



National Aspect of Student Movements in St. Vladimir's University of Kiev 1855 - 1863

Johannes Remy

Схід-Захід: Історико-культурологічний збірник.

Випуск 7. Спеціальне видання:

Університети та нації в Російській імперії. –

Харків; Київ: Критика, 2005. – С. 248-273.

При використанні матеріалів статті обов'язковим є посилання на її автора з повним бібліографічним описом видання, у якому опубліковано статтю. Дана електронна копія статті може бути скопійована, роздрукована і передана будь-якій особі без обмежень права користування за обов'язкової наявності першої (даної) сторінки з повним бібліографічним описом статті. При повторному розміщенні статті у мережі Інтернет обов'язковим є посилання на сайт Східного інституту українознавства імені Ковальських.

Адреса редакції:

Східний інститут українознавства імені Ковальських («Схід/Захід»), ауд. 4–87,
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна,
пл. Свободи, 6,
Харків, 61077,
Україна.

E-mail: siu.kharkiv@gmail.com

Тел.: +38 057 705 26 30;
+38 096 1555 136

Веб-сайт: <http://keui.univer.kharkov.ua>

© Східний інститут українознавства імені Ковальських

© Автор статті

© Оригінал-макет та художнє оформлення – зазначене у бібліографічному описі видавництво

© Ідея та створення електронного архіву часопису – А. М. Домановський

Johannes Remy (Helsinki)

NATIONAL ASPECT OF STUDENT MOVEMENTS IN ST. VLADIMIR'S UNIVERSITY OF KIEV 1855-1863

Student activism emerged in Russian empire as a mass movement in the years 1855-1861.¹ St. Vladimir's University of Kiev was not an exception to this general trend. However, the national aspect of student movements in Kiev and especially the prominence of Polish and Ukrainian student movements made the situation there rather different from what it was in St. Petersburg or Moscow. In the beginning of 1860s, the Right Bank of Dnepr was still subject to Russian-Polish controversy. The Polish question was here a local one. The conflicting Polish and Russian claims were bound to compete in a state university with Russian language of instruction and a sizeable Polish student body. Although a Polish student union existed also in some other Russian universities, only in Kiev it was able to claim dominant status among students. Ukrainian student movement emerged in early 1860s mainly as a response to the Polish-Russian conflict and rival territorial claims presented.

In the beginning of 1860s, the national dividing lines were not set and clear-cut. Within the Polish national movement, there coexisted two different concepts of Polish nationality. One of them was based on ethnicity and entailed the idea of either Roman Catholicism or use of Polish language as a necessary condition of Polish national identity. On the other hand, there existed also a Polish nationality concept based on pre-partition Polish-Lithuanian state; in it, all the inhabitants of the territory of the previous Poland-Lithuania within its pre-partition borders were considered Poles. According to this state concept of nationality, also Orthodox Ukrainian-speakers could be Poles. Indeed, inhabitants of the Right Bank could choose between three different national identities: Polish, Ukrainian, and all-Russian identity, in which Ukrainians were seen at most as a somewhat distinct tribe within the larger Russian nation. On the

Left Bank, too, there was ambiguity in national identity and a possibility, but not a necessity, to make a deliberate choice between Ukrainian and all-Russian identity existed. Not all those who considered themselves Ukrainians as yet saw Ukrainian and Russian identities as mutually exclusive ones. Even Ukrainian activists would according to circumstances use the word 'Russian' in a sense that included also them in this concept, although such a terminology was most often based on tactical considerations.

Because of the fluidity of the concept of nationality at the time, it is impossible to define exactly the numbers and proportions of representatives of different nationalities in the whole student body. However, something can be said on the basis of the lists that give religious confession and domicile for each student. In 1857 the overwhelming majority of students, 612 of 881, came from the Right Bank Ukraine or Lithuania in its historical sense that included both Belarus and present-day Lithuania. Inhabitants of Right Bank alone numbered 462, the majority of the whole student body. All Roman Catholic students at the university numbered 428, slightly less than half of all students. However, not only Roman Catholic inhabitants of the Right Bank received higher education. By religious confession, the composition of student body from the Right Bank was the following:

Roman Catholic	306
Orthodox	127
Protestant	18
Jewish	11

There were 174 Orthodox students from Left Bank and Sloboda Ukraine and 18 from New Russia. In all there were 319 Orthodox and 363 non-Orthodox students from different regions of Ukraine in the university. However, until the formation of *Kievan Hromada* in 1861, Poles showed much stronger national consciousness and coherence than did the potential Ukrainians.²

In the autumn term 1861, the 478 Roman Catholic students from the previous Poland-Lithuania formed the majority, 50,6%, of the student body of 945.³ Compared with the situation in 1857, the total number of students from Lithuania and Belarus had remained rather stable, whereas the university had more students than previously from the Right-Bank Ukraine and the Kingdom of Poland. Nevertheless, within the group of students from the former Poland-Lithuania, the proportion of non-Catholics had increased in absolute numbers as well

as proportionally. Somewhat more than a third of students from Right Bank Ukraine were now Orthodox. The composition of the student body from the Right Bank according to religious confession was as follows:

Roman Catholic	328
Orthodox	176
Protestant	13
Jewish	11
Not available	2

There were now enough Orthodox to challenge the Polish and Roman Catholic domination in the Right Bank. However, the number of Orthodox from other parts of Ukraine had actually declined. There were 126 Orthodox students from the Left Bank and Sloboda Ukraine as well as 16 from New Russia. Somewhat surprisingly, the majority of potential Ukrainians came from the Right Bank. In all, there were 318 Orthodox and 369 non-Orthodox students from different regions of Ukraine in the university.

By 1855, Polish students of Kiev already had a tradition of forming student unions and political conspiracies. The most active periods had been in 1836-1838 and 1846-1848. Unlike Ukrainian and Russian students, the Poles had in 1855 some organised independent activities: a refectory, literary evenings, and a bank of mutual assistance to aid needy students.⁴ These beginnings gradually led to the formation of a large and well-organised Polish student union. At first, the activism was marked by a moralist campaign. Its immediate cause was a scandal involving some Polish students in a theatre in the presence of a Grand Prince in 1856. A large student meeting to denounce the immoral behaviour was held publicly in the assembly hall of the university, although the Curator, Nikolaus Rehbinder, had refused to give his permission for it.⁵ The announcements about the meeting were written in Polish and posted on the walls of the university. Polish memoirists describe the meeting, which began the moralistic *purist* movement, as exclusively Polish. However, Rehbinder reported to the Minister of Public Enlightenment Avraam Norov that one of the causes of dispute in the meeting was that some of the participants wanted it to be conducted only in Russian, whereas others claimed their right to speak Polish. In fact, a public meeting hardly could have been nationally exclusive. Polish 'purism' soon developed into a sub-culture. Its adherents had a tendency towards asceticism. They wore simple dress and advocated informal behaviour.⁶ A pur-

ist's outward appearance and way of life to some extent violated the traditional noble code of behaviour. However, even the purists kept to a noble concept of honour and its defence in duels. The Polish students could not afford a total break with the values of the nobility, since in the Western Provinces the Polish identity was so closely tied with them.

The purist movement did not pass unopposed. Right after the very first meeting some students complained to Rehbinder that they had been insulted in it. The Curator ruled that there should be an election of an honorary court consisting of representatives from both sides, which should make a submission on the matter to him. Rehbinder's idea was to establish a controlled student movement uniting all the nationalities. The attempt was in vain, since students held meetings not only publicly in the university building, but also secretly in private lodgings. Governor-General Ilarion Vasilchikov firmly opposed all kinds of student meetings, and Rehbinder had to explain his conduct to Norov. When defending himself, Rehbinder claimed that hostile Ukrainophiles and Poles had been slandering him.⁷

An especially large number of the Polish opponents of "purism" came from Podolia. The controversy was also marked by political disagreement. The opposition included conservatives loyal to Russian rule. Though the son of a tenant farmer, Podolian leader Władysław Rudnicki mixed socially with both the Russian and the Polish local aristocracy. He even wrote an anonymous pamphlet in which he proposed that Russian and Ukrainian students should be accepted as members of the student union. Rudnicki argued that the university was an academic institution, not a national one. The students should concentrate on their studies and not on spreading propaganda. Further, it was not fair to reject a hand that was offered in friendship. At the end of the pamphlet there was a suggestion that Kiev was actually not a Polish town, and that the Poles should behave accordingly. Rudnicki's initiative was inspired by Russian students and Michał Grabowski, a conservative Polish-Ukrainian writer loyal to Russian rule. The proposal was rejected by the Polish student community, as purists set the tone for it.⁸

The next great challenge was a conflict with local officers. The relations between students and officers were strained and gave rise to violent clashes. In March 1857, a drunken officer killed a Polish student. After the fateful incident, Rehbinder delivered a speech to all the students. The Curator blamed the students for their bad behaviour and explained that the university authorities

would not defend those who themselves asked for trouble. Rehbinder also abstained from attending the funeral because he feared that it would be interpreted as a Polish patriotic demonstration.⁹ Curator's position stirred the students. In April 1857, two weeks after the first incident, a Polish student called Jarocki hit a dog with a stick after it attacked him in the street. The owner of the dog, Colonel von der Brinken, had his soldiers arrest Jarocki, insulted him verbally and also slightly assaulted him physically. On the advice of Governor-General Vasilchikov, the Rehbinder refused to forward Jarocki's formal complaint to other authorities. When representatives of the students, one Polish and one Russian, approached the Curator on the matter, he explained to them that there was no organized student body, and accordingly a case involving one student did not concern the others. The students now decided to take the matter into their own hands. On 15 April, when he was coming out of a theatre, von der Brinken was met by about 200 Polish, Russian and Ukrainian students, some of whom beat him with wooden sticks.¹⁰

Norov was very dissatisfied with Rehbinder's conduct. He wrote to the Curator that the von der Brinken scandal was caused by his tactless behaviour. In the Minister's opinion, active defence of the insulted students would have been an appropriate policy.¹¹ A commission was set up to investigate the incident. The case was decided by the Emperor without a formal trial at the end of July 1857 on the basis of a submission by the Minister of War, Ivan Sukhozanet. In all, 85 students were arrested, of whom 50 were punished. Four medical students were found guilty of having participated in the actual beating. Of them, three who had already graduated were sentenced to two years' service in military hospitals in Helsingfors, Viatka and Astrakhan. After that they were not to be allowed enter into service in the Western Provinces. One who had not yet completed his studies was sent to Kazan for one year's service as a barber-surgeon. The rest received milder sentences. However, the emperor also stated that the whole scandal was due to the Curator's ineptitude (*nerasporjaditel'nost'*).¹²

In summer 1858, Rehbinder was replaced as Curator by Nikolai Pirogov, a famous surgeon and educational reformer. Pirogov adopted a position that accepted student activism within certain limits. He favoured Russian, Ukrainian and Jewish activities to counterbalance Polish nationalism. However, he was not against establishing the chair of Polish language at the university, although his superiors blocked the plan. Pirogov refrained from the suppression of Polish

student activism, considering it the task of the ordinary police, not the educational authorities.¹³

The solidarity between students of different nationalities that was expressed in von der Brinken case did not lead to continuous co-operation. Occasionally there were general meetings concerning all the students, but they did not have a permanent organizational structure. The existing student institutions, like the library and the bank of mutual assistance, remained exclusively Polish. In fact, by 1860 Polish-Russian relations at the university were rather tense, and opinions at general meetings were divided along national lines. The organized student groups were international only in so far as they also included Orthodox Ukrainians from the Right-Bank of the Dnepr, but this was due to the fact that the Ukrainian and Polish identities were not as yet considered mutually exclusive.¹⁴

Ukrainian and Russian students became more active in the late 1850s. In 1859 many members of a revolutionary republican conspiracy founded at the University of Kharkov in 1856 moved to Kiev. Originally, the idea of Ukrainian independence had some support in the group, but then its members began to prefer all-Russian revolutionary aims: democratic republic and abolition of all estate privileges. Although the conspiracy ostentatiously disbanded in 1858, its members were rather active and remained in contact with each other even after that time. With Pirogov's permission, the members arranged in Kiev literary circles and began the first voluntary Sunday school, where common people were given elementary education. The Sunday school movement soon spread all over Russia. Originally, the members of the Kharkov-Kiev group were eager to co-operate with Poles, but these preferred to act on their own. One meeting to which Polish representatives were invited ended in the announcement of a Podolian Pole that as a Christian he could not discuss with Jews. Soon the Ukrainian/Russian revolutionaries got disappointed with Poles because of their national arrogance, and began to resent the Polish domination of the student body. The conspiracy was uncovered and its members arrested in February 1860. In all, 22 persons were involved, of who 15 were found guilty. Six of them were students of St. Vladimir's University. Five persons were subjected to the most severe punishment, deportation to distant parts of European Russia. The case made the relations between Vasilchikov and Pirogov deteriorate. From October 1860, Vasilchikov began to campaign for Pirogov's dismissal. According to Governor-General, Pirogov had been too close and too helpful to

the uncovered revolutionary students, and had let the students too loose. However, although the investigation of the Kharkov-Kiev group gave to the authorities reliable evidence about the existence of Polish student union, Vasilchikov did not proceed to investigate it.¹⁵

The Polish student union took shape in the course of a few years.¹⁶ The first organizations (*gminy*) united students from the same gymnasium. By 1857 they had a common board, which was responsible for funds. At some time between 1858 and 1860 a provincial structure was adopted with five constituent organizations: «Ukrainian» (the Province of Kiev), Podolian, Volynian, Lithuanian and «The Crown» (the Kingdom of Poland). Each organization elected its representative to the board. The regional organizations mainly gathered money for needy colleagues and supervised their members' moral behaviour. These organisations were initially not directed towards immediate political action. However, a conspiracy within the student union and directed towards a more political nationalist orientation was formed in 1857 under the name of «Triple Union» (*Związek Trójnicki*).¹⁷ The actual meaning of the name is not quite clear. Most probably it derived from the organizational structure, which was based on cells of three persons, but it may have also denoted the three provinces of the Right-Bank Ukraine. The first leading three included the prominent purists Włodzimierz Miłowicz and Włodzimierz Antonowicz/Volodymyr Antonovych. Soon the Triple Union directed all the activities of Polish students in Kiev and established relations with the other groups involved in the national conspiracy. The first coordinator of the Warsaw conspiracies, a retired officer called Narcyz Jankowski, came from Kiev in May 1858 and was rather likely sent by the Triple Union. The contact with the St. Petersburg Polish officer organization as well as with the St. Petersburg and Moscow Polish student unions was established in winter 1860 at the latest. The officers' organization counted among its members five persons who had completed their studies in St. Vladimir's University between 1858 and 1860. In March 1860, Stefan Bobrowski moved from the University of St. Petersburg to Kiev and became one of the leaders of the Kievan conspiracy. One year before that, in 1859, Włodzimierz Miłowicz and Tadeusz Orzechowski had moved to Paris, which facilitated the connection between Kiev and the Polish émigrés. By the end of 1860, the Triple Union had links with all the important centres of the underground national movement.

Although in Ukrainian national movement the Polish insurgents of 1863 were seen as representatives of nobility's interests, this view is somewhat one-

sided. All the Polish student activists opposed serfdom, and most of them were for land reform. Non-socialist radical social egalitarianism was rather widespread among Polish student activists, some of who did not hesitate to express their antipathy against nobility. However, anti-noble radicals seem to have been a minority. When Tytus Dańkiewicz said to the Belarusian peasants that they should cut the throat of a landlord who treated them badly he was widely condemned. For many students, the land reform was only instrumental: the insurgents should proclaim a land reform in order to win peasant support for the national struggle.¹⁸

The urge to promote the welfare of the peasant led to action in the field of education. The student union organized an elementary school in which common people were instructed in Polish. The school may have been an answer to the public Russian and Ukrainian Sunday-school movement, though an organization called «The Society for the Promotion of Learning among the Polish People of Wołyń, Podolia and the Ukraine» had already been founded before its emergence. The Kiev students had, together with the nobility and clergy, an important role in the society, which in 1861-1862 had no less than 43 underground schools functioning throughout Ukraine.¹⁹

In the Polish student union and the Triple Union there was a considerable Ukrainophile orientation. Its political goals were the elevation of the status of the Ukrainian language in a future independent Poland, federal status for Ukraine, the abolition of the estate privileges and a land reform favourable to the peasants. One of Ukrainophiles, Paulin Świecicki, a few years later described their identity and ideals in the following words:

...not distancing themselves from the common people (*ludu*), they called themselves Rusins and representatives of the interests of Rus; however, because the centuries completed the transformation of...the nobility, which adopted the general civilisation, called Polish, and in a governmental sense these lands were an integral part of the Polish commonwealth, therefore the citizens of the three provinces in addition to the name «Rusins» retained the general name of Poles, calling themselves Poles-Rusins (*polakami-rusinami*)...²⁰

The three regional organizations of the Right-Bank Ukraine adopted at a general meeting a resolution with the following contents:

[they] do not break with Polishness, but consider themselves citizens of the Rus lands (*ziem ruskich*), and hold the defence of the interests of Rus as the most important thing; the second is Poland, with which they join in federation, «as freemen with freemen, equals with equals».²¹

The group included both Roman Catholics and Orthodox. Its adherents held a romanticized view of Ukrainian peasant culture and the Cossack past. In their holidays they travelled around the country in peasant dress in order to get acquainted with the life of the people. They read Shevchenko's poetry to the peasants.²² Even at the university some of the Polish Ukrainophiles dressed in peasant style. The uncontested leader of this «*chtopoman*» group, and of Ukrainian (Kiev) regional organization of the student union, was Volodymyr Antonovych. His ideological outlook was shaped mainly by the literature of French enlightenment, like Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire.²³ However, Polish influences on Antonovych included Michał Czajkowski's romantic works, which depicted the Cossack past in an idyllic way as part of Polish history, bypassing Polish-Ukrainian conflicts. Antonovych's involvement in Polish insurgent organisation in its early phase has been disputed in Ukrainian historiography.²⁴ However, the unreliable confessions of Polish insurgents are not the only Polish sources for Antonovych's involvement in Polish underground that prepared the insurrection. There are two pieces of memoirs that confirm how he fulfilled well his obligations as a Polish conspirator during the trip to St. Petersburg and Moscow in 1860. Through Antonovych, students in Moscow and St. Petersburg established contacts with Polish émigrés in Italy who were establishing military training under General Ludwik Mierosławski's leadership.²⁵ Keeping in mind the existence of a Polish nationality concept that was based on previous statehood, Antonovych's participation is not surprising. Apart from Antonovych, many other Kievan Ukrainophiles received their first impulse towards Ukraine from the writings of the Polish-Ukrainian literary school. The Ukrainophile group had its roots in both the previous Ukrainian cultural movement on the Left Bank of the Dnepr and the Polish-Ukrainian romantics of the Right Bank. Some of its adherents were even influenced by the pan-Slav ideas of Aleksandr Herzen.²⁶

The differing political opinions were expressed in hand-written student periodicals. One of them, called *Publicysta*, was edited by Polish students from Kiev Province. It wrote about Polish history and social questions, like the position of the peasants, as well as Rusin [i.e. Ukrainian] question. As a memoirist Wacław Lasocki stated:

Publicysta, which started later, was seen with suspicion among the editors of [another journal] *Ulicznik* who cast doubt on the new journal's Rusinophile tendency. Antoni Mioduszewski answered on behalf of the editors [of

Publicysta] that with regard to the emerging, threatening and crucial Rusin question, it was necessary that Poles respond to it with absolute justice and the recognition of all the legitimate Rusin demands.²⁷

For *Publicysta*, an interest in the Rusin (Ukrainian) question did not mean a betrayal of Polish nationalism. In autumn 1859 political disagreements split the editors of *Publicysta*. Wincenty Odyniec from Belarus wrote an article, «Insurrection or revolution?» in which he came to the conclusion that delicate social questions that might cause class enmity must not be touched upon during the preparatory phase of the insurrection. As a protest against Odyniec and the editing board, social radicals Antonovych and Tadeusz Rylski left the periodical.²⁸

The Polish students in Kiev wrote and published lawfully in 1858 a collection of works entitled *Fragmentary writings in poetry and prose by Józef Prosper Gromadźki*.²⁹ The book expressed the variety of ideological influences within the Polish student community and the existence of different opinions about the Rusin question. Fortunat Nowicki's introduction was inspired by Mickiewicz's national Messianism. Nowicki combined egalitarianism, national liberation and expectation of the millennium with conservative criticism of all rational philosophy and modern western civilization, striking a Slavophile note.³⁰ On the other hand, Aleksander Jabłonowski's «Notes on the importance of provincialism in the history of Poland» showed the influence of German idealism despised by Nowicki.³¹ Most likely it derived from popular Polish idealists August Cieszkowski and Bronisław Trentowski rather than directly from Hegel. Jabłonowski's main thesis was that all ethnic non-Polish groups of the former Poland-Lithuania were incapable of political independence or even of creating a civilization of their own. They could develop only under Polish influence.

In evaluating the history of Lithuania and Rus we must admit that these lands, which had not much organic in themselves, and which in everything were at a lower level than Poland proper, in their unification with it did not bring anything creative to the organism; they served only as fruitful and receptive ground on which Polish thought...could more properly flower.³²

Jabłonowski's article is a most concrete example of Polish arrogance about the previous eastern parts of Poland-Lithuania. However, one must note that such a view was not held by all Polish students in Kiev. The Gromadźki book also contained pieces of poetry glorifying the Ukraine's Cossack past especially for its freedom.³³

Until 1860, the mutually incompatible ideas of a Polish nation defined by the borders of 1772 on the one hand, and by Polish language and/or Roman Catholicism on the other, had existed side by side without causing much discord in the student community. However, now the wide backing of ethnic concept of Polishness among Polish patriots made the position of Polish Ukrainophiles uneasy. In 1860 in the Polish student union it was proposed that a delegation should be sent to St. Petersburg to petition that the instruction at the university should be in Polish. The arguments showed an ethnic interpretation of Polish identity:

The university is a continuation of the Wilno Academy, which the late Emperor, for the benefit of local inhabitants, transferred to Kiev . . . Considering that among the 1,200 students there are 800 Poles and that among the rest one third is from the three occupied provinces, for whom Polish is not a foreign language, the goal set by the founder of the university can only be completely reached if the lectures are in Polish.³⁴

This provocative plan received wide support, but Antonovych proposed that the case should be negotiated with Ukrainians. It turned out that they were only ready to petition for the establishment of chairs for the Polish and Ukrainian languages. Curator Pirogov may well have inspired such a position, for it was in accordance with his policy at least concerning the Polish chair. The Poles deemed such a moderate action useless and decided to send their own original delegation and petition regardless of Ukrainians. At this point Antonovych threatened the Poles with a counter-delegation and counter-petition. As a result, the petition plans were dropped.³⁵

The spring of 1861 was eventful at the university. The reactions to the mass demonstrations in Warsaw and to the abolition of serfdom were interconnected and caused discord between Poles and Russians/Ukrainians. The turmoil at the university began on 1 March with a Roman Catholic memorial service, where prayers for the souls of the demonstrators killed by Russian troops in Warsaw were read and patriotic songs sung. A few hundred of people participated in the service, which was organized by the students. Vasilchikov asked Pirogov for the names of the organizers. However, Pirogov answered that they had not been identified. At the same time, the Kievan Polish population received letters urging them to abstain from dancing as a sign of mourning. When, despite this advice, a Polish-owned girls' school arranged an evening dance, its windows were smashed. Vasilchikov was sure that the students were guilty. Al-

though the university inspectors were able to name three suspects, there was no definite proof of their guilt.³⁶

On 10 March the town police paid attention to a student called Konrad Paszkowski who was smoking a cigar and keeping his hat on while the imperial decree about the abolition of serfdom was being read out to the public. Vasilchikov demanded Paszkowski's expulsion from the university. Pirogov somewhat softened the punishment, expelling Paszkowski without denying him the right to enrol in any other university. Vasilchikov decreed that Paszkowski should be deported from Kiev to his parents for an indefinite time. However, the Governor-General gave in after a large student meeting, at which the Poles demanded Paszkowski's return to the university and protection from the authorities' arbitrary conduct. Paszkowski was reinstated in the university, officially because his guilt had not been established. While the case was being discussed, the general student meeting for the first time split into parties inspired by national differences: Poles, Russians and Ukrainians. Among the students there were those who for the first time encountered the need to define their nationality:

I shall never forget the most comical scene, when one of the students, standing in the middle of the hall, presented the following question to the whole assembly: «Gentlemen! My father is a Ukrainian (*Chachol*), my mother a Pole. I was born in Zhytomir. Accordingly, to which nationality do I belong?» ...one Russian advised him that he should turn to the Poles for a solution to that complicated question. The disoriented young man, noticing that he had only made himself ridiculous, after a moment's hesitation joined the Rusin group.³⁷

New meetings followed, which were now arranged separately by each nationality. Russians and Ukrainians demanded the organization of an all-university student union, in which Russians and Ukrainians would form three sub-unions and Poles two. Decisions would be made by the sub-unions, each one of which would have one vote. Naturally, the Poles could not accept the proposal that would have given the Russians and Ukrainians control of the student union despite the fact that the Poles formed the majority of the students. Finally, the Russians and the Poles handed two separate petitions to Pirogov who forwarded them to Vasilchikov. The Russian petition represented 92 students, who admitted that many Russians had been against any petition. The Polish one spoke in the name of «the Polish students of the Imperial University of St. Vladimir». It stated:

The recurring clashes between police and students, having recently developed into the open persecution of Poles, force us to turn to you with a demand to prevent the constant malfeasance and to protect us with legal guarantees.³⁸

Indeed, the tone of the petition was rather provocative. The Russian petition asked in much more polite terms that the investigation of student transgressions be conducted in accordance with the existing rules, with the participation of the university's representative. It emphasized that violations of this legal procedure decreed in the charter of the university gave rise to disturbances, of which the petitioners disapproved. Vasilchikov answered to both petitions together and consented to the Russian demand, not punishing anyone. Such a positive reaction to the collective student petitions was Governor-General's complete about-turn. Previously Vasilchikov had opposed recognition of any student society, but now he tried to exploit the rift between the nationalities by using the Russians as a counterforce against the Poles.³⁹

Vasilchikov's new approach to Russian and Ukrainian student activism was combined with his proposals for limiting the size of the Polish student community in Kiev with the expressed aim of creating a Russian majority within the student body. On 28 March, Vasilchikov proposed to the Minister of Public Enlightenment Evgraf Kovalevskii and the Head of the Third Section Vasilii Dolgorukov that Roman Catholics from the Kingdom of Poland and historical Lithuania should be forbidden admission to St. Vladimir's University. The Governor-General claimed that the Kingdom's students were the most active in Polish national undertakings. He was especially concerned that the Poles formed the majority of the student body. If they could be made into a minority, their behaviour might improve. However, the State Council rejected the proposal on that basis that the projected reopening of the university in Warsaw would help the situation in Kiev enough.⁴⁰

Disappointed by Pirogov's answer concerning the initiators of memorial services, Vasilchikov complained about him in very strong terms to Dolgorukov and Kovalevskii on 21 March. The Governor-General claimed that the university police often protected students who were guilty of transgressions, pretending that it had not identified them. «I absolutely cannot take care of the Curator's tasks in the university», Vasilchikov wrote. A dispute about student dress sealed Pirogov's fate. Alexander II heard in March that Kievan students were wearing Polish and Ukrainian national costumes. Dolgorukov inquired about the matter from Vasilchikov, who confirmed the information. When Vasilchikov

proposed to Pirogov that students be banned from wearing national dress both within and outside the university, Pirogov refused to do so, using rather weak judicial excuses. Moreover, Dolgorukov's inquiry from Kovalevskii revealed that the Minister had in the previous autumn already instructed Pirogov to ban national dress. Pirogov was dismissed as Curator at the end of March. National dress was forbidden to all inhabitants of Kiev. Pirogov's departure from Kiev in the beginning of April turned into a political demonstration. The students announced that money would be collected to set up an academic fund to be disbursed according to his wishes. The ex-Curator himself made a speech in defence of his policy.⁴¹

In January 1861 the continuous denunciations of Polish nobility against Right-Bank Ukrainophile students finally led to the investigation of their most prominent representatives, Antonovych and Fadei Rylsky (Tadeusz Rylski). Rylsky was reported to have mixed socially with peasants with the aim to agitate them against the lords, and told stories about Cossack times and Shevchenko.⁴² Although about Antonovych the denunciations were much less detailed, they indicated his leading role in the group. Antonovych and Rylski were not arrested, but their lodgings were searched and some illegal literature and suspicious manuscripts found. While Rylski gave evasive answers to the authorities' questions,⁴³ Antonovych presented his principles rather openly. He explained that the slandering denunciations resulted from the resentment of Polish nobles against his position that the Right Bank was not Polish, but 'South Russian' territory, since the majority of population was South Russian.⁴⁴ The final result of the investigation can be defined as a truce between the authorities and *Hromada*, Ukrainian organisation that was just taking shape. Although the investigating commission did not fully trust Antonovych, it evaluated his and his adherents' disagreement with Polish nobility about the national character of Right Bank in a positive light. According to the commission, it was enough to notice this remarkable phenomenon, to act against it would be in vain. The commission found it desirable that Antonovych and Rylski would publish their opinions in journals and co-operate with the Archival (*arkheograficheskaiia*) Commission.⁴⁵ It is likely that Antonovych had to promise something in return: to remain within the limits of law and to follow anti-Polish orientation.

Vasilchikov now adopted a tolerant attitude to Ukrainian activities. He repealed the deportation of Rylsky to Kazan that had already been confirmed

by Alexander II. He wrote about this to Dolgorukov on 31 March, the very day Pirogov sent him the two student petitions. The Governor-General motivated his change of mind by that he had received information from Pirogov to the effect that «Fadei is now approaching Russian students and by his behaviour shows sympathy towards them». The emperor accepted Vasilchikov's conduct.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, Ukrainian rapprochement with the empire was a local arrangement that did not have any bearing outside the area that Vasilchikov administered. It lasted only to Vasilchikov's death in December 1862, and probably neither side ever considered it lasting. True, a Ukrainian handwritten journal *Independent Word* (*Samostainé Slovo*) that was distributed in the university attacked local Poles, but it also hinted to the prospect of Ukrainian independence and found that Ukrainians had more in common with the Russia of *Kolokol* and *Sovremennik* than with the Russia of the government.⁴⁷

Even in February 1861, when the loyalty of Antonovych to Poland was questioned in the Triple Union, he was ardently defended by some of its most active members. However, by that time *Hromada* already existed. There is somewhat contradictory information about whether *Hromada* was established by Antonovych's group of Right Bank students or whether the group joined *Hromada* after it had already been founded by students from the Left Bank. Since Poles in 1860 had negotiated with Ukrainians about petitioning for the change of the language of instruction, some kind of Ukrainian representation at least for those negotiations must have existed already by that time. Pirogov promoted the establishment of *Hromada* by pointing to some Left-Bank students the necessity of a separate Ukrainian organization, which could counter Polish dominance. In the Paszkowski affair, *Hromada* already acted as an independent group siding with the Russians against the Poles. Besides the student politics, most remarkable activities of the early *Hromada* were in the field of popular enlightenment. Its members were active in Sunday school movement and published simple textbooks in Ukrainian. Perhaps the most remarkable of these books was *Something about God's World*, (*De Scho pro Svit Bozhyi*), introduction to natural science. The fictitious publisher 'K.Hurt' mentioned in the front cover responded to previous Gromadzki invented by Poles.⁴⁸

The new student union that was proposed during the Paszkowski affair was founded without Polish participation. Its first action was to make a petition to Pirogov about the re-establishment of the University of Warsaw in order to rid St. Vladimir's University of Polish political propaganda. According to Juzefo-

vich, the authorities inspired the act. Indeed, the proposal fits well with Vasilchikov's policy. However, when the petition was about to be delivered, the news of Pirogov's dismissal reached Kiev. We do not know what happened to the petition. It inspired a counter-address to Pirogov by more radical Russian/Ukrainian students, which has survived to our days, since it was found among the papers of an arrested radical Ukrainian student Ievhen Mossakovsky in 1862. The counter-address disapproved of the original petition on the grounds that it sounded like an appeal to the government to expel Poles from Russian universities and like a denunciation. Not merely the Poles, but all students were behind the unrest in the university. However, on the main political point even the counter-address agreed with the petitioners:

...to react against Polish propaganda is a cause which deserves our fullest sympathy. We, too, are convinced that history will decide the right to this region does not lie with the Poles...We are not ready to betray our national interests...⁴⁹

The authors of the counter-address wanted to combat Polish pressure with moral influence, not repression. They proposed to found societies to support the Russian character of the region, the establishment of schools with Russian and 'Little Russian' as the languages of instruction. «Such means would be perfectly noble, since they would be directed not against Polish nationality as such, but against principles and strivings incompatible with our nationality».⁵⁰ In other words, the counter-address expresses a clear Ukrainian tendency. Although *Hromada* is reported to have approved of the original petition,⁵¹ this was not the position of all Ukrainian activists in the university.

Hromada at first also counted among its members those persons who belonged to the Polish student union. The final break between *Hromada* and the Poles took place only in autumn 1861. *Hromada* demanded from its members that they should not belong to any other national student union. According to Antonovych, 15 members of the Polish student union chose *Hromada*. Leon Syroczyński, who remained a Polish Ukrainophile, claims that there were only six defectors. However, quite a number of Polish Ukrainophiles remained within the Polish movement and left *Hromada* instead.⁵²

Concerned because of widespread student disturbances in universities, the government decreed some counter-measures against them in May and July 1861. Most important of them were the ban on all student meetings and a dramatic reduction of the number of students that because of their poverty

could be exempted from tuition fees. The measures resulted in mass student demonstrations in the autumn 1861 in all Russian universities except in Dorpat. However, in Kiev, the Polish domination of the student body gave the demonstrations a national character. There general student protests became impossible, since the majority of Russians and Ukrainians could not be induced to participate in the Polish national movement.

On 16 September, Polish students arranged a memorial service for the recently deceased Joachim Lelewel, a historian and democratic émigré politician. The church demonstrations were then repeated no less than 11 times between 17 September and 5 November.⁵³ Some of them included violence: once students beat up a civil servant whom they suspected of writing down the names of participants, another time a policeman was grievously assaulted. General student meetings dominated by the Poles were also held to discuss protests against the new university rules. Some Russians participated, but many others boycotted the meetings. Hundreds of students participated in the national demonstrations. Each time the authorities identified some of them, and by 14 October there were 82 identified demonstrators. I have at my disposal information about the background of 64 of them: as might be expected, all except three of the identified demonstrators were Roman Catholics, 43 of them from the Right Bank.⁵⁴ The three included a Right-Bank Orthodox and two Protestants from the Kingdom of Poland. Vasilchikov's ideas about the special danger represented by students from the Kingdom were unwarranted, since the locals were rather eager to demonstrate their Polish patriotism.

As it seemed that the university might be closed down because of the incidents, another Polish-dominated general meeting was arranged. There the Poles threatened a Jewish student, who disapproved of the demonstrations, with physical violence. Many non-Poles left the meeting.⁵⁵ The rest elected a committee consisting of representatives of each national group, but it could not complete its work.⁵⁶ The most probable reason for the committee's abortive activity was that the Russians and Ukrainians refused to recognize it as their representative. On 12 October there was a general meeting of all the Russian and Ukrainian students. In violation of the new university rules and an explicit imperial order received by telegram, the new Curator Baron Aleksandr Nicolay permitted the meeting and arranged an auditorium as the meeting place. Two competing draft resolutions were presented. Myhailo Drahomanov's proposal condemned the Polish demonstration and denied the complicity of other students in it. The

other proposal further declared that the «South Russian region» was not Polish. The latter resolution was accepted with a narrow majority of votes. It stated:

...we, the signatories, delegated by 162 Little Russian and Russian students of Kiev university, have the honour to inform Your Excellency [Nicolay] that they do not support the outbursts of the Polish students, which occur in the wrong place and are counter to the needs of the university and the South Russian region. They will not participate in them and categorically protest against them, since, in all those outbursts there expresses itself...a strong attempt to impose an alien nationality on a completely non-Polish region.⁵⁷

As lightly as the Poles judged the Right-Bank Ukraine theirs, their opponents now dismissed the local Polish population as “alien”, though it had inhabited the region for hundreds of years. The decision was presented to the Curator by five elected delegates. All the deputies were from Ukraine, three of them from the Right Bank. Antonovych was among the signatories, and as a whole the decision reflected the position of *Hromada*. It was planned to publish it in a newspaper. Alexander II forbade this, but allowed it be posted on the wall in the university. The University Council reacted by demanding that all the students sign an undertaking not to participate in demonstrations. The text put forward for signing condemned the previous demonstrations, but did not mention the Poles at all. In his report to Nicolay, Rector Nikolai Bunge justified the Council’s action as a wish to take the initiative back from the students to where it belonged. The result was somewhat disappointing: only 294 members of the student body out of 945 signed. This low figure prevented the punishment of those who did not sign.⁵⁸

According to Bunge, there were a few Poles among the signatories. When the collecting of signatures was over, the Polish delegates visited him. They told him that they could present signatures from hundreds of Poles who disapproved of the disturbances. Bunge told them that such a separate address would be meaningless, and invited them to sign the undertaking proposed by Council. The delegates left and did not come back. Bunge wrote that, as a final result of the events, almost all Russian and Little Russian students were now united. A few Poles who disapproved of «extreme expressions of nationality at the university» had joined them.⁵⁹

The students who were accused of participating in church demonstrations were tried before police courts established especially for this purpose. The harshest punishment was forced service in the army as a soldier. Vasilchikov soon found the court procedure too ineffective and asked for permission to

expel and deport by administrative decision all Polish students who were identified as having participated in the demonstrations. Alexander II granted Vasilchikov the powers he sought. The arrests did not begin until long after the demonstrations. In the Governor-General's documents, the first mention of them is dated 14 October, by which time 58 students were under arrest. Most of them received lenient sentences and were set free by November. Vasilchikov thought that all the Poles should be expelled from the university. Those who behaved well could afterwards be re-admitted. However, the Emperor rejected any restrictions on the admission of Poles in Kiev, since that would have been harmful to other universities as well as anger public opinion in Poland.⁶⁰

The force behind the Polish demonstrations was the Triple Union. In the autumn of 1861 its leaders included Stefan Bobrowski, Władysław Henszel and Antoni Juriewicz. The Union began illegal publishing and printing work, using lithography techniques. The press was finally located in the publishing house of the Orthodox Cave Monastery. It was discovered by the authorities on 2 February 1862, just when the first issue of the Triple Union's organ *Odrodzenie* (Renaissance) was being printed. The printing of *Odrodzenie* was not completed and the paper was distributed in an incomplete form. Stefan Bobrowski, the main organizer of the press, and another Kiev student, a Jew called Ludwig Bernstein, successfully escaped abroad.⁶¹

Although a Polish patriotic publication, *Odrodzenie* was permeated with a strong local identity and a sense of being distinct from the Kingdom of Poland. It stated as one of its tasks to oppose the Ukrainian journal *Osnova*, which aimed at the separation of Rus from Poland. However, the unity of these two countries was possible only in liberty:

...our national idea indeed is morally so strong that it does not need the sacrifice of anyone's liberty. We want union with the Vistula region, but a voluntary union. Our motto in this delicate question will be the words of the Warsaw craftsmen: «Let that nation be with us which wants to be with us, but that which does not, let it remain free». However, we declare that we will give way only to a nation and not to a handful of persons, for though they are personally much respected, their attitudes and temperament we must consider as belonging to the seventeenth century.⁶²

The reference was clearly to *Hromada*.⁶³

The year 1862 was marked by preparations for the insurrection. The underground administration of all the Right-Bank Ukraine was constructed around a

nucleus of students and recent graduates. The connection with the Warsaw conspiracies continued. After spending some time in Warsaw and abroad, Stefan Bobrowski returned secretly to Kiev in August as a representative of the National Central Committee (*Komitet Centralny Narodowy*, KCN). In August the Triple Union reformed itself and became the Provincial Committee of Rus, which recognized the supreme authority of the KCN. The Committee of Rus consisted of former key activists of the Triple Union, including three recent graduates, Antoni Chamiec, Aleksander Frankowski, Aleksander Jabłonowski, and a teacher of the university, Izidor Kopernicki. Ukrainian orientation was represented by Antoni Juriewicz and Leon Syroczyński who from time to time replaced any of the five full members who were not present. The influence of Ukrainophiles was somewhat weaker in the Committee than it had been in the Triple Union. The relations between the Kievan committee and the KCN were finally defined by the agreement concluded in Warsaw on 7/19 December. It guaranteed an inner autonomy to the Provincial Committee. The Committee adopted the organizational structure of the KCN.⁶⁴ It was fairly evident that the chances of an insurrection succeeding were not very good. However, an uprising was deemed necessary in order to demonstrate the Polish presence in the region and the demand for the restoration of pre-partition borders of 1772, as well as to create a diversion to help Polish troops in the Kingdom and Lithuania. In December, the Provincial Committee made a decision to finish preparations by the end of February. At the end of the year, most Committee members departed to the countryside. After that the Ukrainophile Antoni Juriewicz became the actual leader of the Committee.⁶⁵

On the eve of the insurrection, there was relative calm in the university. Students no longer arranged mass demonstrations since they had a more important undertaking to prepare. In Kiev the Polish insurrection had the character of a student action. At first the students planned to attack government positions in Kiev itself. The military commander Edmund Różycki disapproved of such a foolhardy plan and demanded that insurgent units be formed in the countryside. The Kievan students then decided to form their own unit, which would fight near Kiev. This happened on the night of 26-27 April, when about 550 insurgent troops consisting mainly of students departed from the town in a couple of units. On 1 May Russian troops attacked and completely routed them in the village of Verkholevsk.⁶⁶

The students had retained their ideas of social justice and reforms to benefit the peasantry. At the same time as the main Kievan troops, a propaganda unit

of 21 persons led by Antoni Juriewicz departed from the town, mainly consisting of Ukrainophiles. They distributed the so-called «Golden Decree» (*Złota Hromota*) to the peasants, written in Ukrainian. It proclaimed the equality of all citizens regardless of social rank or religious adherence, granted electoral rights to the peasants at both the local and the national level, handed over to the peasants all their fields and pastures without any redemption fee, decreed complete freedom of religion and the right to use the local language in schools, courts and local administration. Each participant in the insurrection was promised land from state domains.⁶⁷ In the village Soloviovka, the student propagandists were captured by peasants who had been armed by the government. In the incident, 12 students fell, according to Polish sources without putting up any resistance against the peasants. Such was the end of hopes to unite democracy and Polish national liberation in the Right-Bank Ukraine.⁶⁸

The turn of 1860s marked the sharpening of national dividing lines in the university. In 1861, even the nationally indifferent were pressured to choose a nationality. In this process, Ukrainian identity developed into an exclusive identity that was all the more difficult to combine with either Polish or all-Russian national identity. Seen afterwards, both Ukrainian and Polish student unions had more in common than their eventual mutual conflict would suggest. They both aimed to strengthen their respective nationalities by the elevation of the status of peasants. They both represented a modern change of society in terms of national identity and the opposition to estate privileges based on birth. As to the Russian government, its initial role in the national conflicts within the university emerges as somewhat surprising: instead of repressions, the local government benevolence gave *Hromada* a smooth start.

¹ This article is based mainly on my book *Higher Education and National Identity. Polish Student Activism in Russia 1832-1863*. Helsinki 2000: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, *Bibliotheca Historica* 57. However, in part it is a result of my research project 'Ukrainian National Movement and Russia 1855-1876' financed by the Academy of Finland under project number 103289.

² RGIA f. 733, op. 95, delo 886, l. 38-92. List of students of the university in 1857. There were in all 28 Jews in the university.

³ The statistics compiled on the basis of *Imennaja vedomost' o studentah Imperatorskogo universiteta Sv. Vladimira na 1861-62j učebnyj god*. Kievskie universitetskie izvestija 2/1861, p. 1-85.

⁴ Sowiński Leonard: Jeden z niewielu. Wspomnienie posmiertne o lekarzu Fortunacie Nowickim. Tygodnik Powszechny 28/1885, p. 438.

⁵ On this incident, see RGIA f. 733, op. 70, delo 709, l. 1-2. Minister Norov's preparatory draft for submission to the Emperor. Ibid. f. 735, op. 10, l. 56-57. Rehbinder to Norov, unofficial letter 9th November 1856. Dubiecki Marian: Młodzież polska w uniwersytecie przed rokiem 1863. Kijów 1909. Pp. 68-69. Lasocki Wacław: Wspomnienia z mego życia. I. W kraju. Kraków 1933. Pp. 185-188. Tabiś Jan: Polacy w uniwersytecie Kijowskim 1834-1863. Kraków 1974. Pp. 80-81.

⁶ Lasocki 1933:188. Poznanski B. S: Vospominania. Ukrainskaia Zhizhn 1-5/ 1913. Here 2:13-14. Rudnicki Władysław: Z dziejów kijowskiego uniwersytetu (1855-60). Nasz Kraj 1906, tom 1, nr 5-16, 18, 20, 22-23, 25-27, tom 2, nr 1. Here t. 1, nr 20, pp. 23-24.

⁷ RGIA f. 733, op. 70, delo 709, l. 1-2. Ibid. f. 735, op. 10, l. 65-68, 73-74. Rehbinder to Norov unofficially 7th and 29th December 1856. Lasocki 1933:186-187. Rudnicki 1906: tom 1, Nr 10, p. 14.

⁸ Lasocki 1933:207-210. Rudnicki 1906: tom I nr 18, p. 43, nr 20, p. 23-26, 28, nr 22, p. 9-10, nr 25, p. 24-25. Wspomnienia z uniwersytetu kijowskiego. Wiek No 30/ 1864, p. 1-2.

⁹ RGIA f. 733, op. 70, delo 709, l. 3-4. Rehbinder's telegramme to Norov 26th March and Norov's submission to Alexander on the same day. *ibid.* l. 14-15, 38-41. Rehbinder to Norov 8th and 23rd April 1857. L. 77-78. Rehbinder to the Deputy Minister of Public Enlightenment Viazemskii 15th June 1857. Lasocki 1933:213. Tabiś 1974: 83.

¹⁰ RGIA f. 733, op. 70, delo 709, l. 30-37. Vasilčikov to Norov 26th April 1857. *Ibid.* l. 38-47. Rehbinder to Norov 23rd April 1857. l. 83-99. Copies of two reports by the chairman of the investigating commission, Count Bobrinskii, to the Minister of War 22nd June 1857. Tabiś 1974: 83-84. Lasocki 1933: 1:213-216. Rudnicki 1906: tom 1, No 26, p. 28-29.

¹¹ RGIA f. 733, op. 70, delo 709, l. 38-47, 75-79. Norov's remarks in the margins of Rehbinder's report. Rehbinder to Vjazemskii 15th June 1857.

¹² RGIA f. 733, op. 70, delo 709, l. 58-63, 65-66, 105-106, 122-123. Copy from report of the chairman of the investigating commission, Bobrinskii, to the Minister of War Sukhozanet 10th May 1857 and Alexander's decision on it. Sukhozanet to Viazemskii 5th June 1857 and 28th July 1857. Copy of Vasilchikov's letter to Rehbinder 8th October 1857. Tabiś 1974:85.

¹³ Pirogov N.I: Sobranie sochinenii. 1-2. Kiev 1910. 1:691-694. Pirogov to Baronesse E. F. Raden 7th December 1860.

¹⁴ GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1860g., ed. hr. 253, l. 3-6, 9-12. Correspondence between Dolgorukov, Vasilchikov and Gribovski. Antonovych V: Tvory. Kyiv 1932. Tom I, p. 53. [Burzyński Tomasz:] Wspomnienia z czasów młodości. In: Wydawnictwo materiałów

po historii powstania 1863-64. IV. Lwów 1894. P. 121. Poznanskii 1913: 2: 13. [Święcicki Paulin, a book review:] Na gruzach. Powieść w dwóch tomach przez Teofila Szumskiego. Siolo 2/1866, p. 161. Wiercieński Henryk: Pamiętniki. Lublin 1974. P. 115. Marahov G. I: Pol'skoe vosstanie 1863g. na pravoberežnoi Ukrainie. Kiev 1967. P. 40-49. Marahov: Social'no-političeskaja bor'ba na Ukraine v 50-60-e gody XIX veka. Kiev 1981. P. 75-79, 101-104, 111-112. Marahov's statement about a Polish-Ukrainian-Russian conspiracy directing the activities of all Kievan students is a product of his imagination.

¹⁵ Baraboi A. S: Kharkovsko-Kievskoe revoliucionnoe tajnoe obschestvo 1856-1860gg. Istoricheskie zapiski 52. 1955. P. 239-252. Ivanova L.H., Ivanchenko R.P: Suspilno-politychnyj rukh 60-h rr. XIX st. v Ukraini: do problemy stanovlennia ideologii. Kyiv 2000. Pp. 79-81, 100-103, 140-141, 143-144, 148-149. Obschestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie na Ukraine 1856-1862. Kyiv 1963. Pp. 2-5, 19-22, 31-34, 49-53, 68-75. Henceforward this collection of documents is referred to as OPDU. Rudnicki 1906: t. 1, nr 10, p. 15-16, nr 11, p. 27.

¹⁶ The description of this organization is based on: Antonovych 1932: I:53. Burzyński 1894: 121. Koszczyz W: Zródło ruchu 1863 r. i akademicy Kijowscy. Gazeta Narodowa nr 9-10, 14-17, 53-55, 57/1884. Here Nr 14. Lasocki 1933:231-232. According to Lasocki, there was also a Belorussian gmina. [Miłowicz Włodzimierz:] Wspomnienia z czasów młodości. In: Wydawnictwo materyałów do historii powstania 1863-64. IV. Kraków 1894: 9. Poznanskii 1913: 2: 14-16, 22, 3: 15-16. Święcicki 1866: 159-160. Syroczyński Leon: Z przed 50 lat. Wspomnienie b. studenta kijowskiego uniwersytetu Leona Syroczyńskiego, profesora szkoły politechnicznej we Lwowie. Lwów 1914. P. 20. Tabiś 1974: 85-86.

¹⁷ On the Triple Union, Beiersdorf Otton: Kijów w powstaniu styczniowym. In: Kraków-Kijów. Szkice z dziejów polsko-ukraińskich. Kraków 1969. P. 77-79. Kieniewicz Stefan: Powstanie styczniowe Warszawa 1983. Pp. 40, 50-53, 68. Miłowicz 1894: 7-8. OPDU 65-66. Syroczyński Leon: O życiu młodzieży kijowskiej przed r. 1863 przez członka ostatniego zarządu Trojnickiego. Lwów 1884. P. 10-14. Syroczyński 1914: 8-9, 21. Tabiś 1974: 90-91. On contacts with St. Petersburg: Leikina-Svirskaja V. R.-Šidlovskaja V. S: Polskaja voennaja organizacija v Peterburge (1858-1864gg.) In: Russko-polskie revoliucionnye svjazi 60-h godov i vosstanie 1863 goda. Moskva 1962. P. 26-27. Vosstanie 1863 goda. Materialy I dokumenty. Russko-polskie revoliucionnye svjazi 1-2. Moskva 1963. 1:337-339, 345, 349.

¹⁸ Hendrychowski Edmund: Wspomnienie z Kijowa 1858-62. Przeszłość 1933: Nr 8, p. 125-126. Komar Tadeusz: Dumy i pieśni Ludomira. I. Bendlikon 1865: pp. 24-32. [Komar:] Mądrość polska. Napisał Ludomir. Paryż 1861. Lasocki 1933: I:203, 244-245, Komar's poem pp. 251-257, 293-297. Miłowicz 1894: 10. Poznanskii 1913: 2:16-17, 23-24. Święcicki 1866: 159. Syroczyński 1884: 10-11, 17. Syroczyński 1914: 28-29. Wiercieński Henryk: Pamiętniki. Lublin 1974. Pp. 120-122.

¹⁹ OPDU 88-93. Rules of the Society and commentaries. Poznanski 1913: 2: 15. Święcicki 1866: 161-162. Syroczyński 1884: 15, 18-19. Syroczyński 1914: 25-26.

²⁰ Święcicki 1866: 161.

²¹ Ibid. 162.

²² [E. U.:]Paryż w m. czerwcu 1866. Sio_o 1/1866, p. 148-149.

²³ Antonowych 1932: I:40.

²⁴ Miakovsky Volodymyr: Nedrukovane i zabute. Hromadski ruhi deviatnadsatoho storichchia. New York 1984. Pp. 323-334.

²⁵ Syroczyński 1914. Reutt Gustaw: Do legionów. (Z notatek rodzinnych). In W czterdziestą rocznicę powstania styczniowego 1863-1903. Lwów 1903. P. 357.

²⁶ Antonowych 1932: I:8-10, 30-34, 40-46, 60-61. Mihalchuk K. P: Iz ukrainskogo byloho. K vospominaniam B. S. Poznanskogo. Ukrainskaja Zhizn 8-10/1914, p. 82-83. Poznanski 1913: 1: 35-36, 2: 22-26, 3: 20-23, 4: 24. Syroczyński 1914: 22, 25, 27, 33.

²⁷ Lasocki 1933: I:233-234.

²⁸ Lasocki 1933: I:187, 233-236. Syroczyński 1914: 14. Święcicki 1866: 159.

²⁹ Pisma urywkowe wierszem i prozą Józefa Prospera Gromadźkiego. Kijów 1858.

³⁰ Pisma...1858: 40-50.

³¹ Pisma...1858: 157-214. Uwagi nad znaczeniem prowincjalizmów w dziejach Polski.

³² Pisma...1858: 207.

³³ Pisma...1858: 150-155.

³⁴ Burzyński 1894: 134-135. The quotation is from Burzyński's memoirs, not from the petition.

³⁵ Burzyński 1894: 134-136.

³⁶ TsDIA Uk. f. 442, op. 811, delo 58, l. 9-10. Pirogov to Vasilchikov 21st March 1861. GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1861g., ed. hr. 52, l. 24. OPDU 105-106. Tabiś 1974:107-108.

³⁷ Burzyński 1894:132.

³⁸ TsDIA Uk. f. 442, op. 811, ed. hr. 72, l. 2.

³⁹ TsDIA Uk. f. 442, op. 811, ed. hr. 59, l. 1, 4-10. Vasilchikov's correspondence with the Kievan Police Chief, Pirogov and Civilian Governor. Ibid. ed. hr. 72, l. 1-4. Pirogov to Vasilchikov 31st March 1861, containing the two student petitions. Burzyński 1894: 132-133. Juzefovič V.M: Tridtsat let tomu nazad. Russkaja Starina 10-11/1895. 10:168-176, 180-191. Juzefovič's publication is in part fiction, containing imaginary discussions. Simonov S.S: Studencheskoe dvizhenie v Kievskom universitete v XIX veke. Dissertatsia na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata istoricheskikh nauk. Manuscript. Taras Shevchenko University, Kiev 1963. Pp. 139-140, 157.

⁴⁰ GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1860g., ed. hr. 253, l. 28-32. Rodzevich N.N: Otvavka E.P.Kovalevskago. Istoricheskii Vestnik 1/1905. Pp. 122-123.

⁴¹ TsDIA Uk. f. 442, op. 811, delo 58, l. 12-13. Pirogov to Vasilchikov 21st and 23rd March 1861. Ibid. ed. hr. 68, l. 3. Vasilchikov to Kievan Civilian Governor 21st March.

GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1860g., ed. hr. 253, l. 18-21, 27. Correspondence between Dolgorukov, Vasilchikov and Kovalevski. OPDU 107-110. Tabiš 1974:106-107.

⁴² TsDIA Uk.f. 442, op. 810, ark. 30-37, 91-92. Reports of the acting chief of police of Kiev to Vasilchikov 13th December 1860 and 9th January 1861.

⁴³ TsDIA UK. F. 442, op. 810, ark. 86-90. Rytsky's testimony 16th January 1861.

⁴⁴ TsDIA Uk. F. 442, op. 810, ark. 259-263. Antonovych's answers to the investigating commission 11th February 1861.

⁴⁵ TsDIA Uk. F. 442, op. 810, ark. 241-242. Conclusions of the investigating commission.

⁴⁶ GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1861g., ed. hr. 29, l. 1-3, l. 11-13, 18-19. Gendarm officer Gribovskii to Dolgorukov 21st January. Dolgorukov to Alexander II 16th February 1861. Vasilchikov to Dolgorukov. OPDU 86-87.

⁴⁷ RVIA f. 801, op. 80/21, 3-e otd., 2-oi stol, 1862g., delo 48, sv. 667, l. 502-503, 505. Samostaine Slovo No 3.

⁴⁸ Antonovych 1932: 54-55, 59. De Scho pro svit Bozhy. Koshtom K. Hurta. Kyiv 1863. Mihalchuk 1914:70-71. Poznanskii 1913:5:41-42. Święcicki 1866:2:160, 162. Syroczyński 1884:19. Syroczyński 1914:21-22. Juzefovič 1895:10:171, 177-180, 186-190. Zhytecky Pavlo: Z istorii Kyivskoi ukrainskoi hromady. Promova na Shevchenkovykh rokovynah. Zapysky naukovohto tovarystva imeni Shevchenka. T. CXVI, V/1913. P. 178-179.

⁴⁹ TsDIA Uk. F. 442, op. 811, ed. hr. 222, l. 36. The whole counter-address on lists 36-39.

⁵⁰ Ibid. l. 38.

⁵¹ Juzefovich 1895:10:191-193. Simonov 1963:157-159. Simonov claims that *Hromada* was the initiator of the petition, Juzefovich describes it as an undertaking of the whole anti-Polish student union.

⁵² Antonovič 1932:53-54. Syroczyński 1884:19-20, quotation on p. 20. Syroczyński 1914:29-30. For the continuation of the Ukrainophile orientation within the Polish movement, see also Święcicki 1866:161-162. OPDU 132-133. Tabiš 1974:132.

⁵³ On church demonstrations and reaction to them, TsDIA Uk f. 442, op. 811, ed. hr. 359, l. 15, 17-18, 21-22, 30-33. Police reports about church demonstrations on 16th, 17th, 24th, 28th September, 1st, 8th and 9th October. GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1861g., ed. hr 359, l. 20-25. Gendarme officer Gribovskii to Dolgorukov 17th, 25th October, 3rd and 6th November. Juzefovich 1895:11:95-97. OPDU 150-152, 197-199. Święcicki 1866:163-164. Syroczyński 1914:30-31. Marahov 1967:91-94. Simonov 1963:149, 153-154. Tabiš 1974:109-112.

⁵⁴ TsDIA Uk f. 442, op. 811, ed. hr. 222, l. 22, 32, 43, 46, 69-71. F. 707, op. 26, ed. hr. 481, l. 8-48. OPDU 152, 198. Imennaja vedomost . . . 1861, pp. 1-85.

⁵⁵ Juzefovich 1895:11:97.

⁵⁶ Syroczyński 1914:31.

⁵⁷ Rennenkampf K.N: Kievskaja universitetskaja starina. (Sobytia v universitete Sv. Vladimira v 1860-1862gg.) Russkaja Starina 7/1899:41.

⁵⁸ GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1861g., ed. hr. 359, l. 15-16. Vasilchikov's telegramme to Alexander 10th and Dolgorukov's answer 11th October. RGIA f. 733, op. 147, delo 41, l. 150. Efim Putiatin to Nicolay 23rd October. L. 197. Bunge to Nicolay 19th October. L. 200. The text proposed by council for signing. Imennaja vedomost... 1861:2-5, 8-9, 36-37, 50-51. Juzefovič 1895:11:98-104. OPDU 199. Poznanskii 1913:5:42. Rennenkampf 1899:42-45. Simonov 1963:159-160.

⁵⁹ RGIA f. 733, op. 147, delo 41, l. 197-198.

⁶⁰ TsDIA Uk. f. 442, op. 811, ed. hr. 257, l. 4-6. Vasilchikov to Petr Vauev 25th September 1861. L. 68-70, 72, 74. Lists of arrested students, Vasilchikov's draft proposal to curb unrest. GARF f. 109, 1 eksp., 1860g., ed. hr. 253, l. 37-41. Vasilchikov to Dolgorukov and Putjatin 25th November 1861. RGIA f. 733, op. 147, delo 41, l. 176-177. Vauev to Putjatin 24th October 1861. OPDU 199, 204. Marahov 1984:68-69. Tabiś 1974:115.

⁶¹ OPDU 219-221, 229-245. Burzyński 1894:157. Syroczyński 1884:12-14. Beiersdorf 1969:79, 85-88. Bobrowski Tadeusz: Pamiętnik mojego życia. 1-2. Warszawa 1979. 2:495-498. Koszczyć 1884: 14, 17. Marahow Grzegorz: Stefan Bobrowski i tajna drukarnia w Kijowie (1861-1862). Przegląd Historyczny 4/1958, p. 703-707.

⁶² OPDU 213.

⁶³ *Odrodzenie* is published in OPDU 211-215.

⁶⁴ Syroczyński 1884:14-15. Syroczyński 1914: 24-25, 35-36. Zbiór zeznań śledczych o przebiegu powstania styczniowego. Wrocław 1965. Pp. 186, 261. Insurrectionary commander Władysław Rudnicki's testimony. Beiersdorf 1969: 90-91. Kieniewicz 1983:297-299. Marahov 1981:140-143. Tabiś 1974:134-135. Various sources give somewhat a different list of the members of the Provincial Committee. I follow Rudnicki's evidence.

⁶⁵ Syroczyński 1914:36-37. Zbiór...1965:186-187. Beiersdorf 1969: 93-94.

⁶⁶ Beiersdorf 1969: 106-107.

⁶⁷ Syroczyński 1914:119-120. The Golden Decree in Polish translation.

⁶⁸ Beiersdorf 1969: 105-106.