The recent appearance of three major English language studies on tsarist Russian censorship, has opened a hitherto little known aspect of Russian Imperial history to a broader circle of readers. However, all of these detailed and well-written surveys are limited to a study of censorship policy and the effect it had on Russian writings and intellectual life. They do not deal with, or mention only in passing, the effect of censorship on the non-Russian nationalities. More generally, they do not examine how the tsarist regime used censorship as an instrument of political and ideological control in the borderlands. To shed light on these two broader issues, this article will illustrate how tsarist censorship effected one particular body of writing—Ukrainian historiography. The article will list twelve censored Ukrainian historical works, try to explain why they were prohibited and, on the basis of these examples, attempt to determine the impact of tsarist censorship modern Ukrainian historiography. In a broader context, it also touches upon the question of how censorship impeded the evolution of Ukrainian national consciousness in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The first historian to refer in print to censorship of Ukrainian historiography was Mykola (Nikolai) Kostomarov in his article

---

"Ukraina," published in Kolokol in 1860. He told readers that after the dissolution of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in 1847, scholarly articles even written in Russian about "Little Russia" began to be controlled, and that the terms "Ukraine," "Little Russia" and "Het'manshchyna," came to be regarded as disloyal. In 1883 the critic and political thinker Mykhailo Drahomanov, in the introduction to his Politychni pis'ni ukrains'koho narodu [Political Songs of the Ukrainian People] published in Geneva, noted that Ukrainian historians were unable to deal with the deleterious consequences of tsarist rule in eighteenth-century Ukraine because of censorship, and that as a result, the history of Ukrainian social life and the attitudes of the nation towards the states in which they lived were not truthfully described. In the 1920s Bahalyi listed some censored works in his survey of Ukrainian historiography and claimed repression had led scholars to pay more attention to the national than to the social aspects of the Ukrainian past. Dmytro Doroshenko also referred to this issue:

No prohibition was placed on studies of Ukrainian history as long as they were written in Russian and within the limits of general censorship rules. However, even more serious than the Tsarist ban [on Ukrainian language publications], was the reaction within Ukrainian society which set in as a result of the prohibitions and repressions. It restrained the development of the Ukrainian national movement, lowered the level of political thought, thus weakening national consciousness, and depriving the study of the past of any clear guiding idea. 

Drahomanov, Bahalyi, and Doroshenko, all claimed that the pre-1914 Ukrainian image of their past was seriously affected by censorship though none of them examined this subject in detail. However, solely on the basis of information available in secondary literature, it is possible both to qualify and elaborate upon their generalizations. A consideration of what is known to have been prohibited leads to the conclusion that the development and academic level of Ukrainian historiography was definitely less crippled by censorship than was Ukrainian language and liter-