithuania-Poland. He writes, “in western Russia private property prevails. From this follows that the boundary between the two areas where two types of feudal dependence existed also marks the old borders of the Muscovite Russia and the Lithuanian-Polish state.”⁷¹ The historian notes that the Russian government started to forcibly implement communal ownership reform for recently established peasant village communities in Ukraine and Belarus with particular fervor after the Polish Uprising of 1863 as a means of purposeful cultural assimilation, denationalization and social leveling of non-Russian speaking population.

Another French Ukrainophile of the third generation, historian and archaeologist Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé (1848–1910) analyzed the political figure of Hetman Ivan Mazepa as a key element for understanding the essence of Ukrainian-Russian relations in the early modern period. In his 1881 article on Ivan Mazepa he debunks the inaccurate French perception of the hetman as a Pole and Catholic and compares the position of the Orthodox hetman at the Polish royal court with the position of the Huguenots in France in the time of the French Wars of Religion during the reign of the last Valois monarchs in the last half of the 16th century.⁷² In his comparison of the passage of the Desna River crossed by the Ukrainian hetman and his Cossacks on their way to the camp of Charles XII of Sweden with the passage of the Rubicon by Gaius Julius Caesar, the French historian states that after the disaster that befell both Swedish and Ukrainian statesmen, Little Russia turned from an autonomous Hetmanate into a mere province of the uniform Russian Empire.⁷³

Kiew. Precede d'une notice par Charles Simond. Paris, 1897. 32 p.; Idem. La Russie et les Russes: Kiew et Moscou, impressions de voyage. Paris, 1884. 423 p.; Vogue M-E-M de. Mazepa – la legende et l'histoire. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1881. T. 48. P. 320–351; Idem. Les écrivains russes contemporains. Nicolas Gogol. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1885. T. 72. P. 241–279; Idem. Le fils de Pierre le Grand. Mazepa. Un Changement de regne. Paris, 1884. 363 p.

⁷¹ Leroy-Beaulieu Anatole. *L'Empire des tsars et les Russes*. Paris, 1881. T. I. P. 469.

⁷² Vogue E.-M. de. Mazepa – la legende et l'histoire. *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 1881. T. 48. P. 331–332.

⁷³ *Ibid.* P. 348, 351.

The third French discourse on Ukraine was developed not only by the Ukrainophiles but also by scientists who, on the contrary, expressed pro-Russian views and emphasized that a single Rus' world is a sound idea since they believed that Ukrainians and Russians are a part of a common Rus' (i.e. Russian) people. Leger is a prime example of such French scientists. He worked in Slavic studies and took not only a Russophilic, but also an anti-Polish stance. For instance, in Leger's description of public life of Ukrainian Orthodox metropolitan bishop Petro Mohyla, this French scholar notes that the metropolitan "contributed to the restoration of Orthodoxy in the seventeenth century, a religion that was weakened by the Poles".⁷⁴ In another study of the life and work of Russian-Ukrainian writer Nikolai Gogol (pronounced in Ukrainian as "Hohol"), the French scholar notes that the friendship between Pushkin and Gogol, between the "great katsap" (pejorative for Russian – *H. P.*) and "great hohol" (pejorative for Ukrainian – *H. P.*) is a bright example of the "unbreakable unity of the pan-Russian world".⁷⁵ In general, Gogol's work had a significant impact on Leger's perception of Ukrainian Cossacks, specifically due to Gogol's interpretation of the "united pan-Russian world" and "struggle for the Rus' land". In the same way, Leger shows his attitude to the position of Ukraine in the Russian Empire, where he does not even define Ukraine as a country that was independent in the past and merely compares its role to Provence in France.⁷⁶ Maria Luchytska (1852–1924), a wife of a prominent Ukrainian scientist Ivan Luchytskyi (1845–1918), writes in her memoirs that while she was with her husband on a scientific trip to France in the 1870s and met with Leger, the French scholar was quite dismissive of her husband's use of Russian language, because "he heard Little Russian tone in it [*the language* – *H. P.*]".⁷⁷

Baron de Baye was another Russophile who approached the Ukrainian-Russian relations from the Russian imperial viewpoint. He was a fairly well-known historian, ethnographer and archaeologist at that time. De Baye considers the abolition of Little Russian autonomy as a perfectly logical decision by justifying its political viability from Russian

⁷⁴ Leger L. *Etudes slaves. Voyages et litterature*. Paris, 1875. P. 18.

⁷⁵ Leger L. *Nicolas Gogol*. Paris, 1913. P. 16, 256.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* P. 5.

⁷⁷ Refer to: Луцицька М. В. Спогади. *Українознавчі студії та мемуари Івана і Марії Луцицьких (кінець 19 – початок 20 ст)* / упоряд. Новікова О. О. Київ, 2007. С. 288.

imperial point of view. He notes that after 1709 “Ukraine had ceased to exist as a sovereign state” and states that “to be frank, Little Russia has never even been a state”.⁷⁸

For the first time, German intellectual historical discourse of Ukrainian issues in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries radically differed from the French one of the same period. This difference laid not in the separation of German scientists into Russophiles and Ukrainophiles, as it was the case with France, but in the context of opposing views on the role and position of Ukraine in Europe, held by German Ukrainophilic historians, on the one hand, and German geopoliticians, on the other. It is worth noting that German geopoliticians favored a liberal approach in the German political discourse of that time, while historians were prominent conservatives and supporters of Otto von Bismarck’s views.⁷⁹

The main idea of professor Eduard von Hartmann (1842–1906), the chancellor’s scientific advisor on scientific matters, historian and philosopher, was to create on the future map of Europe an independent Poland, an independent Baltic Kingdom (consisting of Estonia, Livonia and Courland) and a country called Dnieper State or the Kingdom of Kyiv, in which Ukrainians and Belarusians would become subjects of a king.⁸⁰ All three states mentioned above were planned to become a part of a European anti-Russian military coalition.⁸¹ Professor Otto Hoetzsch (1876–1946), another historian with conservative political views, believed, unlike Hartmann, that the liberation of Poland, Finland, Ukraine, and the Caucasus could be made possible only after major Russian defeats, and not as a result of agreements with this empire or concessions on part of the imperial center.⁸² Dr Paul Rohrbach was the third historian who also professed conservative values (1869–1956). He noted that,

⁷⁸ Baye J de. *En Petite-Russie, souvenirs d’une mission*. Paris, 1903. P. 19–21.

⁷⁹ On the fundamental difference in the political visions of the German national idea between liberals and conservatives at the turn of the century and on the eve of the First World War, see: Heiss Theodor. *Die deutsche nationalidee im Wandel der Geschichte*. Stuttgart, 1946. 40 S.

⁸⁰ Hartmann Eduard. *Rußland in Europa. Die Gegenwart*. Berlin, den 7. Januar 1888. Bd. XXXIII. Nr. 3. S. 37–38.

⁸¹ Hartmann E. *Zwei Jahrzehnte deutscher Politik und die gegenwärtige Weltlage*. Leipzig, 1889. S. 300, 322.

⁸² Remer Claus. *Die Ukraine im Blickfeld deutscher Interessen. Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1917/1918*. Frankfurt-am-Main ; Berlin ; Bern ; New York ; Wien, 1997. S. 206.

according to the plan of political reformation of Eastern Europe after a war, Russian Empire would forever lose Poland and Courland, and the only way to prevent the restoration of Russia and a resulting new European crisis is the separation of Ukraine from Russia.⁸³ Rohrbach believed that all three independent future Polish, Ukrainian, and Muscovy states should balance each other out.⁸⁴

Friedrich Naumann (1860–1919) was a prominent German geopolitician of that time who created a theoretical geographical concept called *Mitteleuropa* (literally Middle Europe).⁸⁵ Naumann states that the creation and existence of Czech, Polish, Lithuanian, Estonian, and Ruthenian states would depend on the assistance, or, conversely, opposition from Russia or Germany.⁸⁶ He believed that in this struggle with Russia, Ukrainians and Poles should form a united front, since these peoples, like conjoined twins, possess traits and qualities that are somewhat missing not only in each of them if taken alone, but also in other Eastern European peoples.

Naumann's plan to create a "Middle Europe" was also supported by German academic circles. A well-known German geographer, geopolitician and professor Albrecht Penck (1858–1945) used it as a basis for his geopolitical approach to the issues of European countries. In his approach, he also considers the issues of Ukraine, Poland, and Russia individually. Penck thought that the historical and political circumstances that should determine the authentic position of Ukraine in Europe include the differences between Ukraine and Poland, on the one hand, and Russia, on the other. In this context, he emphasizes the federalism and democracy prevalent in Ukraine and opposes them to the centralism and autocracy of the Russian Empire.⁸⁷ Regarding Poland, its difference from Ukraine is determined by a historical set of geographical and geopolitical circumstances, since Poland in his model is located in the same cultural and political sphere of Germanic Middle Europe, while central

⁸³ Refer to: Кураєв О. О. Українська проблема у політиці Відня та Берліна у Першій світовій війні (1914–1918). Київ, 2006. С. 134.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* P. 134–135.

⁸⁵ See: Meyer Henry Cord. *Mitteleuropa in German Thought and Action 1815–1945*. The Hague, Netherlands, 1955. P. 11–18, 29–33.

⁸⁶ Naumann Fr. *Tschechen und Polen. Hilfe 1915*. 5 Aug. Naumann Fr. *Werke*. Köln ; Opladen. 4 Bd. 1966. S. 481.

⁸⁷ Penck Albrecht. *Die Ukraina. Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*. 1916. No. 7. S. 470.

Ukraine is located in Sarmatian Middle Europe, and eastern Ukraine is even placed in the Varangian belt together with a part of Russia.⁸⁸

Conclusions

Theoretical and methodological aspect. The paper employs Karl Mannheim's approaches in conceptology, Ukrainian-American professor Omelian Pritsak's interpretation of intellectual history, and author's analysis of the research problem in order to recognize and describe three generations of scientists and politicians who worked in different periods of French and German history. The first generation was composed of French and German scientists and politicians who launched a discourse about Ukraine in the late eighteenth century; the second generation includes French and German scientists and politicians who revived the discourse about Ukraine in the 1840s and 1860s; and to the third generation belong French and German intellectuals who studied the issue of Ukraine from 1880s and 1890s to the early twentieth century. They formed the last third generation of scientists and politicians whose legacy is examined in this paper. The paper follows Gordon Leff's approach and comprehensively considers the historical context and contemporary situation in foreign policy, i.e. relations between France and Germany as well as intellectual prerequisites, i.e. the influence of Polish emigrants on scientific process and emergence of French and German discourses about Ukraine in the 1840s-1860s and relations of foreign scholars with their French and German colleagues in the 1880s and early 1900s.

Conceptual aspect. Prominent members of three generations of French and German scholars and politicians established six main narratives in French and German intellectual history about Ukraine that were subsequently developed in the period between the end of the eighteenth and to the beginning of the twentieth centuries.

The discourse of the 1770s and 1790s was marked by the presence of Ukrainophilic and Russophilic trends in both French and German intellectual history, which opposed each other in their efforts to define the role and position of Ukraine in Europe. These trends emerged in response

⁸⁸ Penck Albrecht. Politisch-geographische Lehren des Krieges. *Meereskunde. Sammlung volkstümliche Vorträge zum Verständnis der nationalen Bedeutung von Meer und Seewesen*. 1915. No. 9. Heft 10. S. 1, 40.

to the reaction of European circles to the incorporation of autonomous Ukraine into the Russian Empire and subsequent attempts to restore it. They were made by Ukrainian autonomists and emigrants, efforts of whom were acknowledged by contemporary European politicians and scholars.

The discourse of the 1840s and 1860s was also influenced by common trends that were supported by both French and German writers and politicians. In both narratives, these trends were characterized by the opposition of Polonophilic and Ukrainophilic sentiments in their depiction of Ukrainian history. The reason for the existence of such trends in both narratives is explained by the decisive influence of a large group of Polish immigrants that were mainly concentrated in France, and the interest in the Ukrainian issue that was displayed by the opposition in Prussian court and the senators of the Second French Empire.

The French narrative of Ukraine in the 1880s and early 20th century was profoundly different from its German counterpart, both in terms of its focus and occupations of people who were engaged in the discussion. In France, a shift in the political course towards rapprochement with Russia and the dynamic activity of Russian diaspora resulted in the introduction of a Ukrainophilic perspective to history (that was still a continuation of the previous discourse), the newly emerged Russophilic versions of Ukrainian past and present, which became a repetition in a new historical period of this discourse at the end of the eighteenth century. In Germany, the third discourse emerged in entirely different circumstances. German intellectuals of that period again experienced a division between the authors of historical and geopolitical narratives, something that is characteristic of the second French and German discourses of the 1840s and 1860s.

Source aspect. Source criticism is focused on the analysis of French, German, English, Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian language academic literature and other sources. Such selection would make it possible to recognize the stances and verify the statements of selected authors, help to establish the essence of disputes and discussions on the issue studied between and within groups of German and French authors. It should be noted that the differentiation of directions, trends, and dissimilarities of the six discourses of the so-called “long” nineteenth century is formulated in part based on only the author’s acquaintance with most works of

authors mentioned in this paper. Thus, the differentiation appears in its preliminary form, since the only further analysis of primary sources and academic literature will allow for a more precisely-defined research purpose that resonates with the nature of concepts and ideas found in the sources and may answer all the conceptual questions raised in the introduction to this paper.

However, evidence received at this stage of research offers certainty that the conducted analysis makes it possible to take a fresh look at the partially forgotten concept of “Ukraine” in French and German historical and political thought, especially in the nineteenth century and on the eve and during the First World War. Furthermore, the investigation into this concept may help to determine its underlying ideas and its position between the concept of “Russia” and the concept of “Poland”.