Being European: Russian Travel Writing and the Balkans, 1804-1877

By Sarah McArthur

April 2010

University College London
School of Slavonic and East European Studies

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Declaration

I, Sarah McArthur confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Abstract

This thesis examines the ways in which Russian identity was articulated in the early to mid-nineteenth century through the medium of travel writing. Russian identity has traditionally been examined by analysing the country's relationship with Western Europe, whilst travel writing has typically focused on the paradigm of the Self/Other opposition. This work demonstrates that these conventional patterns of analysis are too simplistic. Rather than addressing the topic as a set of binarisms (Self/Other, Russia/The West), this thesis presents a triangular pattern of analysis. Many of the travellers examined here did seek to define themselves in opposition to West European culture, and they did so by seeking to portray themselves as the leading representatives of a separate "Slavic" culture sphere. Yet the values of this sphere were only identified and understood as Russians travelled through the South Slav lands and interacted with the local population. It was the Balkans, not the salons of London or Paris, which provided the forum for debating many elements of Russian identity. Through their travelogues, journal articles and letters written from the Balkans, it is possible to identify a set of values with which the travellers were increasingly associated.

Yet, while identifying with supposedly "traditional Slavic values" the travellers claimed they found amongst the South Slavs, the Russians actually revealed how integrated their own identity was with the larger European cultural sphere. Even in their attempts to define themselves separately from Europe, they effectively demonstrated their inherent Europeanness. They did this by appropriating the travelogue, a genre that had long enjoyed popularity among Western audiences, and their approach to travel writing closely mirrored the way in which the genre was evolving in Western Europe. Furthermore, their writings express a set of cultural values that were far closer to "Europe" than they acknowledge.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In late 1877, the well known Slavophile activist Ivan Aksakov noted, "All that has happened in Russia this summer is an unheard of phenomenon in the history of any country: public opinion conducted a war against a foreign state, separate from the government and without any state organization."[1] The Russian declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire on 24 April 1877 was unprecedented in many ways. It was the first war in Russian history to be driven by public opinion. In the months prior to the commencement of the hostilities, the public had exerted significant pressure on the government, which, against its better judgment, had eventually acceded and declared war on Turkey. Russia's involvement in Balkan affairs had profound international repercussions, transforming the crisis from a localised dispute into an international conflict. Russia's intervention seized the attention of all of the major European powers, none of which wanted to see Russia acting autonomously in the region. Consequently, Russia inadvertently transformed the Eastern Crisis into a European security issue, casting itself in the leading role.

Nevertheless, the prominence of the Balkans in Russian public opinion was neither foreordained nor inevitable. At the start of the nineteenth century, few people in Russia had any knowledge of the Balkan Peninsula or its inhabitants. Furthermore, Russia was an absolutist state that, prior to the 1860s (when rules on censorship were eased), allowed only a very limited political role for public opinion. It was during this window of relative leniency that travellers, writers and publicists were able to create public debate seemingly centred on the Balkans. So effective was this public discourse that it prompted large segments of the population to demand government action. The Russian press argued strongly for intervention on behalf of the South Slavs. Something significant was thus at stake in the Balkans: Russian national identity. To many Russians, going to war to defend the South Slavs seemed somehow essential to maintaining an image of Russia, its values, and its place in Europe. Still, this begs the question of how the Balkans had come to occupy such a central place in the identity of a completely separate country.

In this thesis, I argue that the Balkans represented an opportune forum in which Russian identity was debated and defined. Contrary to what many of the

---

[1] Letter from Ivan Aksakov to the head of the Slavonic Committee in Belgrade, 16 December 1876, reprinted in *Russkii arkhiv*, Moscow, 1897, vol. II, pp. 257-61.

travellers examined in this thesis argued, the Balkans did not come to occupy such a central place in Russian national discourse as the result of any predetermined or spontaneous national "feeling"; rather, this occurred as the result of several decades of intellectual engagement with the region and its people in travelogues written by a group of scientific travellers, the earliest of whom were following in the footsteps of their German mentors. In the Balkans, feelings of perceived cultural inferiority that had haunted Russian travellers to Western Europe for a century were replaced by the perception of their being respected and looked up to as "older brothers" of an independent Slavic state. Furthermore, the travellers themselves identified with images and symbols that they could interpret as positive, such as those from Orthodox Christianity. This creation of a positive image was central to the Russians' attempts to construct an image of their own nation. At the same time, as the Russian Empire sought to expand its university system, the creation of Slavic Studies departments became a prestige project that the government actively supported, and many of the earliest travellers were the beneficiaries of state sponsorship. These travellers all based their authority on their first-hand experiences, and many also drew upon their academic and institutional backgrounds to add credence to their writing. However, the Balkans with which these travellers came to identify was selective, and their interactions were limited to the area's Slavic and Orthodox inhabitants. While many scientific travelogues written by West European contemporaries highlighted the cultural differences between the traveller and the "Other" he encountered on his travels, Russian travelogues often seemingly did the opposite, emphasising the Self they claimed to be observing in the Orthodox Slav populations.

Appearing to identify a foreign people as the Self is ultimately a form of "Othering," however, and at stake in the Russian travelogues was not truly the identity of the Balkan Slavs but rather Russian identity and the place of Russia in Europe. Travel writing was the crucial vehicle for this articulation of identity. The travels of scholars, published as travelogues and articles in the press, claimed authority and authenticity thanks to their "first-hand experience" as well as, frequently, the prestigious academic backgrounds of the authors. Such works not only helped to form a generalised "Russian" view of the South Slavs,

but also contributed to Russians' rapidly developing sense of national identity by creating a popularised format for exploring this topic. The themes that the Russians sought to identify with in the South Slav lands, such as religiosity and moral purity, reflected their own struggle to define themselves—not against the people they encountered but against the model of Western Europe. Nevertheless, whilst many Russian travellers used their travelogues as a means to demonstrate their allegedly inherent separateness from Western Europe, I argue that the true effect was the opposite: Russian travel writing was very much part of a pan-European phenomenon. Even as travellers insisted on their difference from Westerners, they expressed themselves in a way that underlines what they shared with them. Furthermore, even as the travellers sought to distance themselves from the West, Western Europe remained the benchmark against which they measured themselves.

Identity

Central to this thesis is the concept of Russian identity, which has been the focus of a large body of scholarly literature to date. Much of this literature as it is pertains to Russia concentrates on the eighteenth century and the consequences of Peter the Great's efforts at Westernisation. In his ground-breaking work, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, Hans Rogger subscribes to the theory that the sense of self emerges in opposition to an other, noting that "the self, specifically national, was determined and defined in contact with the other, the foreign, the non-national."[2] Rogger thus roots the formation of Russian national consciousness in the eighteenth century, a time when, he claims, Russians intensified their interactions with foreigners so that "even those Russians who had never been abroad came to feel the impact of another world."[3] Beginning with the reign of Peter, the initial stirring of a national consciousness emerged in the reaction of increasingly educated, Westernised Russians against what Rogger calls "the government of foreigners." However, he emphasises that this reaction was not anti-Western.

[2] Hans Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 6.
[3] Rogger, p. 7.

Indeed, he believes that it could not have been because those articulating their views were themselves the product of Peter's Westernisation. Nevertheless, he argues that the movement towards a more defined national consciousness was the result of feelings of inferiority on the part of the Westernised, educated elite who felt their homeland to be somehow "backward.

Leah Greenfeld attempted to explain this phenomenon through what she, following Nietzsche, called *ressentiment*, a term meant to express the simultaneous feelings of envy and resentment felt towards the country (France) from which Russians were borrowing many of their ideas on national identity. According to Greenfeld, Peter came to power at a time when the nobility was already on the verge of crisis.[4] Peter's revolutionary changes, in particular the implementation of the Table of Ranks, only exacerbated the situation, causing the nobility to feel increasingly insecure as their position became more tenuous. Greenfeld argues that Western models were initially respected as useful guides for Russia. However, greater access to education and travel meant that members of Russia's elite in the eighteenth century become more culturally alert and thus able to see the inconsistencies in their own lives and the discrepancies between Russia and its Western model. This "gave way to *ressentiment*, the rejection of the West based on envy and the realisation of the all-too-evident, and therefore unbearable, inferiority."[5] In an attempt to define a Russian identity in light of the country's perceived inferiority, the West was transformed into the anti-model around which eighteenth-century creators of national consciousness "built an ideal image of Russia in direct opposition."[6] Thus, "Russia was still measured by the same standards as the West…but it was much better than the West. For every Western vice, it had a virtue."[7] This nascent identity was being imagined by a small and discrete section of the population: the literate gentry. The gentry's struggle to recreate itself in light of Peter's reforms led many to view the eighteenth century as a complete break with the past and to see themselves as a "new people" representing a "new Russia." This sense of "newness" emerged as a central myth of post-Petrine Russia, albeit one fraught

[4] Leah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2003), p. 206.
[5] Greenfeld, p. 234.
[6] Greenfeld, p. 255.
[7] Greenfeld, p. 255.

with ambiguity. To be sure, scholars have debated the degree to which post-Petrine Russia was, in fact, new. Some, such as Iurii Lotman, have argued that Russian culture remains more traditional than many have thought and that the reforms of the era were superimposed onto deeply rooted traditions and belief structures.[8] The gentry's task of "Westernising" itself in light of Peter's reform was a painful process that left a lasting mark. Iurii Lotman has compared the acquisition of cultural behaviours to the process of language acquisition. This development is experienced naturally by children, who acquire both their mother tongue and their native culture without being aware of the process because, as Lotman notes, "the semiotic and conventional character is apparent only to the external observer."[9] Using this logic, Lotman argues that an eighteenth- century Russian nobleman "was like a foreigner in his own country"[10] because the code that he had acquired naturally was replaced by a new set of codes and instructions, thus rendering "the area of the subconscious" "a sphere in which teaching was needed."[11] As a result, what was perceived as correct behaviour was the artificial mimicry of foreign manners. Interestingly, Lotman argues, this trend did not turn Russians into foreigners; rather, it highlighted their non-foreignness: "In order to perceive one's own behaviour as consistently foreign, it was essential not to be a foreigner, for a foreigner, foreign behaviour is not foreign."[12] The effect of such behaviour was that life for a Russian nobleman began to resemble the theatre because, as Lotman notes, such a nobleman "assimilated this sort of everyday life, but at the same time felt it to be foreign. This dual perception made him treat his own life as highly semioticised, transforming it into a play."[13] However, Peter's forced Westernisation did not limit itself to appearance and behaviour. The gentry had to redefine itself within the structures of Peter's system, in particular that of the

---

[8] Iurii Lotman, "Rol' dualnikh modelei v dinamike russkoi kul'turi" ("The Role of dual models in the dynamics of Russian culture") in idem, *Istoriia i tipologiia russkoi kul'tury* (History and typology of Russian culture), (St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2002), p. 106.
[9] Iuri Lotman, "The Poetics of Everyday Behaviour in Eighteenth Century Russian Culture", in Aleksandr D. Nakhimovsky and Alice Stone Nakhimovsky, eds., *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History: Essays by Iurii Lotman, Lidiia Ginsburg, Boris Uspenskii* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 68.
[10] Lotman, p. 69.
[11] Lotman, p. 68.
[12] Lotman, p. 70.
[13] Lotman, p. 72.

Table of Ranks and obligatory system of state service. Service, both when it was obligatory and after it became voluntary, had a tremendous effect on the country's nascent intelligentsia. As Marc Raeff argued, "service became the young nobleman's first genuine contact with the wider world and his first opportunity to discover and share new knowledge and ideas."[14] It is certainly true that, in the first half of the eighteenth century, only a minority of Russian noblemen had the necessary background interest to take advantage of encounters in the German lands during the Seven Years' War or in the recently acquired Baltic provinces. As time passed, however, this service nobility became increasingly important in the ranks of the tsarist bureaucracy. As government officials, they could also help disseminate education and culture in remote areas. On another level, the very fact that it was the state that had created this new nobility through compulsory schooling and service made it difficult to argue that only the older nobility had the ability to benefit from such schooling and service.

By the reign of Catherine II, service-oriented nobles could look down on those of their peers who did not choose this path, preferring to eke out a boorish existence in some provincial backwater: could such individuals be "true nobles"? Clearly, a sense of social or national responsibility had come to define what it meant to be a "true son of the fatherland."[15] The abolition of compulsory state service in 1762 was thus the catalyst for a self-selecting minority of the nobility that had assimilated the service ideal and its related didactic mindset. Raeff further argues that the split between career and part-time nobles had its origins in the eighteenth century, although he concedes that the emergence of a critical intelligentsia did not occur until the reign of Nicholas I. Curiosity about the world beyond Russia was greatly enhanced by service in the army during the Napoleonic wars and in the ensuing occupation of France during the years 1814 to 1818.[16] Such prolonged exposure to the "other" would lead to both shame and

---

[14] Marc Raeff, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-Century Nobility* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966), pp. 71-72.
[15] Raeff, pp. 74-88.
[16] J.M. Hartley, *Alexander I* (London: Longman, 1994), p. 205. Hartley states that some 30,000 Russian troops were stationed in France during these years and that approximately one-third of the Decembrists had served there as officers.

disillusionment among many young noble officers upon their return to the Fatherland. The abortive uprising of December 1825, and the subsequent trials and punishments of those implicated in it can be viewed as marking the final "parting of the ways" between those nobles who continued to serve the autocracy and those who, to varying degrees, became alienated from it.[17] Some in the latter group might accept specific, short-term appointments, but their energies increasingly focused on the ideas of nationalism that were being articulated mainly by German philosophers and their relevance for the Russia of Nicholas I. Raeff notes that it was in this post-1825 time period, in "circles" of young nobles, that an awareness of developing a new identity as part of what would later be termed an "intelligentsia" occurred.[18] During the course of the 1830s, this intelligentsia fractured into Slavophiles and Westernisers. Slavophile doctrines, as expounded in the 1840s in the writings of leading figures (Ivan and Petr Kireevskii, Ivan and Konstantin Aksakov and Aleksei Khomiakov) have been characterised as constituting "a highly romantic nationalism which extolled the imaginary virtues of the truly Russian ways as superior to those of the decadent West and saw in the Orthodox Church the source of Russia's strength in the past and her chief hope for the future."[19] It should be emphasised, however, that Slavophiles did not have in mind the official state-controlled Orthodox establishment but envisioned rather the religious values and traditions of the faith. In their opinion, Peter I's reforms were detrimental in that they disrupted the previously harmonious nature of Russian society by attempting to impose alien Western models that were at odds with Russian tradition. Westernisers (or Westerners), in contrast, were a less cohesive group, but they agreed that Russia was indeed a European country that had been held back by its geography and history. Their leading figures spanned a range of views from those of the liberal historian Professor T. N. Granovskii to those of the socialist-leaning Aleksandr Herzen or the radical literary critic Vissarion

---

[17] For more on this subject, see Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801-1855* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

[18] Marc Raeff, *Politique et Culture en Russie 18^{e}-20^{e} siècles* (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1996), pp. 144-145.

[19] Cited in Michael T. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), vol. II, pp. 807-809.

Belinskii. Although they were by no means uncritical admirers of Western Europe, they agreed that Peter I's reforms had been positive in their impact and that further selective borrowing from the West- such as constitutional government- would enable their country to achieve its potential. As was the case with their Slavophile opponents, they were convinced that Russia would have a great future if only their policies were implemented. At the same time, Greenfeld notes that both movements were "steeped in *ressentiment*" against the dominant society of Western Europe.[20] Nonetheless, despite occasionally sharp polemical exchanges, adherents of the two groups maintained a high level of respect for one another. As Aleksandr Herzen, surely the most celebrated Westerniser, wrote in an obituary for Slavophiles Aleksei Khomiakov and Konstantin Aksakov:

> Yes, we were their opponents, but very strange opponents: we had *one love* but *not an identical one.* Both they and we conceived from early years one powerful, unaccountable, physiological, passionate feeling, which they took to a recollection, and we – a prophecy, the feeling of boundless, all-encompassing love for the Russian people, Russian life, the Russian turn of mind. Like Janus, or like a two-headed eagle, we were looking in different directions, while *a single heart was beating in us.*[21]

Many scholars have focused on the supposed divide between the Slavophiles and the Westerners, seeing it as symbolic of larger debates on identity and Russia's place within Europe, whilst others have examined Russia's Panslav movement as an example of the country's attempt to promote a Slavic identity on the European stage. In fact, it is hard to separate the Slavophile and Panslav movements from each other or from other movements occurring at the same time because there was considerable overlap of belief and individuals.[22] However, it was particularly (although not exclusively) for the Slavophiles,

---

[20] Greenfeld, p. 265.
[21] Aleksandr Herzen, *Works*, Vol. XI, p. 11, cited in N. Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles* (Cambridge, Mass,: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 89.
[22] Some classics on this topic are Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West in the Teachings of the Slavophiles* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), Hans Kohn, *Panslavism: Its History and Ideology* (London: Vintage, 1953), Frank Fadner, *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karamzin to Danilevskii, 1800-1870* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1962), and Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism, 1856-1870* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), all of which take a fairly traditional narrative historical approach to their subject. More perceptive is the work of Andzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), which examines the topic as an important aspect of Russian intellectual history.

such as Khomiakov and Konstantin Aksakov's brother Ivan, that the Balkans became a prime destination and catalyst for debating identity.

Central to the Slavophiles' view of view of Russian and South Slav identity was the role of the Orthodox Church, and historians have increasingly attempted to understand Russia's sense of self by examining the history of the church, popular Orthodoxy, and the widespread belief that Russia had a special and unique role to play because of its faith. A groundbreaking work on Russian religious and messianic symbolism as perceived outside of the urban elite is Michael Cherniavsky's *Tsar and People*.[23] Cherniavsky argues for a spiritual concept of identity based on the idea of Holy Rus, which existed separately from the borders of the state. Other historians, including Iurii Lotman and Peter Duncan, have looked at the theory of Moscow as a Third Rome, suggesting that Russia had a unique role to play as the spiritual centre for the Orthodox world, and have shown how such messianism has impacted identity.[24]

Although Orthodoxy was central to Russian identity, such an identity was not formed around religious beliefs alone, in part because Russia was simply too large and diverse. At times, moreover, the state advocated a concept of identity based on the leadership of the Tsar, which encompassed the different peoples of the Empire. Many scholars have attempted to understand the way in which Russia's diverse empire, peoples, languages and religions have affected a sense of Russianness. Given the country's enormous diversity, creating the criteria by which one could be classified as "Russian" proved problematic. Over the course of the nineteenth century, different approaches were attempted at different stages by the government, ranging from forced conversion to cohabitation and attempts to create a pan-national concept of the Empire, incorporating all its diverse inhabitants and uniting them under the Tsar. *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist*

---

[23] Michael Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People* (New York: Random House, 1961). See chapter 4 on Holy Russia.

[24] See Iurii Lotman and Boris Uspenskii, "Moskva-tretii Rim' v ideologii Petra Pervogo" ("Moscow as the third Rome in the ideology of Peter the First"), in Lotman, *Istoriia i tipologiia russkoi kul'tury* (History and typology of Russian culture), St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2002, Peter Duncan, *Russian Messianism: Third Rome, Revolution, Communism and After* (New York: Routledge, 2000).

Russia, edited by Robert Geraci and Michael Khodarkovsky, focuses on the problem of conversion and the evolution that this concept underwent as the empire's leaders' views on identity evolved. *At the Edge of Empire*, by Thomas Barrett explores religion and identity by examining the case of the Cossacks, who in many ways defied definition but came to be seen by many as "the soul or Russian national identity"- "strong, spontaneous, Russophone, Orthodox."[25] Many scholarly works look at Orthodox-Muslim relations through a set of power structures, presenting Russian Muslims as victims of repression and forced conversion by Orthodox governmental authorities. Robert Crews's *For Prophet and Tsar* is an excellent challenge to this view, demonstrating how Muslim leaders frequently manipulated the Tsar's representatives to their own ends.[26] An excellent essay is Jane Burbank and Mark von Hagen's "Coming into the Territory: Uncertainty and Empire," which reveals how fragile the empire's sense of self remained through the nineteenth century.

All of the studies discussed above have made an important contribution to the complex subject of Russian identity. The works of Raeff and Lotman on the formation of the intelligentsia in the eighteenth century provide the necessary intellectual background for understanding the travellers considered here, which is essential if we hope to comprehend the milieu from which such men emerged. Cherniavsky's work on Orthodoxy and Holy Rus' helps to separate spiritual identity from political or state-predicated identity, as many travellers would do in the Balkans. The studies of the Russian Empire correctly highlight how Russian identity was stimulated through interactions with other, competing identities, while also highlighting the degree to which Russia, alongside other European empires, participated in "civilising missions" in its occupied territories, thus placing Russia firmly in the larger European context. Nevertheless, most have been preoccupied with Russia's relationship either to Western Europe or to Asia/Islam, while Russian identity was more complex than a mere binary opposition. Using many of the intellectual trends examined in previous works, such as religion, this thesis argues that Russian identity

[25] Thomas Barrett, *At the Edge of the Empire: Terek Cossacks and the North Caucasus Frontier, 1700-1860* (Boulder, Westview, 1999).
[26] Robert Crews, *For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006).

found particular expression on the streets of Belgrade, indeed more so than in any Western capital.

It was in the Balkans that the Russians travellers examined here found a place for themselves, their identity, and their country. This thesis seeks to add to and contribute nuance to the existing body of literature on Russian identity by applying a triangular framework for analysis: Russia-the West-the Balkans. I use travel literature as a means to analyse and demonstrate the importance of this third dimension.

Travel Writing

The specific type of "scientific" travel examined here has its origins in the mid-sixteenth century, when the pilgrimage was replaced by educational travel. Justin Stagl has argued that around 1550, learned men such as Erasmus of Rotterdam began to extol "the pious work of self-improvement against the useless, expensive and morally corrupt pilgrimage." The increasing belief amongst humanists that travel was essential for education and that "the whole earth was a place where something was to be learnt" led to an increased curiosity and questioning of the larger world. Early such travellers who left written records of their journeys often focused on the encounters or aspects of travel that appeared most striking or exotic, leaving many to question their authenticity.[27] Over time, however, travel writing became more systematic in its character as writers attempted to organise the knowledge they were gathering. Led by men such as Theodor Zwinger and Hugo Blotius, a new approach to science emerged that emphasised the need for the acquisition of knowledge through scientific observation. Francis Bacon likewise stressed the connection between travel and knowledge, feeling strongly that travel represented a form of natural philosophy and one to which empirical methods could be applied via a "universally appropriate model for the procedure of scientific discovery."[28] Such ideas inspired numerous journeys to far-away lands for the purpose of collecting evidence of species to be categorised and classified by European scientists. However, travel literature quickly

[27] Justin Stagl, *The History of Curiosity* (New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 50-51.
[28] Stagl, p.131.

diversified beyond the collection of artefacts.

After the 1760s, travel writing began to evolve down two separate paths, that remained noticeably distinct even as they frequently intertwined: the sentimental and the scientific. Mary Louise Pratt has argued that the former, as exemplified by Laurence Sterne's *Sentimental Journey through France and Italy*, grew out of the already established tradition of shipwrecks and castaways found in survival literature, which had flourished since the sixteenth century.[29] With its emphasis on feeling and emotion, this style of travel literature proved extremely popular throughout Europe, and Sterne's work inspired many imitators, not least of all in Russia. Nevertheless, sentimental travel writing shared certain elements with the scientific: both sought credence for their writing, as opposed to many quasi-fictional travel works that also enjoyed popularity. As Stagl has argued, "the sentimental traveller was not a teller of fairy tales. He was as truthful as the scientific traveller, yet not to the outer world but to his inner experiences."[30] Scientific travel writing, meanwhile, sought credibility by claiming to be reporting facts acquired through first-hand observation. In many areas, it became part of the process of "territorial surveillance, appropriation of resources and administrative control" of the modern state.[31] As a result, in the nineteenth century, "travel writing became increasingly identified with the interests and preoccupations of those in European societies who wished to bring the non-European world into a position where it could be influenced, exploited, or in some cases, directly controlled."[32] Many studies on travel literature from this era focus on the major colonial powers, particularly France and England, and see travel writing produced from these regions as part of a larger colonial project.

Although the sentimental and the scientific represented the two most visible trends in travel writing from the period, both genres were rich with variation. Whereas sentimental and scientific travel writing flourished in

---

[29] Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 86.
[30] Stagl, p. 87.
[31] Pratt, p. 38.
[32] Roy Bridges, "Exploration and travel outside Europe 1720-1914" in Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, eds., *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 53.

France and Britain in particular, Germany "had lost its leadership in this field and had become a backwater."[33] Nevertheless, if Germany failed to keep up with its Western neighbours in these trends, it certainly produced innovation in other areas of travel. Justin Stagl argues that while French and British travel writing evolved considerably during this period, German travel writing preserved older techniques that ultimately helped to define the fields of ethnography and anthropology.[34] Much of this ingenuity took place at the University of Göttingen under the leadership of August Ludwig von Schlözer. However, as Stagl argues, such dynamism did not emerge in isolation: the scholars of Göttingen were very much part of a larger European network of intellectual interaction. Many of the ideas that underpinned German innovation in ethnology had their basis in British empiricism and had made their way to Göttingen thanks to the close connections between Great Britain and the electorate of Hanover. Schlözer himself was heavily influenced by French thought, and particularly by the ideas of Montesquieu. He corresponded with scholars across Europe, not least in Russia, where he lived from 1761-1767.[35] After his time in Russia, Schlözer returned to Göttingen, where he helped to introduce the term "ethnographic" into scientific parlance and attempted to craft the methods by which different peoples could be studied. He and his many followers at Göttingen analysed other peoples by looking at their geographic, genetic and political structures and origins and by trying to relate groups of peoples to each other through such data.[36] As Göttingen's reputation grew across Europe, the university became a key destination for young aspiring Russian intellectuals, many of whom were keen followers of Schlözer and his teachings, both on ethnographic theory and on gathering data from travel.

Like Western Europe, Russia both participated in the mapping of other societies for its own purposes and used travel writing as a vehicle for expressing itself. Early secular Russian travel writing developed along lines very similar to those in Western Europe, although this occurred slightly later. The earliest secular voyages were undertaken during the reign of Peter the

[33] Stagl, p. 87.
[34] Stagl, p. 88.
[35] Stagl, p. 244.
[36] Stagl, p. 255.

Great—and, as was the case with early French and English travellers, these journeys were undertaken for the purpose of gathering knowledge. These initial travellers were sent by their governments to Western Europe to acquire technical knowledge that was not available at home. An early example of such a traveller was Boris Kurakin, who was sent to Italy in 1697 to study nautical sciences. He later travelled to Amsterdam, Brussels, Rome, Vienna, and Hamburg, keeping a detailed account of his travels in execrable French.[37]

The number of Russians travelling increased over the course of the eighteenth century as the Grand Tour became as much a part of the young Russian nobleman's experience as that of his French or English counterparts. Many of these young Russians appear to have consciously emulated the travelogues of young West Europeans abroad. An excellent example of such literature is the travel journal of Aleksandr Kurakin, the great-grandson of the aforementioned traveller. Aleksandr spent three years in 1770-1773 touring the Netherlands, England and Paris in the company of his tutor. While abroad, Aleksandr studied "philosophy, natural law, history, Latin, French, Italian, riding, dancing, and fencing." He attended classes at the University of Leiden and supplemented them with regular excursions around the Low Countries, all of which he dutifully recorded in his travelogue, entitled *Mon voyage*.[38] Going abroad for study was a growing trend during the time of Catherine the Great as clusters of elite Russian students formed around universities such as Göttingen and Leipzig.[39] Russian students gravitated in particular towards Germanic, Protestant institutions. It was at such institutions that some Russian students came into contact with scholars such as August von Schlözer, whose ideas heavily influenced the later Slavophile movement. Others were attracted to the message of Johann Herder, who first praised the Slavs as an "ascendant and unique people" whom he felt represented humanitarianism and democracy in contrast to the autocratic and militaristic Latin and Germanic races.[40]

Although groups of Russian pilgrims had long travelled through the

---

[37] Sara Dickinson, *Breaking Ground: Travel And National Culture In Russia From Peter I To The Era Of Pushkin* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), p. 34.
[38] Ludmila Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke* (The History of Slavic studies in Russia in the 19th century) (Moscow: Indrik, 2005), p. 36.
[39] Lapteva, pp. 35-36.
[40] Lapteva, p. 37.

Balkans on their way to the Holy Lands, it was through this interaction with German ideas that the first secular Russians became interested in exploring the South Slav lands, and it was from Germany that the first Russian travellers set off for the Balkans, imitating the scientific style of travel writing that had been gaining popularity in Western Europe. However, while Russian travel writing began by emulating West European models, the genre was much more than a mere copy. It developed its own particular style and rhetoric, the latter of which clearly articulated a uniquely Russian set of arguments and conception of national identity. At the same time, it never departed entirely from its Western origins, thus forming more an independent branch of European travel writing rather than a completely separate genre.

Despite the generous volume of Russian travel writing available, relatively little scholarly work has been done on the subject. This is partly due to the tendency among Soviet and Russian scholars to disregard travelogues as serious literature. The main work on the historiography of the South Slavs is *Istoriografiia istorii iuzhnikh i zapadnikh slavian*, which notes some of the travellers examined in this thesis but only examines the scholarly works they published after returning from their trips and sees their travels as having been fact-finding missions not worthy of study in and of themselves.[41] The best volumes on the teaching of Slavic Studies in the Russian Empire are undoubtedly *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX- nachale XX veka* and *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke*, both by Ludmila Lapteva.[42] These two volumes examine the lives and academic work of many of the more scholarly travellers considered here, and the former volume dedicates nearly an entire chapter to Aleksandr Gil'ferding. However, Lapteva also regarded travel as a means of supporting "serious" narrative history and did not analyse the actual travelogues for their intrinsic merit. Nevertheless, her work highlights the close link between travel and the

[41] Ludmila Vassilievna Gorina, *Istoriografiia istorii iuzhnikh i zapadnikh slavian* (Historiography of the History of the South and West Slavs) (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskovo Universiteta, 1986).
[42] Ludmila Pavlovna Lapteva, *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX- nachale XX veka* (Slavic Studies at Moscow University in the Nineteenth to the Beginning of Twentieth Centuries) (Moscow: Isdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1997); for more on Gil'ferding, see chapter three.

development of an institutional approach to Slavic Studies in the Russian empire: the earliest Slavic Studies departments were formed as the direct results of knowledge-gathering travel; and furthermore, throughout the nineteenth century, Russian universities would continue to provide the institutional framework in which Russia's relationship to the South Slav lands could be debated and disseminated to younger generations.

More has been written in English on Russian travel writing. Sara Dickinson's *Breaking Ground: Travel and National Culture in Russia from Peter I to the Era of Pushkin* examines travel from a literary perspective, exploring how it reflected and shaped Russia's national culture.[43] Dickinson's analysis of travel literature in this period accurately reveals the difficulty that the West posed for Russia's nobles as they struggled to construct an acceptable national image: on the one hand, these young, French-educated nobles were at pains to demonstrate their Europeanness, frequently writing their travelogues in French, but on the other hand, in the era of Romantic nationalism, they simultaneously constructed an image of their country that put it in opposition to the Western culture that they were emulating. While Dickinson shows how Russian travel literature displays a "marked orientation towards Western European tradition," she ends her study in the early nineteenth century, which is when many of the debates on Russian identity were just beginning.[44] This decision can be traced back to Dickinson's focus on literary travel writing, which by the nineteenth century was being incorporated into Russian fiction. I argue, however, that the debates on identity continued in the genre of travel literature but that the genre moved away from the literary and into the scientific, in Russia as in other parts of Europe.

A fascinating literary interpretation of travel and nineteenth-century images of Russian identity is Susan Layton's *Russian Literature and Empire*, which moves away from travel literature to look at literary representations of the Caucasus, while examining the vital role that the Caucasus, like the

[43] Dickinson, p. 42.
[44] Dickinson, p. 44.

Balkans, played in the formation of Russian identity.[45] Following Edward Said, Layton identifies the Caucasus as Russia's Orient, a key forum for Russia's construction of the Self. Russian literature on the Caucasus and Central Asia does indeed parallel colonial motifs being promoted by other European powers at the time, in particular France and Britain. Like the French in North Africa or the British in India, Russians also argued that they were engaged in a "civilizing mission" in their southern territories, and literature on the region helped to construct an image of Russians as cultured Europeans in contrast to the Orientals of the south.

Layton's work builds on a lively debate in post-colonial literature. In the era of decolonisation, new readings of travel texts have emerged, as has an extensive body of theoretical writing analysing the discourses central to the genre. Many early theoretical works have focused on the identification of the Self and the Other, arguing that the concept of the Self cannot be created internally and that the presence of the Other is required. The two identities are formed simultaneously, as the Self separates and distinguishes itself from attributes ascribed to the Other.[46] However, this separation is never a complete one because the perception of the Other always remains part of the Self. As Homi Bhabha has argued, "the Other is never outside or beyond us: it emerges forcefully within cultural discourse when we think we speak most intimately and indigenously between ourselves."[47] In the post-war period, fresh re-readings of the relation of the Self to the Other made it possible to reinterpret travel literature, reading it for discourses of identity, knowledge and power that had previously been disregarded.

An early work to take on some of these topics was Edward Said's 1978 classic *Orientalism*, which reread this Self/Other dichotomy, noting how Western scholars had long aligned "Other" with "inferior," allowing certain types of travel literature to support the imperial domination of other peoples. Said harnesses Michel Foucault's theory on knowledge/power to attack the way in which Western scholars had appropriated "knowledge" of the Middle

[45] Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
[46] Paul Ricoeur, *Soi-même comme un autre* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1990), p.145, see also Edward Said, *Orientalism*, London, Penguin, 1978.
[47] Homi Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 4.

East to justify the intervention in the region. Said's work has provided a catalyst for debate and encouraged numerous post-colonial rereadings of nineteenth century travel texts.

While the relation of knowledge to power is an important part of the study of nineteenth century Russian travel writing, the exploration of identity is perhaps even more central. Travel writing also has the potential to serve as a representation of the community. As Percy Adams has noted, travel writing shares numerous traits both with the autobiography and especially with the novel. Elements of crossover include "the concentration on a protagonist; the concern with a set of ideas and themes; an exemplar theory of history (vice and virtue must both be shown in the protagonists and other characters);the suppression, ordering and digressions, and the picture of society."[48] Like autobiography, travel writing, particularly scientific travel writing, is presented as being true and appeals to the readers' sense of trust and reality. Still, like novels do, travel writing tends to tell a story with a clear beginning, climax and conclusion. Furthermore, travel writing takes place in "societies", presenting a consistent reality. However, unlike in many novels, the societies depicted in travel writing are intended to be real ones, and the values exhibited by the protagonist are reflective of those of the target audience, thus creating a forum through which identity can be expressed.

Travel writing tends to be chronological in its structure and circular in space. With the exception of one, all of the travelogues considered in this thesis are chronological, and most give careful attention to dates throughout the texts, making sure the reader is aware of the regulated passage of time. Most of the travelogues maintain a circular structure by beginning and ending in Russia. Casey Blanton has argued that this pattern of departure and return adds to the genre's narrative power and the longevity of its popularity, as the "reader is swept along on the surface of the text by the pure forward motion of the journey while being initiated into strange and often dangerous new territory. The traveller/ narrator's well-being and eventual safe return become the primary tensions of the tale, the traveller's encounter with the Other the

[48] Percy G. Adams, *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983), p. 163.

main attraction."[49] In this way, the journey is the driving force of the genre, while the inevitable safe return of the traveller provides the logical conclusion. The concept of the return is also essential to the traveller's sense of identity: the traveller sets off with a particular destination in mind, but throughout his journey, he maintains the connection with his homeland. The continuity of this connection is essential because travel, as reflected in scientific travel writing, loses its purpose if the writer/traveller does not actively and faithfully maintain his affiliation with his home culture. If a traveller loses the perspective of his homeland, he will not be able to report on foreign sights in such a way as to make them of interest to those in his native country, which is one of the key functions of travel writing. Because it is vital that the travel remain rooted in the writer's indigenous culture, it is a crucial part of the genre that the writings conclude with the traveller's return to his native society. Travelogues, including Russian ones, are often filled with nostalgia and expressions of homesickness. As the traveller approaches the conclusion of his time abroad and prepares for the voyage home, he often writes that he longs to be back among his friends and family. This sense of longing to be back and the subsequent joy the traveller feels when he does arrive home simultaneously confirm the ultimate superiority of the home culture and emphasise the writer's uninterrupted connection to it.

While the structure of travel writing strongly resembles that of the novel, its element of alleged truth, that of the narrator's "lived" perception, means that it can provide an even stronger format for representing or debating community identity and values. Central to this is an encounter with an Other—a people whose culture, language, religion or values differ from the traveller's own. Typically, these differences are highlighted and form one of the key focal points of the writing. However, the act of highlight the other culture's differences has the simultaneous effect of defining the writing'e own perception of his native society. As the writer selects and describes what is different, he is simultaneously reflecting what is in his mind "normal." Many scholars of travel writing have examined the genre through the lens of imperialism, questioning the way in which acquired knowledge of foreign lands shaped Europeans'

[49] Casey Blanton, *Travel Writing: The Self and the World* (New York: Routledge, 2002), p.2.

mental geography, thus psychologically rendering colonialism a viable and even essential system.[50] In her groundbreaking text, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation,* Mary Louise Pratt attempts to decolonise knowledge, examining how travel writing was used to construct the world beyond Europe and North America and how such images were used to legitimate empire. Particularly illuminating is her examination of eighteenth-century scientific travel and efforts made by such travellers to chart and categorise the peoples and places they encountered, something the Russian travellers examined here actively sought to do in the Balkans. In *Rhetoric of Empire,* David Spurr goes one step further than Pratt, examining traces of colonial discourse in literary journalism to question the structures of power in which such writing was created. So well absorbed are these structures (as well as certain cultural assumptions) that they can be found even among the writers who denounce them. In this way, Spurr's inclusion of writers such as Susan Sontag underlines his central idea that colonial discourse is "a series of rhetorical principles that remain constant in their application to the colonial situation regardless of the particular ideology which the writer espouses."[51]

While Russian travel writing adhered to the conventional stylistic patterns of travel writing noted above, this thesis examines Russian travel writing more for what it says about Russian identity, attempts to define itself, and its insecurities than for the purpose of furthering a post-colonial debate. While certain statements made by the travellers examined here at times appear to be close to West European colonial discourse, Russia had no viable colonial ambitions in the Balkans. Still, this region nonetheless served as a forum in which Russian identity could meaningfully be debated. The early Russian travellers followed a method of investigation and engaged in a type of scientific

---

[50] Following the line of Edward Said's seminal work *Orientalism* (London : Penguin, 1978). Much has been written on how travel literature relates to imperialism. See, for example, Steven Clark, *Travel Writing and Empire: Post Colonial Theory in Transit* (London: Zed Books, 1999), James Duncan and Derek Gregory, eds., *Writes of Passage* (London: Routledge, 1999), David Spurr, *Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing and Imperial Administration* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), Casey Blanton, *Travel Writing: The Self and the World* (London: Routledge, 2002), Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge,1992), Tim Youngs, *Travellers in Africa* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), Tzvetan Todorov, *La Conquête de l'Amérique: la question de l'autre* (Paris : Editions du Seuil, 1982), and Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference* (London: Routledge, 1991).

[51] Spurr, p. 39.

travel writing similar to that which Pratt examined. The Russians in the Balkans, however, used the knowledge they acquired in the region to make the Balkans 'theirs' in an emotional sense rather than a political one. Nevertheless, Spurr's identification of the latent imperialist tendencies even by those denouncing them also presents an invaluable means of examining some of the travel writing examined here, given that the social structures of imperial power shaped Russian attitudes toward, and experiences of, the Balkans.

About the Present Work

Like many of the works cited above, this thesis also tackles the enigmatic topic of Russian identity. It differs from these other texts, however, in that it moves away from traditional binaries and instead suggests that the pattern through which an identity emerged was triangular: Russia, the West and the Balkans. The influence of Western Europe was never absent from the writings of the travellers examined here, but what was equally essential was the role played by the Balkans as a forum or even a mirror that helped the travellers to envision their own sense of Self. Even as many travellers sought to denounce the West and demonstrate their differences from it, they did so in ways that ultimately underlined their profound European ties.

This thesis has been divided into five chapters that are roughly geographically based and chronologically structured. The first chapter is devoted to Serbia and Bulgaria. The most accessible geographically, these countries experienced the greatest volume of Russian travellers, many of whom had diverging reactions to what they witnessed. It was here that the earliest travellers attempted to create a mental map of the region and to identify how they, as Russians, related to the local population. The chapter focuses on the way in which these earliest travellers attempted to categorise themselves and the local populations and demonstrates that the travellers' "findings" were often more the result of their German education than of spontaneous Slavic feeling.

The second chapter is devoted to Montenegro. As the only state in the region to have achieved de facto independence from the Ottoman Empire, Montenegro was recognised by travellers as occupying a special and separate place in the Balkans. Many Russians came to see it as an exemplary, autocratic Slavic state. The chapter examines Russians'

fascination with the Sparta-like nation alongside their struggle to interpret certain traditions that differed radically from their Europeanised habits—traditions that they found exotic and even disturbing.

The third chapter turns to Bosnia and Herzegovina and Old Serbia (Kosovo). This region was very difficult to reach, and as a result, only two Russian travellers undertook significant travels in the area. Both wrote important books on the region, but they took sharply different approaches to questions of identity, one perceiving it in religious terms and the other using racial categories. These differing approaches to the concept of identity mirror similar debates taking place within the Russian Empire at the time and thus provide a fascinating double perspective on the way in which identity was defined in a multi-ethnic space.

The fourth chapter looks at travel in the aftermath of the Crimean War and the diversification of the genre. The war presented a considerable blow to Russian pride and dominance in the Balkans, leading some to question Russia's ability to defend Orthodoxy abroad. The chapter argues that some travellers responded to this challenge by proclaiming their country's moral superiority over what they saw as the treacherous West, while at the same time, a new variety of revolutionary traveller emerged. This traveller figure was uninterested in religion-based concepts of identity and often closely connected to pan-European revolutionary movements.

The final chapter considers the culmination of several decades of Russian travel writing on the Balkans. By the 1870s, Russian views on the region had solidified, and for many vocal members of Russian society, the plight of the Balkan Slavs had become intertwined with Russia's sense of self. Many had developed a clear sense of the role their country should play in the region, while others continued to express doubts. Some of the travellers considered in previous chapters took an active role in the rapidly expanding mass media, publishing articles and stories about the Balkans in newspapers and journals. However, at the same time, others revolted against the set of stereotypes about the region and the role of Russia in it. These dissident travellers ultimately questioned the very values that their predecessors had highlighted, and in doing so, they questioned the values on which their own country's image was based. The region became a forum

through which elements of Russian society articulated their identity, and travel writing was one of the chief components of this society—resulting, as Aksakov noted, in a truly “unheard of phenomenon.”

Chapter One: Struggle to Define the Terms

Commenting on the state of Slavic Studies in the Russian Empire from the perspective of the late nineteenth century, scholar A.N. Pypin noted, "at the beginning of the nineteenth century, we didn't have a single person who was capable of correctly listing all the Slavic tribes and pointing out their territory on a map."[52] By the 1870s, in contrast, the Balkan Slavs were a topic of daily discussion in the Russian press, as the country moved towards military involvement on their behalf. Knowledge of the region, which was constructed rapidly and effectively over a relatively short period of time, drew heavily on the observations of Russian travellers to the region. In the process of "getting to know" the Balkans, Russian travellers increasingly described those aspects of South Slav culture with which they strongly identified. Many did so in a conscious attempt to demonstrate their difference from both the Muslim Ottomans and Western Europeans, and yet they were an integral part of a pan- European tradition. This chapter examines the very European origins of Russian travellers' "discovery" of their Slavic brethren, a complex process with its intellectual genesis more in Germany than in Russia. It examines how the earliest Russian travellers borrowed Western knowledge and constructs in order ultimately to articulate their non-Western identity. Although the number of travellers at this time was small, their findings paved the way for growing interest in the region. Yet the reactions of these earliest travellers were far from uniform, and they further displayed some of the underlying contradictions of Russia's place within Europe, a topic considered throughout this work. The way in which Russians related to the Balkans reflected how they envisioned their own country: those who saw Russia primarily as a Slavic and Orthodox nation identified more strongly with the Balkan Slavs than those who identified themselves more closely with Western European culture, exemplified in particular by France and Germany.

Of all the areas under study in this thesis, Serbia and Bulgaria were the most visited by Russian travellers. These travellers came from a broad

[52] Quoted in Ludmila Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* (The History of Slavic Studies in Russia in the nineteenth century), (Moscow: Indrik, 2005), p. 238.

range of backgrounds, and it is thus not surprising that their writings reflect the greatest degree of both evolution and variety of the works analyzed in this study. Given this diversity, it might initially appear unclear why these two lands have been grouped together. They do, however, share certain common characteristics, or at least they did for Russian travellers. First, they were the areas most easily accessible from Russia. While Montenegro could only be reached via Dalmatia, and Bosnia and Old Serbia (Kosovo) were generally avoided altogether due to difficulties of geography and security, Serbia and Bulgaria could be reached by land from the East, and Bulgaria was also accessible to Russians via the Black Sea.

These two regions also sustained Russian interest for the longest period of time. Serbia came to the attention of Russians in the aftermath of the First Serbian Uprising of 1804, and it was in that year that the first Russian travellers, Aleksandr Turgenev and Andrei Kaisarov, visited the region, getting as far as Belgrade.[53] Travel to these regions grew steadily: by the 1870s large numbers of Russians had visited the region, at first on "fact finding" expeditions and later as war correspondents and soldiers. Finally, this was the region that became the focal point of Russian interest in the Balkans, and by extension, the forum through which Russian civil society explored and debated its own identity. However, in 1804, when Turgenev and Kaisarov first embarked on their journey, it was by no means clear that these lands would stimulate the intense interest which drew subsequent groups of Russians to the area.

These pioneering Russian travellers to the South Slav lands had scant knowledge of the region's inhabitants, and their self-assigned task was to classify the Balkan peoples, an endeavour replete with difficulties. The bases upon which such classification took place were by no means always self-evident. Their identification with some people more than with others, and their rather tortured attempts to explain their choices demonstrate the difficulties that they faced and the subjective nature of their undertaking. The travellers

[53] Russians had previously travelled to and, in particular, through the Balkans prior to the travels of Kaisarov and Turgenev. However, such travellers were almost exclusively monks. Most of them regarded the Holy Lands as their primary destination, and very few left written records of their travels.

struggled to create definitions for terms such as "Slav" or "Turk" and they attempted to understand the ways in which these terms applied to the peoples they interacted with on their journey. Their scholarly research agenda sought to determine the identities of the different peoples whom they encountered, an undertaking which would continue to challenge subsequent Russian travellers in the early nineteenth century.

These challenges were part of a broader academic and political agenda within Russia. In an effort to understand all of its own peoples, the Russian government sought to improve the level of Russian scholarship on Asia, in order to better understand the empire's Asian subjects and formulate a more coherent policy towards them. At the same time, the Russian elites also began to examine their relationship to the empire's diverse inhabitants, delving into ethnography, linguistics, history and anthropology in their struggle to better understand themselves.[54] Knowledge became a goal for many in the quest to create a mental map of the empire and "measuring, counting, mapping, describing" came to be seen as essential to create an efficient system of governing, as well as to understand and defining the country.[55] Yet, as Jane Burbank and Mark von Hagen have argued, "there was no magic key, no perfect model to follow" in this drive to reach the desired level of understanding.[56]

---

[54] Lapteva, pp.5-6.
[55] Lapteva, p. 16.
[56] Jane Burbank and Mark von Hagen have argued that right up until the First World War, Russian identity was fluid and open to redefinition. The Empire's great diversity complicated the effort: should non-Russian peoples be assimilated or not? What roles did language, ethnicity and religion play in formulating a Russian identity? See Jane Burbank and Mark Von Hagen, "Coming into the Territory: Uncertainty and Empire", in Jane Burbank, Mark Von Hagen, and Anatolyi Remnev, eds., in *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700-1930*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007). As Theodore Weeks has noted, the absence of any consistent legal definition of Russianness allowed advocates of different criteria to develop litmus tests. Proponents of religion as the key could exclude, for example, Jews and Poles. The sense of inherent difference was generally applied to the distrusted Poles, who according to another government official possessed a "flawed character." Their gentry was noted for its "vanity, frivolity, inconstancy, a tendency for deception and lies" and had to be civilised by Russian administration and presence. In light of such views towards other religions, some advocated converting minorities to Orthodoxy. This was, however, problematic, as some argued race should play the pivotal role in defining the nation. Still others insisted that language held the key to identity, following the romantic notion that language was not arbitrary, but the "bearer of human essences." See Theodore Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996), p. 48.

This questioning was not confined exclusively to the territory of the Empire: many Russian intellectuals were anxious to make connections and to classify their neighbours, as part of their efforts to define their own identity and position in the world. In the Balkans, as within the Russian Empire, the Russians faced a similarly difficult task of interacting with and studying diverse groups of peoples. When the first Russians began traveling to the region in the early nineteenth century, they had very little concept of the places they were to visit. Furthermore, the notion of a large "Slav family" had yet to be articulated: not enough was known about the history, culture and languages of the other Slav peoples to support such a concept. The definition of who was a Slav, and the assumption that Slavs everywhere had some common bonds, had yet to develop.

It is therefore not surprising that the earliest Russian travelogues were far from homogeneous, and revealing that not all Russians were convinced that they were indeed the "brother nation" of the Balkan Slavic Christians: the concept of Slavic brotherhood was poorly developed at the time. The earliest travellers had diverse preconceived notions about the peoples and the regions they visited, and at times they reacted in different ways to their encounters. Some identified with the Turks, on the basis perhaps that they represented the ruling elite, and thus the people to whom the Russian travellers were closest in terms of social class. Other travellers identified with the Orthodox Christians specifically on the grounds of faith and without distinguishing among such Christians on linguistic grounds. Yet, with time, travellers began to draw distinctions among the different types of Orthodox, recognising that the Romanians were different from the Serbs, the Bulgarians from the Greeks. These distinctions developed over a period of nearly 40 years, between 1804 and 1840. What led travellers to identify with some peoples more than others? How did Russians begin to differentiate amongst these peoples? In what ways did their efforts to do so both parallel and feed back into similar efforts taking place in their home country? The earliest travellers experienced the difficulty Russians faced in categorising the peoples of the Balkans, demonstrating that "Slavic brotherhood" is a historical construct.

Furthermore, the rather chaotic nature of travelogues of this time was also reflective of the genre, which was similarly still defining itself. Nigel Leask

has identified the period of 1770-1840 as one filled with an "uninhibited energy," as scholarly travel writers moved inconsistently among methodologies, punctuating their reports with "botany and zoology alongside ancient ruins and monuments, mineralogy alongside modern manners, ancient history alongside contemporary politics."[57] Whilst there was a trend to the scientific, there was still a high level of confusion over the exact form such collected data should take, a confusion which is clearly visible in the travel accounts studied here. Leask has identified this period as the age of "curiosity" travel, as the genre moved away from the "empiricist and objectivist bias of the Enlightenment travelogue" yet had not encountered the emergence of discrimination based on "racial science."[58] It was a time of seeking a framework through which to proceed, and in this respect the Russians examined here were very much European thinkers.

Creating Brotherhood

The first secular Russian travellers to the Ottoman Slav lands, Aleksandr Turgenev (1785-1846) and Andrei Kaisarov (1782-1813), were privileged sons of the Moscow elite, at a time when studying abroad was seen as prestigious and even necessary to embellish a nobleman's education.[59] They were both young Russians whose world-view had been largely moulded by their parents' participation in the late Russian Enlightenment, and the cosmopolitan aspirations and international ideology that characterised this era.[60] As young

---

[57] Nigel Leask, *Curiosity and the Aesthetics of Travel Writing, 1770-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 2.
[58] Leask, pp. 3-4.
[59] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke*, p.46.
[60] Andrzej Walicki has argued that, intellectually, the Russian Enlightenment was largely based on the atmosphere and the literature of the French Enlightenment, in which Catherine the Great took an active interest. The penetration of Enlightenment ideas was profound enough in Russia that even its enemies could not escape its influence. The comparative openness of the first part of Catherine's reign allowed foreign philosophy to enter Russia, initially in the form of foreign-language books and journals, and later in Russian translation. Furthermore, until the later part of her reign, Catherine encouraged the elite to take an active interest in such Western literature. Russian Enlightenment did, however, represent an imperfect borrowing of a foreign concept. As Diderot noted, Russia was inevitably governed worse than France, as "individual freedom is reduced to zero here, the authority of one's superiors is still too great and the natural rights of man are as yet too restricted." Despite Diderot's doubts as to Catherine's genuine commitment to Enlightenment ideals, it is nevertheless true that young Russian elites of this era were able to participate in larger European intellectual trends on an unprecedented scale. For more, see Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp 5-9. Yet foreign influences in Russia were not exclusively French. Marc Raeff noted the crucial role played by German

men, both had studied at the prestigious Moscow "*Blagorodnii Pansion*" before attending Göttingen University. Turgenev and Kaisarov became close friends while still students in Moscow, where they formed a circle of friends interested in reading German literature and dedicating themselves to self-improvement.[61] In addition to literature and philosophy, many of the young men were strongly drawn to the study of history. Intellectually, Alexander I's reign represented a period of transition. According to Walicki, the early years were a "continuation and even culmination of eighteenth-century intellectual trends" which were succeeded by the proliferation of both conservative and revolutionary movements.[62] Turgenev's father Ivan was regarded as one of the most enlightened men of his generation.[63] Ivan had been an active member of Novikov's Masonic circle and Aleksandr had been raised in a household that combined the spirit of masonry with western humanism.[64] Ivan Turgenev had also served as the director of Moscow University, and oversaw its reorganization in the first years of Alexander I's reign.[65] Like Turgenev,

---

thought and literature, as well as Freemasonry, in the Russian Enlightenment. Raeff argued that Masonic ideas, imported from England and Germany "acquainted the average nobleman with the significance of the individual personality." German literature enjoyed great popularity in Masonic circles, consisting of men such as Aleksandr Turgenev's father. For more, see Marc Raeff, *The origins of the Russian Intelligensia* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966), pp. 160-162. For more on the impact of Freemasonry and the spread of its ideas in Russia, see Douglas Smith, *Working the Rough Stone: Freemasonry and Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1999).

[61] The interest in German literature was part of a trend: the works of Kant, and in particular of other Post-Kantian academicians such as Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel enjoyed considerable popularity and influence in Russia in the early nineteenth century. The government tolerated this, as Post-Kantian ideas seemed less threatening than the empirical reason of revolutionary France. For more on the German intellectual influence in early nineteenth century Russia see John Randolph, *A House in the Garden: the Bakunin family and the Romance of Russian Idealism* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2007), pp. 11-12.

[62] Walicki, p. 53.

[63] John Randolph, building on the research of Inga Bryden and Janet Floyd, argues that in Russia as elsewhere in early nineteenth century Europe, the home environment "provided a powerfully influential space for the development of character and identity." See Randolph, *A House in the Garden*, p.5. Accepting this private influence on identity formation, the personal backgrounds of Turgenev and Kaisarov are all the more intriguing.

[64] Turgenev was one of several brothers, all of whom were active in Moscow intellectual circles. His older brother, Andrei, considered to be one of the most promising Moscow intellectuals, died in his early 20s. His younger brother, Nikolai, later took part in the Decembrist uprising. For more on Turgenev and particularly Kaisarov, see Iurii Lotman, "Liudi 1812 goda" (People of 1812), *Besedi o russkoi kulture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII-nachalo XIX)* (Notes on Russian culture: the way of life and traditions of the Russian nobility from the eighteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century) (St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo- SPB, 2006), pp. 314- 330.

[65] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* p.47.

Kaisarov also came from an established Moscow family. As was often the case for many of those of his background, he grew up speaking French at home, but studied German intensively with private tutors. As a young man, he travelled extensively in England and Scotland, receiving a degree in medicine from the University of Edinburgh. However, his interest gravitated more towards the study of language, and he began to study the Slavic languages.[66] While at Göttingen, both men took courses in Slavic history and were apparently fascinated by this new subject. According to their correspondence, both were inspired by their experiences there and hoped one day to follow their mentors into academia.[67]

Motivated by a desire to "go to those places, which were first known to us only in a dusty chronicle," the two youths set off together on their tour of the Slav lands at the suggestion of their professors at Göttingen University.[68] After years of reading about Slavs, they felt the need and desire to investigate the region for themselves, and to establish first hand if those peoples they had read of in German texts were in fact related to them. Prior to travelling to the South Slav lands they went to the two major centres of Slavic studies- Vienna and Prague, where they consulted with leading Habsburg experts, including Josef Dobrovský. Although still largely unheard of in the Russian Empire, Slavic Studies was already a flourishing field of study in the Habsburg lands. Furthermore, academic networks of slavists were already well established in Central Europe. Scholars such as Dobrovský and Jernej Kopitar had made considerable efforts, using largely linguistic analysis, to chart the Slavic peoples and their relationship to each other.[69] Recognizing Dobrovský in

---

[66] Lotman, p. 325.

[67] After his travels in the Slav lands, Kaisarov returned to Russia to begin his academic career as a professor at the University of Derpt (now Tartu University). There he set about constructing a pan-Slavic dictionary comparing all the Slavic languages he had encountered on his trip in an attempt to categorise the various Slav populations. His project was never to be completed, however. He volunteered for service at the start of the Napoleonic War, and died in battle in 1813. See Lotman, pp 323-326.

[68] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke*, pp. 14-15.

[69] Dobrovský was in frequent contact with South Slav scholars such as Dositej Obradović and Vuk Stefanović Karadžić. Dobrovský also regularly corresponded with Jernej Kopitar, author of the first Slovene grammar. Already in the first decade of the nineteenth century, men such as Dobrovský and Kopitar had sought to establish historical links amongst the Slavic peoples through comparative linguistics. This was an interactive process of correspondence and collecting of primary examples of language and dialect. Despite Dobrovský's considerable fame, it was probably Kopitar who exerted more influence in the South Slav lands. Kopitar

particular as possessing a wealth of knowledge on the Slavs, many early Russian travelers consulted with him while planning their journeys. In particular, his use of language as a primary means of classifying people was frequently employed by the young Russian scholars in the first part of the nineteenth century.

After their trip through Vienna and the West Slav lands, Kaisarov and Turgenev reached Serbia in 1804, though their first encounters with Serbs, had occurred while they were still in the Habsburg Empire. In Vojvodina, Turgenev and Kaisarov met Orthodox Metropolitan, Stefan Stratimirović, whom Turgenev described as the "Metropolitan of the Slavo-Serb and Vlach people" and who "accepted us as his own children."[70] From the limited written materials available, it seems clear that Turgenev felt a strong connection between himself and all the "Slavs." Turgenev informed his father in a letter that, for Russians, travelling in the Slav lands is far more enriching than going to other popular destinations, such as Italy, since in the latter "there lived a people who are totally different from us, and here we are located amongst our ancient ancestors, and in their offspring, despite all degeneration, we can still see some remains of the ancient Slavic habits and customs."[71] How Turgenev reached this conclusion is unclear, but his definitions appear to be linguistically based. This was a time when the concept of Slavdom was poorly understood, and no fixed definition existed. Turgenev's notions of Slavic history and languages were vague at best, and the result of second-hand German teachings. As Ludmila Lapteva has correctly pointed out, his letters reveal large gaps in his knowlesge of the

---

was a major influence on Karadžić, as well as on the Croat Ljudvit Gaj. For more, see Pavle Popović, "Dobrovski i srpska književnost" ("*Dobrovský and Serbian Literature*") In Jiří Horak, ed., *Sbornik Statik k stému výročí smrti Josefa Dobrovského* (Collection of articles for the 100th anniversary of the death of Josef Dobrovský) (Prague: Karlovy University, 1929), pp. 277-287. There was not complete agreement on Slavic linguistics at the time. For example, Dobrovský was strongly opposed to the adoption of the vernacular as the standard dialect in the South Slav lands, whilst Karadžić endorsed it. As a result of this conflict, some Serbian scholars have dismissed the influence of Dobrovský in the region, claiming that he failed to understand the Serbs linguistically, pushing them towards a Russianized version of their language. For more see Ljubomir Stojanović, "Dobrovský chez les Serbs," in Horak, ed., *Sbornik Statik*, p. 408. Regardless of these debates, the influence of Dobrovský on young Russian scholars was significant, although a study of how his ideas were received and interpreted in Russia has yet to be written.

[70] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke*, p. 46.

[71] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke*, pp. 14-15.

history of these peoples. He frequently used the terms 'Serb' and 'Vlach' interchangeably, apparently unclear if these were two peoples or one. He also confused the details of Czech history, and grossly oversimplified and exaggerated recent history, writing, for example, "first the Bohemians were slaves, but Joseph II freed them from their shackles."[72] These errors should not be seen as reflecting a lack of education on Turgenev's part, but rather the efforts of a highly educated man to understand his country, its place in Europe, and how his countrymen were or were not related to other European peoples. The Slavic world was understood very differently at the time, and Turgenev's conclusion reflects this, as well as demonstrating his inherent intellectual curiosity and desire to improve his own understanding of Slavic history.

Interestingly, he did not seem to differentiate between the West and the South Slavs though Poles did not figure in his writing at all: he mentioned only Czechs, Wends[73] and Serbs, all of whom fell only under the general category of "Slav" in his view. His works likewise present a clear image of an "Other" in the form of "Saxons" or "Germans." Turgenev claimed, for example, that Wends "love Russians and all related peoples, and how they hate the Saxons, their victors, who try to deprive them even of their last possession: their language!"[74] He also claimed that the Czechs were the "irreconcilable enemies of the Germans" as the latter "try as much as they can to Germanize them [the Czechs]."[75] Thus, as many later travelogues would, Turgenev identified with the "Slavs," portraying the Germans as, if not *his* Other, the Other of those with whom he seemed to sympathise. This is ironic, particularly given his German education and the fact that most of what he knew of Slavic history was conditioned by his German professors. This influence proved to be inescapable for Turgenev. Back in Russia after his travels, and while preparing to take part in a history competition proposed by Karamzin, he wrote to Kaisarov that he would need the advice of the leading specialists: "Dobrovský's opinion I more

---

[72] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* p.17. For more detailed analysis of Turgenev's historical inaccuracies, see Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* p.49.
[73] Wends here refers to the Slavic people more commonly known today in English as the Sorbs.
[74] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* p. 14.
[75] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* p. 17.

or less know from his *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und Litteratur*. However, I lack Dobner's, who also wrote a new hypothesis on the origins of the Slavic letters. Oh, and also Rüdiger's *Grundriss der Geschichte menschlichen Sprache nach allen bisher bekannten Mund- und Schriftarten*, Leipzig, 1782. If you can try and procure for me what you can, and ask Schlözer whether he has something, and if he himself knows more than us about this, then could he send me his opinions, as I need to base everything on them."[76] The Germans might emerge from Turgenev's letters as the enemies of the Slavs, but they also appear to have been the experts on them.

Turgenev's feeling of kinship with the Slavs (minus the Poles) provide early indications of what would become a culturally constructed phenomenon. That this was not a natural, inherent reaction is illustrated by the fact that not all early Slavic travellers responded to travels in the Slav lands with the same enthusiasm as Kaisarov and Turgenev. Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii (1788-1850), son of the well-known antiquary Nikolai Bantysh-Kamenskii, was able to spend more time travelling around the region than had the previous two travellers, and he came away from his journey with a less sentimental view of the South Slavs. Sent there on official government business in 1810, at the age of 22, his travels took him through southern Russia, Moldavia and Wallachia en route to Serbia. The travelogue that emerged from this trip fits well into the genre of sentimental Western travel writing of the time: tears are frequent as the writer is seized by fierce emotions along his journey. The work also conforms to many of the Western trends of travel writing in tone, structure, and stated *raison d'être*. Throughout his journey, he claimed to have kept a daily account of his adventures, which he was "forced to publish" by his friends upon his return, as there had never been written "in a foreign language or in our tongue, a travelogue of Serbia." This not particularly accurate claim was often found at the start of travel writing in that era. Moreover, as in many Western travelogues of the time, he added that his only goal in publishing his work was to "bring pleasure to some of my compatriots."[77]

---

[76] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke,* p. 341.
[77] Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Puteshestvie v Moldaviiu, Valakhiiu, i Serbiiu* (Travels in Moldavia, Wallachia and Serbia) (Moscow, 1810), pp.3-4.

Despite this claim, Bantysh-Kamenskii's travelogue, *Puteshestvie v Moldaviiu, Valakhiiu, i Serbiiu,* could easily have been written by a young Englishman or Frenchman, and touches on many of the same themes as Western travelogues about the Balkans. Like many such travellers, he saw the region as a dark and dangerous place, certainly not a land inhabited by brother nations, as future Russian travellers would allege. First, the journey into Serbia was portrayed as complicated and risky. Describing the moment he crossed the Danube and entered Serbian territory, he wrote, "I was in a state of great fear, and saw death at every turn in front of me."[78] From there he and some companions made their way towards Belgrade. Every part of the journey was described as arduous. For example, the path they chose to take was described as a "dangerous labyrinth."[79] While on the road, the traveller confessed he was unable to sleep, surrounded (as he felt he was) by "unknown armed men."[80] On an excursion to Smederevo, the journey filled the traveller with a sense of "horror and fear"[81] which he claimed was in complete contrast with the comparatively more developed Moldavian system. On another occasion, he found himself staring over the Danube at Austria, and wishing he were on the other side.[82] According to him, all Serbian men were armed at all times, wearing their weapons as they did their clothing.[83] Things did not get easier once he arrived in Belgrade. Attending a soirée at a Serbian general's house, Bantysh-Kamenskii felt nervous, surrounded by "armed men."[84]

Like many future travellers, Bantysh-Kamenskii acknowledged that the Serbian and Russian languages were indeed similar,[85] and claimed that all Serbs love Russia, Russians and the tsar. However, he nevertheless felt the people to be "different"[86] and confessed to missing his own homeland "with all his heart."[87] When writing about the Serbs, he noted their low level of literacy- at one point in a meeting with Serbian senators, he began to suspect

[78] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 95.
[79] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 96.
[80] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 97.
[81] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 106.
[82] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 107.
[83] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 96.
[84] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 100.
[85] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 110.
[86] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 109.
[87] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 118.

that the senators were in fact illiterate, but hid this from him.[88] In his twelve-page description of Karadjordje, the Serbian leader was described as a "crude and uneducated man"[89] with an incredible cruel streak, exemplified by the murder of his own father.[90] The Russian seemed both fascinated and horrified by the Serbian rebel, whom he presented as symbolic of all of Serbia in his brutality and crudity. As a further indication of the Serbs' seemingly endless barbarism, Bantysh-Kamenskii noted that Karadjordje's son seemed cunning and sly already at ten years old and that his hobbies were hunting and killing.[91] Serbian women were dismissed as being all ugly and "swarthy with dark hair." Thus, Bantysh-Kamenskii concluded that it was hardly surprising that many Serbian men wanted Turkish women, many of whom were, according to Bantysh- Kamenskii, beautiful.[92] This remark is interesting as it is one of several occasions where Bantysh-Kamenskii seemed to show empathy towards Serbia's Turkish population, which he claimed lived in a state of fear, abject poverty[93] and great unhappiness.[94] The sight of them filled Bantysh-Kamenskii with a sense of great pity, a theme that would disappear quickly from Russian travelogues. Towards the end of his stay in Serbia, Bantysh-Kamenskii wondered why he was not already back in Moscow,[95] and he felt an overwhelming sense of relief when he crossed the border, writing to his friend "you will never believe, my dear friend, how I was overjoyed to see myself outside of Serbia!"[96]

While a stream of Enlightenment thinking, led by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, valued the alleged virtues of the "noble savage," Bantysh-Kamenskii identified too closely with the urban, cosmopolitan strands of Enlightenment thinking to appreciate the primitive in Serbia, as later travellers would do. Although his connection with Russia, and in particular with Moscow, remained strong throughout the work, the cosmopolitan tone of his writing also reflects

[88] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 111.
[89] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 119.
[90] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 121.
[91] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 128.
[92] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 135.
[93] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 129.
[94] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 130.
[95] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 139.
[96] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 134.

the work of a man who saw himself first as part of an international pan-European elite, and second as a Russian. He presented himself at once as the educated scholar, writing extensively on the history and architecture of the places he visited, and as the romantic hero, who was profoundly disturbed by social injustice. Seeing peasants sleeping without roofs, or being taken advantage of by cruel landlords brought tears to his sensitive eyes.[97] Yet, he appeared to have no notion that any sort of "Slavic family" might exist. Except for language, he saw no connection between himself and the Serbs he met.

During his travels, Bantysh-Kamenskii appeared to feel most at home in the company of Germans, and frequently sought out German-owned inns, even while still in the Russian Empire. He described such places as being "well-cleaned" and "stone built," both of which were extremely important to him.[98] He also praised the Germans and the English for their advanced level of technology, which was only slowly being imported into Russia.[99] Unlike many future travellers, he was also comfortable in Greek-owned accommodation, and did not attack the Greeks with the vehemence future travellers would, again suggesting little concept of Slavic brotherhood, and thus no sense of Slavic grievance against the Greeks.[100] Throughout much of his travels, he referred to Orthodox churches generically as "Greek," suggesting that the Greeks' prominent role in the Church did not bother him.[101] He felt slightly more comfortable in Moldavia and Wallachia than in Serbia, noting that in the former two regions, at least the people spoke decent French, and the women dressed in "the European style," all of which he seemed to find reassuring.[102] Nevertheless, while he did not feel in constant danger there, as he did in Serbia, he did note that the people were generally "crude and lazy" and he found little to discuss

---

[97]Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 20. It must be noted that his sense of compassion extends to Christian peasants only, as the sight of poor Jews disgusts him.

[98] See for example, Bantysh-Kamenskii, p 39. Bantysh-Kamenskii appears to have been quite interested in how buildings were constructed, making detailed notes of this in all the towns and settlements he visited. He dismissed wood construction as being of poor quality, opting whenever possible to stay in stone accommodation. While many travellers note the way in which buildings are constructed, he is the only one to take such detailed notes on stonework, suggesting it was perhaps a subject of personal interest to him.

[99] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 43.

[100] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 55.

[101] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 78.

[102] Bantysh-Kamenskii, pp. 77-78.

with them.[103] Again, while in Moldavia and Wallachia, he actively sought out German (Saxon) owned places to stay, noting they were inevitably cleaner.[104] The further away from "Western" civilisation Bantysh-Kamenskii travelled, the more apprehensive he appears to be. German-owned hotels seemed to represent a reassuring presence of civilisation for him, and when they were absent, he was uncomfortable.

Bantysh-Kamenskii returned home to Russia via Poland, which, he also disliked. Here again, he was not aware of sharing any common Slavic identity with the Poles, and saw no connection with them at all. As anti-Semitism was a consistent feature of his works, it was not surprising that the worst insult he could use to describe Poland was to claim that the whole country was "filled with Jews" and that they were all dirty. He decided to leave the place as soon as possible as there were "too many Jews for my liking."[105]

His works bear strong resemblances to Western travelogues of the same period, which also commonly featured labyrinth- like roads, seemingly endemic bad weather, and conditions that resulted in sleep deprivation. For example, the Reverend R. Walsh, an Englishman travelling through the Ottoman Balkans in the 1820s, wrote of having a similar experience. He too noticed that the Christians, even the elite, were completely illiterate,[106] lamented the same bad roads ("I soon, for the first time, began to feel all the annoyances of this miserable mode of posting…..the motion of this rigid

---

[103] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 79.
[104] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 86.
[105] Bantysh-Kamenskii, p. 154. There are several instances of anti-Semitism in Bantysh-Kamenskii's work. While still travelling in the Russian Empire, he comes across a town "filled with Jews" and appears horrified when he accidentally purchases a bun from a Jewish baker. Disgusted and unable to eat the "Jewish bun," which he concedes is well made, he gives it to one of the soldiers with him (p. 59). On another occasion (p. 61), he finds himself in a town where the only inn is owned by a Jew, and he decides it would be preferable to sleep out in the open than in such a place. Given that the town has a large Jewish population, he refuses to write his usual commentary on the place, concluding it did not merit it.
[106] Reverend Robert Walsh, *A Residence in Constantinople During a Period Including the Commencement, Progress and Termination of the Greek and Turkish Revolutions* (London: Frederick Westley and A.H. Davis, 1836), p. 265, 174. Interestingly, large portions of Walsh's work were translated by Iuri Venelin and incorporated into his 1829 work on the history of Bulgaria. At the time his first work came out, Venelin had not yet had the opportunity to travel to Bulgaria personally, and it appears he used Walsh's work to help provide him with a first-hand report on the region.

little machine, dragged with velocity over uneven ground, was such, as to shake the whole frame violently, and produce a sensation as if the limbs were disjointed by use."[107]) and the post stations offered Walsh no possibility of sleep, not due to the abundance of armed men, but rather because all the locals had been contaminated by an outbreak of the plague, and he did not wish to "compromise [himself] by entering an infected place."[108] Clearly Walsh shared Bantysh- Kamenskii's contempt for and suspicion of local conditions.

While Turgenev identified with "the Slavs" on apparently linguistic grounds, and Bantysh-Kamenskii felt sympathy for the Turks, possibly out of a sentimentalist outpouring of emotion for the downtrodden, neither attempted to classify in a systematic way the peoples they saw. Rather, both travellers seemed unsure what to make of the surroundings in which they found themselves, and reacted to them in a fashion largely determined by their own cultural baggage and training: Turgenev sought the Slavic similarities which had already been brought to his attention in his German university, while Bantysh-Kamenskii, like many West European travellers, saw only the poor, violent and primitive. This occurred with little effort to interpret the local cultures or to place the inhabitants they encountered within the larger framework of regional peoples. However, the classification of peoples and languages was becoming a popular field of study in the early nineteenth century, and the next generation of Russian travellers to the South Slav lands would take the task of classifying their inhabitants extremely seriously.

Classifying Knowledge

The first member of this new generation of travellers was Iurii Gutsa-Venelin. In many ways an outsider in the developing world of Russian academia, Venelin spent much of his professional life on the margins, never achieving in his lifetime the recognition he felt he deserved. Despite this, his journey to the South Slav lands was pioneering, and many would follow in his footsteps. The Ruthene son of a Uniate priest, Venelin's

[107] Walsh, p. 210.
[108] Walsh, p. 211.

background was similar to those of the *popovichi* (sons of Orthodox clergymen). Like Venelin, the *popovichi* "didn't look like other educated Russians…[they] had been educated separately in special schools, and were unfashionably dressed."[109] Although his family wanted him to attend a seminary, Venelin went against their wishes and moved to Moscow in 1825 at the age of 23, ostensibly to study medicine.[110] Both his regional and social origins would have marked Venelin out as an outsider in Moscow, and throughout his career, he never felt completely accepted by mainstream academia. However, he quickly became active in Moscow intellectual circles, where he was drawn to the teachings of Mikhail Pogodin, who introduced him to the emerging field of Slavic studies.[111] Venelin became interested in Bulgarian history during a brief teaching stint in Kishenev, where he came into contact with resident Bulgarians. Intrigued, he sought to educate himself on the Balkan Slavs, albeit with very limited success. Nevertheless, using the meagre resources available in Russia at the time, he attempted to piece together a history of Bulgaria. His first book, *The Ancient and Present-Day Bulgarians in their Political, Ethnographic, Historical and Religious Relationship to the Russians* was one of the first to be published in Russia on the subject, though it was deeply flawed by factual errors and filled with fantastical speculation.

In his effort to classify, Venelin argued that the Bulgarians were Slavs and closely related to the Russians, as were the Huns, Avars and Khazars. He even maintained that Attila the Hun had in fact been a Slav, and at times refers to him as a "Russian (Bulgarian) Tsar."[112] This reflects his life-long belief in the Slav origins of the Bulgarians. This notion ran counter to the received wisdom of the day, as expressed by scholars such as Karamzin in Russia and Šafářik in the Habsburg lands, according to which the Bulgarians were a non-Slav people who had come to adopt the

---

[109] Laurie Manchester, *Holy Fathers, Secular Sons: Clergy, Intelligentsia and the Modern Self in Revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008), p. 1.
[110] D.D. Daniliuk, "Iu. I. Gutsa-Venelin", in G. Kamaeniash and V. Gisem, eds., *Iu. I. Gutsa-Venelin z naukovoi spadshchini viznachnoho slavista* (Iu. I. Venelin, from the Academic Legacy of an Outstanding Slavist) (Uzhgorod: Vidavnitstvo Padiaka, 2002), pp. 141-144.
[111] Daniliuk, p. 143.
[112] Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke*, p.80.

Slav language after their arrival in the Balkan peninsula.[113] In an attack on Venelin, P.J. Šafářik noted, "all Byzantine historians declare the Bulgarians who came from the Don and Volga as ethnic relatives of the Huns and Kuturgurs. Even Nestor….did not include the Bulgarians among the Slavic peoples, but along with the Avars, Hungarians, and Khazars." Other Central European scholars claimed the Bulgarians were Turkic in their origins, but had adopted their language from their Slav neighbours. Venelin was the first "scholar" to stand apart from such views, arguing that the Bulgarians were Slavs, and furthermore, that their language was essentially a dialect of Russian.[114]

In his attempt to categorise people, Venelin created a series of criteria and categories:

1. Language and the name of the people;
2. Arrangement (*ustroistvo*) of the people, which could be external (the forms of construction) or internal (laws and rights);
3. The people's soul (*dusha naroda*), (which he defined as their character and habits, as well as their view and beliefs on subjects such as God and the natural world);
4. Lifestyle of the people[115](consisting of their food and drink, clothing, and living quarters);
5. Institutions created by the people, such as the army, scientific groups etc;
6. Connections to and relationship with neighbouring peoples.[116]

Venelin was not the first to use such a scheme of categorization, for he was building on ideas that had been circulating in Germany since the end of the eighteenth century. In his work *Weltgeschichte nach ihren Hauptttheilen im Auszug und Zusammenhänge,* August Ludwig von Schlözer argued that there were five key components to development: "The life-style determines, climate

---

[113] M. V. Nikulina, "Puteshestvie Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariu i evo mesto v nachal'noi istorii bolgarstiki v Rossii" ("The Travels of Venelin in Bulgaria and their place in the early history of Bulgarian studies in Russia"), in G.K. Venediktov, ed., *Iu. I. Venelin v Bolgarskom vozrozhdenii* (Moscow: Russian Academy of Science, 1998), p. 57.

[114] James Clarke, *The Pen and the Sword: Studies in Bulgarian History* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1988), p.134.

[115] The original reads "*proziavanie naroda, to est' pishchu, odezhdy*…." However, as he goes on to include living quarters and other domestic matters under this category, I have chosen "lifestyle" as the closest translation.

[116] Tamara Baitsura, "Mesto Iu. I. Venelina v razvitii slavianovedeniia pervoi poloviny XIX veka" ("The Place of Venelin in the Development of Slavic Studies in the First Half of the Nineteenth century"), in Volodimir Zadorozhnil and Mikola Zimomria, eds., *Iurii Gutsa-Venelin do 200-richchiia Vid Dnia Narodzhenniia* (Iurii Gutsa Venelin, On the 200 year anniversary of his Birth) (Uzhgorod: Vidavnitsvo Karpati, 2002), pp.13-21.

and nutrition creates, the sovereign forces, the priest teaches, and the example inspires." Schlözer had also experimented with using these components to understand different peoples and their origins.[117]

Venelin hoped to get a complete picture of a people by using these criteria to establish how typical members of that society lived, who belonged to which group, and how the groups related to one another. While this approach marked the first endeavor by a Russian in the area of Slavic Studies, it was also very much a reflection of larger trends of the time. As Ian Hacking had noted, in the nineteenth century, the "enumeration of people and their habits" was attempted by a growing number of people as society became an object of knowledge, which drew on statistics for authority.[118] From the 1820s onwards, these statisticians sought the "normal" man through mathematical scrutiny. The very term "normal" "moved into the sphere of almost everything. People, behaviour, states of affairs, diplomatic relations, molecules: all became normal or abnormal. The word became indispensable because it created a way to be 'objective' about human beings."[119] This quest to determine the 'normal' meant, as Venelin found, that "categories had to be invented into which people could conveniently fall in order to be counted." The creation of such structures of knowledge had a profound impact on all of society as "the systematic collection of data about people affected not only the ways in which we

---

[117] August Schlözer, *Weltgeschichte nach ihren Hauptttheilen im Auszug und Zusammenhange*, (*The Main elements of world history in excerpts and context)* (Göttingen, 1772, Vol I.), p. 66. Schlözer was extremely influential in Russia, and has been credited by some for having laid the foundations for the study of Russian history. He was invited to the Russian empire by historian Gerhardt Friedrich Müller in 1761 and taught in Russia for many years. During his stay there, he advocated creating a standard procedure for collecting and comparing old Russian and Greek documents in an attempt to get a more organized view of Russian history. For more on Russia, see Edward C. Thaden, *The Rise of Historicism in Russia*, (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), p.30. After several years in Russia, Schlözer moved to the University of Göttingen, where he and other scholars set out to define the purpose of historical sciences, and the methods it should incorporate. Their new perspective sought to balance the study of a culture's institutions with an analysis of historical events. Their outlook was "deeply conscious of the element of change in human institutions, customs and thought and which recognized the extent to which any attempt to understand human nature required an examination of the historical circumstances in which this nature manifested itself." Schlözer in particular was interested in the way men and their characters were influenced by their physical environment. For more on these views, see Georg Iggers, *New Directions in European Historiography* (New York: Taylor Francis, 1985), pp. 15-16.

[118] Ian Hacking, *The Taming of Chance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 1. He notes on p. 6 that although the concept of probability "came into being around 1660…the great spurt of statistical thinking did not occur until the nineteenth century."

[119] Hacking, p. 160.

conceive of a society, but also the ways in which we describe our neighbour."[120] By creating categories that highlighted the differences (and similarities) among peoples, groups began to relate themselves to and against other peoples. Importantly, the categories Venelin identified were for the most part similar to those studied by future Russian travellers to the region, suggesting that although Venelin's work was unpopular in Russia in his lifetime, it reflected intellectual trends, mainly borrowed from German thinkers such as Schlözer, which were influential.

Although many of Venelin's findings and scientific assertions would ultimately be dismissed by his colleagues both in Russia and in the Habsburg lands, his methods have been credited with helping to provide the base upon which Russian ethnography with regard to the Slavs would be constructed.[121] It appears that many of his assertions were ultimately based on language-related research. Interested in the study of language since childhood, Venelin felt he could prove the Slavic origins of the Bulgarians by comparing place and proper names to other Slavic ones. Using the same techniques, he dismissed the notion that the Bulgarians could be Turks who adopted the Slavic tongue by citing the example of the Greeks. Venelin felt that if the Greeks had preserved their language despite 2,000 years of invasions and encounters with different peoples, it was ludicrous to suggest that the Bulgarians over the space of 200 years could lose their allegedly Turkish tongue in favour of a Slavic one.[122]

While his "research" was attacked by his contemporaries both in Russia and in Central Europe, Venelin's first work was greeted with the highest praise in Bulgaria, where some have even argued that he played a catalytic role in awakening Bulgarian national consciousness.[123] As James Clarke pointed out, Venelin's writing, however fantastical, offered the Bulgarians an escape from the notion that they were somehow related to their

---

[120] Hacking, p. 3.
[121] V.V. Usacheva, "Iu. I. Venelin i pervye shagi Slavianskoi etnografii" (Venelin and the first steps towards Slavic Ethnography"), in Volodimir Zadorozhnil and Mikola Zimomria, eds., *Iurii Gutsa-Venelin* (Uzhgorod, 2002), p. 185.
[122] Clarke, p.139.
[123] This point has particularly been argued in Ukrainian historiography, see D.D. Danilok, *Iu.I. Gutsa-Venelin*, (Uzhgorodskii Derzhavnii Universitet Uzhgorod, 1995), p. 15.

Turkish oppressors. By claiming that the Bulgarians enjoyed a purely Slavic and even heroic past, Venelin removed the stigma and shame of being related to the Turks and instantly provided the miniscule Bulgarian elite with a more acceptable version of their national past.[124] It is thus hardly surprising that Venelin has long enjoyed far greater popularity in Bulgaria than in the country he called his home, Russia.[125]

Venelin himself recognised the need to travel in order to obtain more first- hand knowledge of the region that had so captured his interest. It was, therefore, for this reason that he appealed to the Russian Academy[126] for funding to carry out what he termed an "*uchenoe puteshestvie*" (scientific/academic journey). He defined his goal as making a detailed study of the history, language, writing and ethnography of the Bulgarians, as such studies were at the time utterly lacking.[127] Venelin was the first to use this term with regards to travel to the South Slav lands, although the "scientific journey" would soon become an accepted method of information gathering. In his effort to secure funding from the Russian Academy, Venelin argued that only through travel to the region could he corroborate the theories put forward in his already published work. This travel was necessary not only to the historical field, as a way of gathering historical knowledge, but also to the Russian Empire. Due to its early acceptance of Orthodoxy and the Cyrillic alphabet, Venelin argued, Bulgaria represented the "classical country for Slavic historians and philologists" and understanding Bulgaria was crucial in

---

[124] Danilok, *Iu.I. Gutsa-Venelin,* p. 138.

[125] Venelin did at times referred to "Russia" as his homeland, but he probably meant this to be the Russian Empire, of which he was certainly a part. As he wrote in Russian, and spent much of his life in what is today Russia, Russians generally accept him as having been a "Russian" scholar. However, since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Ukrainians (with justification) have claimed him as Ukrainian, emphasizing his role in addressing certain issues in Ukrainian history. See Danilok, *Iu.I. Gutsa-Venelin,* p. 25.

[126] Many sources, both Russian and foreign, have claimed that Venelin was sent and funded by the Russian Academy of Sciences. However, G.K. Venediktov has recently demonstrated that this was not in fact the case. Rather, Venelin was funded by the Russian Academy, which at that time was a separate institution. The Russian Academy of Sciences was founded on the orders of Peter the Great in 1725, and still exists today. The Russian Academy was created by Catherine the Great in 1783, with the specific purpose of expanding and improving the state of the Russian language and body of literature. This academy existed as a separate entity until 1841, when it merged with the Russian Academy of Sciences. For more about the two academies, and the confusion of Venelin's sponsorship, see G. K. Venediktov, Introduction to Iuri Venelin, *Uchenoe puteshestvie Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu* (The Scholarly Travels of Iu. I. Venelin in Bulgaria) (Moscow: Rossiskaia Akademia Nauka, 2005), pp.6-8.

[127] Nikulina, p. 134.

understanding the Slavic, and thus the Russian past.[128] During his travels Venelin met with peoples of various nationalities. Like many of the other writers considered here, Venelin identified most closely with the Slavs, and saw them as being oppressed. In Varna, he claimed the population was hungry, and that the Russians were moved to do what they could to help out, by giving away dried bread.[129] Despite their incredible suffering however, Venelin felt that the Bulgarians were "wonderful people"[130] and that their obvious common Slavic traits should be pleasing "to all Slavs, especially Russians."[131]

Yet who was a Slav in his view? Venelin's letters back to his sponsors present a confused approach to categorisation. The categories are not specifically linguistic, as Venelin alleged that many of the "Bulgarians" spoke Turkish together. At one point, he even travelled to a village where one-third of the inhabitants were, according to him, Turkish-speaking Bulgarians.[132] During his travels, Venelin made a point of living exclusively with Bulgarians so as to improve his knowledge of their language and culture. He wrote that his knowledge of Bulgarian increased rapidly, although he claimed that Bulgarians were prone to slipping into Turkish and that he often had to force them to speak their "own" language. He also claimed that they had the habit of putting "Russian" words into Bulgarian, which displeased Venelin[133] who claimed "Macedonian" had remained much purer, due to the lack of encounters with foreigners.[134] This insistence on forcing locals to speak their language "purely" is ironic, yet not uncommon for a Russian of Venelin's age. This was a time when the study of language was still in its infancy, and the origins of grammar, syntax and vocabulary were still being determined. Although isolated attempts at linguistics had been made prior to the Enlightenment, it was really only in the late eighteenth

---

[128] Venelin, *Uchenoe puteshestvie Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu* (The Scholarly Travels of Iu. I. Venelin in Bulgaria), (Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk), 2005, p. 19.
[129] Venelin, p. 97.
[130] Venelin, p. 116.
[131] Venelin, p. 112.
[132] P. Bessenov, *Nekotoriia cherty puteshestviia Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu* (Some Notes on the Travels of Iu. I. Venelin in Bulgaria) (Moscow, 1857), p. 14.
[133] Venelin, p. 106.
[134] Venelin, p. 107.

century that Western scholars began to devote serious attention to the subject.[135] The structure initially used to make sense out of the world's languages was based heavily on Carl von Linné's botanical taxonomy from the early eighteenth century, creating categories of facts for different languages.[136] In the early nineteenth century, linguistic studies, such as those undertaken by Kopitar and Dobrovský, were generally comparative, consisting of establishing and comparing inventories created either of different languages, or between the same language at different stages. A surge in data-collection in the first two decades of the nineteenth century necessitated the creation of a clearer approach, and urged the establishment of more categories of examination as well as more scientific means for testing those categories. By 1830, the concept of language families had been established, and terms like "Indo-European" coined.[137] Venelin's efforts to differentiate between the speech in Bulgaria and Macedonia may have been flawed, but it was drawing on a popular methodology of the era, and formed part of a larger struggle to define peoples and their cultures.

If Venelin's classifications were not exclusively linguistic, they were equally not based on religion: Venelin, himself Orthodox, dismissed the Orthodox clergy in Bulgaria as worthless, and made little comment on the Muslim spiritual leadership at all. Furthermore, his writing makes numerous references to men he claimed were "Bulgarians but Muslims." While travelling in Silistria, he became blood brothers with a man named Aga-Mustafa, who promised to be his brother until death. Venelin felt a bit guilty accepting this blood pact, but only because he already had a blood

---

[135] On of the main examples of this would be François Thurot's 1796 work *Tableau des progrès de la science grammaticale*, which is regarded by many as representing the beginning of modern language study. For more on early language studies, see E.F.K. Koerner, "History of Linguistics: The Field", in R.E. Asher and E.F.K. Koerner, eds., *The Concise History of the Language Sciences: From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 3-7.

[136] On the development of linguistics in this period, see, N.E. Collinge, "The Main Strands of nineteenth century Linguistics: the History of Comparative Linguistics", in Asher and Koerner, *Language Sciences*, p. 199.

[137] The term "Indo-European" was invented by Thomas Young (1773-1829). For more, see Collinge, p. 195.

brother in Moscow.[138] There was never any suggestion that Aga-Mustafa's religion was of any relevance at all, and all other references to him in Venelin's writings note simply that he was Bulgarian. As in Varna, Venelin found little to interest him in Silistria and again occupied himself with collecting folk songs and poetry. This he did with the assistance of two "Bulgarian" friends he made in the region, a doctor named Kalcho Petkov and a man named Ahmet-aga Boikovich, who was involved in trade with Macedonia. Venelin and Ahmet-aga became very good friends, so much so that Ahmet-aga joked that they must be of the same origin.[139] Again, Ahmet-aga is referred to as being a "Bulgarian but Muslim," once again suggesting that religion was not the determining factor for Venelin in deciding nationality.

While Venelin did not seem to have a clear definition of what defined a Bulgarian, he was quite certain who was not. Despite travelling in the Ottoman Empire, he wrote relatively little about the Turks and had little contact with them. Venelin claimed that this was because Turks went out of their way to avoid "Europeans in general, especially Christians, and most particularly Russians."[140] He believed that the Turks viewed all Christians as "being born only for being their tributaries and slaves," and that the Bulgarians did, in fact, live in slave-like conditions. He claimed the Turks saw Bulgarians as sheep, i.e. a useful animal to be used to extract resources, or to be used as easily dispensable cannon fodder during times of war. Furthermore, he argued that the Turks deprived the Bulgarians of the means of earning a decent living by preventing them from attaining a high level of education or learning a variety of trades. He even went as far so to claim that Turkey's standing in Europe rested on the backs of the Bulgarians. Yet, he never specifically defined the term "Turk." It appears his definition was linguistic, particularly as he felt it was possible for a person to be a "Muslim

---

[138] Venelin, p. 117. Venelin clearly did feel guilty about accepting a second blood brother, so much so that he wrote to his blood brother in Russia explaining the situation and asking for forgiveness in taking a second blood brother without obtaining the permission of the first.
[139] Venelin, p.122. Strangely, one of the letters refers to Ahmet-aga as also being Venelin's blood brother. It is unclear if this is simply an error, or an expression of the profound nature of their friendship.
[140] Quoted in Bessenov, p.16.

Bulgarian." Still at the same time, he claimed many Bulgarians had forgotten their native language, leaving his definitions of terms like Slav and Turk ambiguous. Despite this lack of clarity, Venelin's sympathies lay exclusively with the Slavs. In Venelin's view, the Slavs suffered worse than any other people in the Ottoman Empire, and the Bulgarians suffered most of all: the Moldovans and the Wallachs were "half free," the Serbs were protected by mountains, as were the Albanians (who were only partially subjected to Ottoman rule) and the Greeks prospered unhindered in business, even enjoying various privileges.[141] The Bulgarians were thus left with the short end of the Ottoman stick, hungry, suffering, and fully deserving of Venelin's unquestioning sympathy.

Venelin's sympathy with the Slavs in general and the Bulgarians in particular can also be seen in his writing about the "Valachs" (Wallachians). His feelings towards them were complicated. During his travels, he found a recently published German-language article that argued that the Wallachians were Slavs by origin. Venelin was incensed that the writer, named as E. Marga, seemed to see this Slavic heritage as a point of great "shame and disgrace" for the Wallachian people. Venelin noted "all Wallachians nowadays were occupied with their Roman origins." Although they were Orthodox, Venelin felt they were trying to remove themselves from the Orthodox world, claiming they were trying "to get rid of Slavic letters, which used to be, from the very start of Christianity, the only ones [they used]." Venelin saw this tendency as being exacerbated by Wallachians in the Austrian Empire, who had started to print Wallachian language textbooks almost exclusively with Latin letters instead of the "wonderful church ones." Venelin found this switch particularly frustrating as he claimed "our alphabet" was more than sufficient for writing "all possible Wallachian words." Additionally, Venelin claimed that the Wallachians had launched into "a war against all Slavic words, of which there are many in the Wallachian language."[142] Unlike Bantysh-Kamenskii who seemed to view the Moldavian/ Wallachian difference as an indication

[141] Bessenov, p. 19.
[142] Bessenov, p. 18.

of their more advanced degree of civilisation, Venelin interpreted this difference as an affront to his own culture and customs. In this way he was voicing a clear aspect of Russianness: the Russian language and its alphabet were for him a source of identity and pride, something a French speaker like Bantysh-Kamenskii would not have dwelt upon.[143]

While the Wallachians were linguistic traitors, it was the Greeks who were the recipients of Venelin's greatest ire and who formed a separate category, despite their shared religion.[144] His letters are filled with anti-Greek tirades. His first encounter with Greeks occurred already in Odessa, before he even reached the Ottoman Empire. From the very first, he decided that all Greeks were untrustworthy, possessing of a devilish character.[145] His feelings towards the Greeks did not change once he reached the Ottoman lands, and he identified them as being primarily responsible for the Bulgarians' low position in society.[146] According to Venelin, Bulgarians "suffer ten times more from the Greeks than they do from the Turks." The Church leadership, the logical Christian elite, was controlled by the Greeks, and because of them, Venelin wrote that it "is impossible to underestimate the poverty of the Bulgarian hierarchy, it almost doesn't exist." In addition to represing the Bulgarians, Venelin found the Greeks' behaviour to be appalling. At one church service, Venelin was so shocked by the way in which the Greek priest shouted at his flock that he simply got up and walked out in the middle of the sermon.[147] The Greek priests were bad, but in areas where there were no Greek priests, the whole region was left with

---

[143] Venelin, p. 126.
[144] Anti-Greek statements were common in a number of travellers' writings. Greek- Russian relations by this period had cooled considerably, yet Russia had a much longer history of interaction with the Greeks at this time than with the Balkan Slavs. In the eighteenth century, Russian leaders had taken an active interest in Greece. In the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainardji, signed in 1774, Catherine the Great claimed rights of protection over the Empire's Christian population. At the time she had ambitions to fulfil her "Greek Project" of expelling the Turks from Europe and establishing an Orthodox Greek Empire with its capital in Constantinople. She even had her grandson named Constantine, envisioning his future role as emperor. Yet Russia often promised more to Greece than it was able to deliver, particularly in the minds of Greek revolutionaries, and distrust grew between the two. Furthermore, Greeks found more active supporters in the West, particularly in England.
[145] Venelin, p. 96.
[146] Venelin, p. 118.
[147] Venelin, p. 115.

no spiritual leaders whatsoever.[148] Furthermore, those few Bulgarians who did manage to get some level of education immediately left Ottoman Bulgaria, heading normally for Wallachia or Moldavia if not for Russia,[149] contributing again to the drain of talent from the region.

Venelin's anti-Greek sentiments suggest that his criteria for sympathising with locals was not class-based, in which case the more educated Greeks would have been his natural allies, nor was it religion-based, as he became blood brothers with a "Bulgarian-Muslim," and it was not even language-based, since he kept finding "Turkish speaking Bulgarians." Yet Venelin was enamoured of the idea of Bulgaria, an entity that he failed to define yet which existed clearly in his mind. Like "Russianness," "Bulgarianness" was a porous term constantly open to redefinition.

Terms of Identity

By the 1830s, clear attempts were being made in Russia to invent and solidify some definitions of nationality and Russianness. External events, not least Russia's victory over Napoleonic France, helped to establish some of these parameters. Partly inspired by what they had seen in France, many former and current officers began to create the foundations upon which a Russian revolutionary ideology would emerge in December 1825. After Alexander I's death, an uprising of such men took place.[150] The Decembrist uprising was a political revolt with deep cultural ramifications. The Decembrists valued the notion of service, to the point of regarding all life as service, or as Lotman has noted they "cultivated seriousness as a norm of behaviour." Nicholas I moved swiftly to crush the rebellion, but it left an imprint over his entire regime: an irrevocable separation occurred between the state and the elite that had served it for over a century.[151] Suspicious of the democratic ideas emanating from the West, Nicholas reoriented the

---

[148] Venelin, p. 116.
[149] Venelin, p. 112.
[150] Iurii Lotman, *Istoriia i tipologiia russkoi kul'tury* (The History and Typology of Russian Culture) (St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2002), p. 608.
[151] Iurii Lotman, *Besedi o russkoi kul'ture: byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva XVIII-nachalo XIX* (Discussions about Russian Culture: the Way of Life and the Traditions of the Russian Nobility) (St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo- SPB, 2006), p.336.

country away from what he perceived as Western danger. His reforms in education and other aspects of Russian life ensured that men such as Turgenev, Kaisarov and Bantysh-Kamenskii would be the last Russian travellers of their type to the Balkans, as the younger generation of Russians would come of age in a very different environment.

Within Russian academia, men such as Mikhail Pogodin set about defining terms such as "Slav" in historical-cultural terms and ascribing certain characteristics to it, such as the "basic Slavic virtues: sincerity, simplicity, and the absence of viciousness or flattery." Along with these definitions, Pogodin began imagining a role for Russians within the emerging concept of the Slavic world. Nicholas Riasanovsky has noted that men such as Pogodin believed Russia had escaped the tyranny and oppression that had befallen other Slav nations and "had proceeded to construct, in spite of all obstacles, the mightiest state in the world."[152] It was thus only natural, Slavophiles such as Pogodin argued, that Russia should play the central role in leading the Slavic world.

The government itself would help with some of the emergent definitions. In 1833, around the time of Venelin's Bulgarian journey, Uvarov, Russia's Minister of People's Enlightenment made one of the most enduring attempts to define the base on which Russian identity existed: Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality. Uvarov felt this trilogy was necessary "in the midst of the rapid collapse in Europe of religious and civil institutions…it was necessary to establish our fatherland on firm foundations upon which is based the well-being, strength, and life of a people; it was necessary to find the principles which form the distinctive character of Russia."[153] The last of Uvarov's three principles remained especially ill-defined, but did indicate the new criteria according to which the empire would measure its peoples.[154]

While many Russians objected vigorously to this attempt at defining their identity, many others ultimately subscribed to it, and it cast a long

---

[152]Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1959), p. 147.
[153] Quoted in Riasanovsky, p. 74.
[154] Burbank and von Hagen, p. 25.

shadow over nineteenth century Russian identity discourse. Indeed, Pogodin's ideas co- existed (with certain difficulties) alongside Uvarov's Official Nationality, particularly as Pogodin moved increasingly towards Pan-Slavism. Ultimately a Slavophile wing of Official Nationality split from the dynastic and Empire- oriented branch, a chasm that would widen over the course of Nicholas's reign. Nicholas, neither a Slavophile nor a Pan-Slavist, wrote that "under the guise of a sympathy for the Slavic tribes supposedly oppressed in other states, there is hidden the criminal thought of a union with these tribes, in spite of the fact that they are subjects of neighbouring and in part allied states. And they are expected to attain this goal not through the will of God, but by means of rebellious outbreaks to the detriment and destruction of Russia herself."[155] Despite the controversy surrounding it, the shadow of Uvarov's three pillars of the state may have stretched as far as the Balkans. The concept of Autocracy could not carry the same meaning as in Russia: except for tiny Montenegro, and later Greece, all the peoples of the Balkans were under Turkish domination and could not choose their model of governance. Yet, the combination of Orthodoxy and Nationality would be crucial to the way Russians identified with the South Slavs. Thus, paradoxically, it would be in the distant Balkans, perceived by some of the travellers to be a microscopic version of their own homeland, that part of Uvarov's trilogy, the pillars of nationality and Orthodoxy, could serve as a lens through which the bonds of brotherhood could be discerned.

The earliest Russian travellers had little knowledge of the region to which they travelled and were thus faced with the task of attempting to understand and categorise the environment in which they found themselves. It was not religion alone that mattered, as Russian travellers over time came to exclude Romanians and Greeks from being "*nashi*" (ours, as in our people). Furthermore, being Slavic was not enough to qualify for favour in the eyes of Russian travellers: those, such as Bantysh-Kamenskii, who travelled through Poland had scathing remarks to make about this people whom they did not regard as their brothers in any way. It was only when Orthodoxy was

[155] For more on the uneasy relationship between Nicholas, Russian Slavism and thinkers such as Pogodin and Ivan Aksakov, see Riasanovsky, pp 163-165.

combined with Slavic nationality that the travellers seemed to identify "brotherhood." Most of the Orthodox Slavs resided in the Muslim Ottoman Empire, and thus were also often the most receptive to Russian overtures of aid. This concept of brotherhood remained vague, however, until after the Crimean War, when it would become much more carefully defined and exploited.

Even though Venelin brought back little from his travels in the way of tangible material, he felt strongly that his trip had been a fruitful one.[156] Although he was the first such Russian scholar travelling in Bulgaria, he believed that should certainly not be the last, and he consequently called for the opening of a new field of study of Bulgaria in Russia.[157] Whilst Turgenev and Kaisarov had taken their inspiration to travel from German scholars, Venelin looked to France as an example of the importance of academic travel. Making his case to the academy, he cited the numerous French scholars who travelled with Napoleon during his expedition to Egypt.[158] By taking a large group of scholars with him on his expedition, Napoleon had certainly set a precedent. The inclusion of men of letters ranging from poets to cartographers produced a diverse wealth of knowledge that would dominate the West's perception of Egypt for decades to come. From the expedition came the first modern map of Egypt, as well as the discovery of the Rosetta Stone.[159] Furthermore, the luxurious conditions in which the scholars were accommodated also represented a remarkable degree of respect for scholarship on the part of the French authorities.[160] Of course, the conditions reflected the recognition on the part of the French that the scholars were useful. While the scholars claimed their goal was "to make Egypt known not only to the Frenchmen who happen to be here now, but also to France and to all Europe," Napoleon's goal was to turn Egypt into a profitable colony. This

[156] Bessenov, p.36.
[157] Bessenov, p. 38.
[158] Venelin, p. 122.
[159] J. Christopher Herold, *Bonaparte in Egypt* (Barnsley: Pen and Sword Books Limited, 1962), p. 175.
[160] Herold, p.170. The scholars were certainly well-housed, occupying in a complex of buildings and gardens based around the palace of Qassim Bey in the suburb of Nasriya. The scholars converted what had been Qassim's harem quarters into their meeting area. One of the scholars noted that in Egypt he worked in conditions that "seem to offer us more comfort and at least as much luxury as can be found in the Louvre."

could only be done by first determining what resources the region possessed and where they were located, work which could be, and was, done by scholarly travellers.[161] It seems the French scholars assumed that their work would also impress the local population, who could learn and better themselves by observing their superior, European, model.[162] The French example was certainly known in Russia: when the first edition of Vivant Denon's *Voyage dans la Basse et la Haute-Egypte pendant les campagnes du General Bonaparte* was published in Paris in 1802, costing at the time roughly the same sum as a longcase clock or a Broadwood piano,[163] some of the first people to purchase copies were Russian crown princes.[164] Venelin was clearly also inspired by Napoleon's example. In one of his letters, he argues that, like the French in Egypt, the Russians, and Russian academics in particular, must take an active role in drafting Bulgaria's glorious future. At a time when West Europeans were referring to countries like Greece and Egypt as "antique lands" and looking to them for the origins of their own civilisation, so too, Venelin argued, was Bulgaria for Russia.[165] Russian scholars had to travel to Bulgaria to collect items of national importance and compile them together for their own preservation, as well as for the Bulgarian people. For Venelin, Russians must be not only the protectors of Bulgarians, but also their educators.[166]

Despite his enthusiasm and groundbreaking approach to both ethnography and history, Venelin never managed to break into the respected mainstream of Russian academia. Although some defended him for his originality, his theories, in particular that of the Slavic origins of the Bulgarians, never gained acceptance, and he always remained slightly on the fringes of the field. Yet regardless of Venelin's reputation as an ultimately mediocre scholar and a volatile personality, the Russian government heeded his advice: shortly prior to his travels, Slavic Studies was made mandatory in

[161] Herold, p. 176.
[162] Herold, p. 172.
[163] Terence Russell, *The Discovery of Egypt* (Phoenix Mill, Sutton Press, 2005), p. 256
[164] Russell, p. 254.
[165] For more on West European travel to "antique lands", see Leask, pp. 1-2.
[166] Bessenov, pp 39-40.

Russian universities.[167] However, Venelin's findings only revealed the extent to which reliable information on the region was lacking. To improve the quality of knowledge of the Slav lands, the government funded one student from each university to travel abroad for several years in order to gain proficiency in the various Slav languages and an improved understanding of the region's history. The first of these travellers was Osip Bodianskii from Moscow University, but he was soon followed by Petr Preis from St Petersburg University and Ismail Sreznevskii from Kharkov University, who spent much of their time travelling together. The last of the four was Viktor Grigorovich from Kazan University.[168]

These students were subject, however, to certain rules. Here again, the spirit of Schlözer's educational advice is felt. The students were required to keep a diary and to bring back books and manuscripts to contribute to the improvement of the Slavic Studies holdings in Russian libraries. Their task was not to travel for the enjoyment of it, but with the specific purpose of extracting "relevant" knowledge of the Slav lands that could be later used at home. The result of this organized and government orchestrated travel to the South Slav lands was that it meant that those being sent there came from a very particular slice of Russian society: the

---

[167] Several attempts had been made to introduce Slavic Studies in Russia. This first department had opened at the University of Moscow in 1811, under the leadership of M.G. Gavrilov, with great aspirations. According to the minister of People's Enlightenment, A.K. Razumovskii, the department was to teach "Slavic-Russian studies in order to show students "Slavic books, and demonstrate the relationship between the Russian language and the Slavic tongues." It should be noted that "Slavic language" at this time referred to Old Church Slavonic, as the divisions of the contemporary Slav tongues into East, South and West Slavonic languages had yet to be created. The courses offered in the first decade after the department's creation were limited, and tended to focus on Russian history and language. A lack of expertise prevented the majority of Slavic languages from being offered, a lack of knowledgeable professors to read lectures, and the limited library resources hindered instruction as well. In 1826, major reforms were undertaken in an effort to improve the Empire's educational system. As part of this, Shishkov, the Minister of People's Enlightenment, Slavic Studies was an essential subject that should be offered in all Russian universities. However, at that time, Russia lacked sufficient specialists in the field to extend the subject beyond Moscow University. At first the government hoped to invite scholars from abroad, in particular from the Czech lands, but this effort failed, and the programme seemingly stalled for some years. Yet, this period was not completely unproductive. Intellectuals from both the South and West Slav lands, including Ljudevit Gaj and Vuk Karadžić, travelled to Russia to give talks at the Russian Academy of Sciences about their nations and languages. For more on the history of the instruction of Slavic Studies in the Russian Empire, see Lapteva, pp.54-68.

[168] Baitsura has directly credited the influence of Venelin for inspiring the voyages of Bodianskii, Sreznevskii, Preis, and Grigorovich. See Baitsura, p. 13.

travelers were young and academically focused. They had been instructed to pay particular attention to the local Slavic inhabitants, and to keep records, not only of their language, but also of their customs and habits. Furthermore, many of them had received preparatory training for the trip in Moscow,[169] under the guidance of more experienced professors like Mikhail Pogodin, whose suggestions profoundly shaped the students' itinerary.

Bodianskii's travelogue was never published, and Preis died shortly after returning to Russia, and thus was never able to complete his. Grigorovich's work is a very technical document, while Sreznevskii's is a fascinating and intricate piece including drawings he made along the way. Unfortunately, with the exception of Grigorovich none of these travellers made it to Bulgaria or the Kingdom of Serbia. Interestingly, and difficult to explain is the near-total gap in travelogues written on Serbia and Bulgaria between 1840-1860. Although some works were still published, the focus of Russian travellers shifted to tiny Montenegro, or in the case of Aleksandr Gil'ferding, to Bosnia. It is hard to find a logical explanation of why this was the case. Yet, as we shall see, when travel to Serbia and Bulgaria did resume in the 1860s, it took a much clearer form than it had in its earlier years. Yet even as the travel literature became a more established genre with its own uniquely Russian lines of discourse, it never fully abandoned the fundamentally European origins outlined in this chapter.

[169] Even those student travellers who were not from Moscow University received their preparation for their travels in Moscow. For example, Grigorovich, who travelled extensively in the South Slav lands first travelled from Kazan, where he was based, to Moscow where he spent almost a year preparing for his travels and receiving advice from both Pogodin and Bodianski, who had just returned from his travels. Unfortunately, Preis, the student from St. Petersburg, who might have had a different outlook, and who would have had less exposure to Slavophile ideas, died shortly after returning to Russia, and without properly completely the notes from his journey.

Chapter Two: Montenegro: the Slavic Sparta

From the 1840s onwards there was a large increase in the number of Russian scholars travelling to the South Slav lands. Part of the reason for the increased numbers was simply that there were more specialists in the field: more students were studying South Slav languages, literature and history, and more were interested in improving their knowledge of these topics through travel. Furthermore, government and Academy funding remained available for such excursions. While the travellers examined in the first chapter at times faced difficulty in gaining access to certain regions, such as Bosnia, Southern Serbia and Bulgaria, this was not so much a problem for travellers from the 1840s onwards. By this time, infrastructure had improved, however marginally, through the region and travellers became more adventuresome in their efforts to out-do one another. The combination of increased numbers of scholars and increased access to different regions means that there is a wealth of material from this period. Furthermore, travelogues from this time tended to be more sophisticated than their predecessors. Whereas early travellers were attempting to identify which peoples of the Balkans were Slavs and which were not, the travellers from the mid nineteenth century were already well aware of such distinctions. Many of them travelled already knowing the local languages, at least to some extent, and having read the travelogues of previous travellers.[170] In Montenegro, they also partly gained understanding of the categories they sought based on the local leadership's vision of itself, as certain locals appear to have deliberately cultivated an image of their homeland for the Russians. The travelogues themselves were hugely influential, and some, such as the work of Pavel Rovinskii, have been credited with forming the basis of Russian knowledge of Montenegro, and for indicating the direction of study for future generations of scholars to follow.[171]

---

[170] Several of the travellers cite the works of earlier Russian travellers in their own texts, indicating that they were in fact well aware of each others' work. Makushev cites the works of Sreznevskii in his travelogue: Vikentii Makushev, *Zadunaiskie i adriaticheskie slaviane* (The Danubian and Adriatic Slavs), St. Petersburg, 1867, p. 116. Meanwhile, Kovalevskii cites the works of Bronievskii in his travelogue: Egor Kovalevskii, *Chetyre mesiatsa v Chernogorii* (Four months in Montenegro), St. Petersburg, 1841, p. 5.

[171] In her book *Rossiia i Chernogoriia* (Russia and Montenegro) (Moscow, 1993), Russian scholar and Academy of Science member N.I. Khitrova credited the ethnographic observations of Rovinskii for providing the Russian public with "truthful information about the lives and customs of the Montenegrin people and their heroic past…until the end of his life, he interrelated his scientific interests with that small Slavic country." While much had already been reported on political events in the country, it was the warm and personal observations Rovinskii made on everyday life in Montenegro that helped make Russians more sympathetic to the smaller country. See pp. 97-101.

In their travels, the Russians were participating in a pan-European trend, as the Balkans were rapidly becoming a popular destination both for Western travellers, especially those from France and England, as well as for Habsburg Slavs, such as Czechs. Travel writers, such as Sir Garner Wilkinson and the Viscountess Strangford provided home audiences with informative descriptions of their encounters with the Balkan Other, and were often instrumental in introducing parts of the region into public discourse.[172] The Russians, however, did not neatly adhere to this model. Although they travelled in "European Turkey," they, in contrast to many Western travellers, rarely interacted with the "Turkish" population, nor did any of them make significant efforts to learn Turkish. Little attention was paid to the Muslims' religion, culture, architecture, social or political life. Russians rarely even encountered Muslims. Instead, their negative views of this population were mainly constructed by second-hand accounts given to them by the local Slavic Christians, who conveyed their dislike of the "ruling occupiers" to the travellers.[173] Thus, the Russian travelogues give the impression that the traveller is visiting a people who represent his brothers "by blood and faith." The similarities between Russian culture and that of the locals is often repeated, and then contrasted to the different habits of the Muslims, who represent an omnipresent, yet absent, Other.

While neglecting the Muslims in their narratives, the Russians took interest in the local Slav populations, which they sought to study in detail, and by which some became fascinated. Perhaps one of the most significant and exceptional examples is they way in which many travellers chose to highlight the particularity of tiny Montenegro, which, especially in the 1840s, was often cited as an example of a model Slavic state. Interestingly, several of the Russian travellers described the region using philo-hellenic terms similar to the ones employed by the English and the French to describe Greece. After only three days in the region, Vladimir Bronievskii wrote

---

[172] Montenegro in particular enjoyed considerable popularity in Western travel literature from the mid- nineteenth century onwards. By the turn of the century, a growing body of scholarly works had appeared, examining the country's history and role in Europe. Among them, Francis Seymour Stevenson's *A History of Montenegro* (London: Jarrold and Sons, 1914), examined specifically the role Russia had played in the region in his chapter on the Eastern Crisis (pp.162-188). In French P. Coquelle sought to trace the history of the region in his massive work *Histoire du Monténégro et de la Bosnie depuis les origins* (Paris, 1895), following in the footsteps of his fellow countryman, G. Filley, whose work, *Le Monténégro contemporain* (Paris, 1876), had appeared in the middle of the country's struggle for independence. Several of these works were republished in translation over a century later, as Montenegro once again moved towards independence and sought to carve out a separate history, independent from that of Serbia. Coquelle's book was republished in Montenegro in 1998, while Frilley and Stevenson's works appeared in 2001.

[173] Such a description is misleading, as the ruling elite was generally of Slavic origin as well, but Muslim. Yet the Russians claim the local Orthodox Slavs saw them as "Turks."

"Montenegro reminds me of happy Sparta."[174] Vikentii Makushev also deemed the tiny nation to be "the Slavic Sparta" based on what he saw as the country's fierce attachment to its freedom, combined with militarism. Yet Russian affection for Montenegro cannot be seen as purely a Russian variant on Western philhellenism, as there are significant differences between the two. French and English philhellenists were attracted to Greece's past glories, and in their quest for ancient history, they often completely ignored the region's contemporary inhabitants. The Russians however, saw the contemporary history, particularly of Montenegro, as being at least as glorious as its past, and were drawn to the modern-day inhabitants of the region, whom they identified as their brothers.

This "brotherhood" is presented in many of the texts as an inherent and eternal truth. Yet, as the previous chapters have demonstrated, ties between Russia and the South Slavs were scarce prior to the nineteenth century. What caused this shift in such a short period of time? It appears that the emergence of this notion of brotherhood and of Montenegro as an ideal Slavic state reflects more a shift in the intellectual and political atmosphere in Russia than in Montenegrin reality. As this chapter demonstrates, the texts on Montenegro can be read as a mirrored reflection of certain aspects of the debates occurring during Nicholas I's reign, funnelled into the microcosm of a tiny and idealised Balkan nation.

As Richard Wortman has aptly observed, Nicholas brought an entirely new imperial "scenario of power" with him. Nicholas was an autocrat who saw autocracy as having created Russia and as being the "necessary condition of the existence of the Empire."[175] He ruled often by personal consent, involving himself in all aspects of the government, and saw the happiness of his people as having been entrusted to him by God.[176] As Tsar, Nicholas played a significant role in the lives of his subjects -- after 1848 all travel abroad required his personal written consent.[177] He was a non-secularist who, like his close advisor Sergei Uvarov, thought that only Orthodoxy could "guarantee social and family happiness."[178] During his reign, Nicholas became fascinated by history and spent large sums both on enhancing the country's history departments, but also by erecting structures to recall Russia's Orthodox and Byzantine

---

[174] Vladimir Bronievskii, *Zapiski morskago ofitsira* (Notes of a Naval Officer) (St. Petersburg, 1825), p. 274.

[175] Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), p.144.
[176] Wortman, p. 146.
[177] Wortman, p. 162.
[178] Wortman, p. 144.

heritage, which he felt was "intimately linked with elements of our nationality."[179] Unlike his recent more cosmopolitan predecessors, "Nicholas saw himself as first of all a Russian." Although he had spent far more time in the West than either Paul I or Alexander I, Nicholas "knew precisely on which side of the Western European-Russian frontier he stood." Throughout his reign, he encouraged efforts to strengthen and widen that frontier, both spiritually and intellectually.[180]

The divine duty to rule that Nicholas felt had been bestowed on him had military as well as political and spiritual dimensions. Nicholas was also a strict disciplinarian, who, according to Wortman, sought to "make himself an example of superhuman achievement, a living reproach to all mortal weakness."[181] Enchanted by the army since his early teens, Nicholas's favourite role was as supreme commander of the empire. He invested heavily in the Russian military, which he saw as symbolising Russian discipline and strength, and it was "at large-scale military reviews that Nicholas I experienced rapture, almost ecstasy, that he felt a violent swelling of his emotions and sensed the proximity of God."[182]

Nicholas and his Minister of Education, Count Uvarov, sought to control the nature of the discourse within educated society, and the secret police – the Third Department headed by Count Benckendorff – attempted to stifle dissent. However, the split within the ranks of the elite which had opened in the aftermath of the Decembrist Uprising of 1825 was not healed. Indeed, it would be precisely during the reign of the 'Iron Tsar' that an explosion of philosophical enquiry occurred. University lecture halls might be infiltrated by police informers and correspondence intercepted and read, but in aristocratic salons and student circles (*kruzhki*) free-wheeling discussion of forbidden topics could take place. Such was the milieu in which one such topic – Russia's nature and destiny – would provoke the ire of the authorities. The leading figure in articulating an interpretation at odds with Count Uvarov's trilogy was Petr Chaadaev. Although his ideas had provoked lively debate within the salons and *kruzhki*, it was their publication as "Philosophical Letters" (in French!!) in the journal *Teleskop* that stirred official fury. *Teleskop* was ordered

---

[179] Wortman, p. 156.
[180] W. Bruce Lincoln, *Nicholas I, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), pp. 70-71. Nicholas had been in Western Europe for the end of the campaign against Napoleon in 1814-1815. He had also spent considerable time in both England and Germany, having lived in Prussia for over a year in 1820-1821.
[181] Lincoln, p. 142.
[182] Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1959), p. 9.

closed and Chaadaev declared insane.

However, the arguments bruited in this 'letter' would cast a long shadow: as Geoffrey Hosking has succinctly observed, Chaadaev had touched a raw nerve by "asserting that Russia was a cultural nonentity suspended uneasily between the civilizations of Europe and Asia,[but] it had not borrowed culturally anything fruitful from either of them." Hosking concludes that Chaadaev's "challenge posed the most important question Russian intellectuals had to face for decades to come".[183] During the 1840s this nascent intelligentsia would split over the issue, with Slavophiles and Westernizers offering competing visions of Russia's 'true' nature and prospects. Not surprisingly, neither vision would meet with the approval of the emperor and his associates. Thus, paradoxically, although Nicholas' reign is sometimes characterized as representing the "apogee of autocracy" it could also be viewed as "a time of outward slavery and inner emancipation." Such was the impression conveyed in the memoirs of the leading Westernizer Aleksandr Herzen, which vividly evoke the intellectual excitement of the salon and the circle.[184]

It thus cannot be argued that the Russians who travelled to the Balkans at this time had any particular fixed agenda derived from Nicholas. However, some were funded by the government through the Academy of Sciences, while others travelled in government service. While not all make mention of Nicholas, or even of Russia, they do reflect the intellectual trends circulating in Russia, and embodied by the Tsar's "scenario of power." Unlike earlier European educated travellers, such as Turgenev and Kaisarov, the men who travelled to Montenegro in the 1830s and 1840s were men of Nicholas's Russia, and their descriptions of Montenegro highlight and praise aspects of Montenegrin society which were prominent in their own society: a personalised, autocratic, non- secular state, where power was concentrated in the hands of one man. As with Nicholas's scenario, the travellers emphasised Montenegro's Spartan-like military training and prowess and the male population's seemingly superhuman physical strength. The Tsar would surely have approved of such displays of men triumphing over mortal weakness. The travellers' descriptions of Montenegro thus provide us with invaluable insights into the values and morals of such men, refracted through their perspectives on Montenegrin society.

---

[183] Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia and the Russians: A History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 274-275.
[184] Sidney Monas, *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 1.

Imagined Brotherhood

As was the case in Russian travel writings about other South Slav lands, many of the Russian travellers portrayed Russian - Montenegrin relations as constituting a long history of brotherly support. The reality was much more complex. Although the two countries did in fact share a history of fighting against adversaries in the nineteenth century, it appears that several of the Russian travellers discussed here exaggerated the reality of these ties. As previously noted, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, very few in Russia had any knowledge of the abroad Slavs, and misconceptions were quite common. In the case of Egor Kovalevskii, part of the reason he was sent to the region, at the expense of the Russian government, was precisely because the region was so little known, and the government wished to know whether it possessed any resources that could be of use to Russia.[185] Moreover, the lack of contemporary Russian primary sources suggests that the mid-nineteenth-century travellers were not putting events completely into context. The reality of Russian-Montenegrin relations was far less flattering. There is no evidence of Russian contacts with Montenegro prior to the reign of Danilo, which began in 1697. An extremely ambitious leader, Danilo initially concentrated his energy on consolidating his position and stabilising the country, which had been devastated by the Morean War (1684-1699). Danilo was determined to assert Montenegrin independence from the Porte, and realised that this could only be achieved with foreign support. He initially turned to Venice, Montenegro's traditional source of support against the Ottomans. Although the Venetian *provveditore* of Dalmatia did invite the Montenegrin clan leaders to meet with him, he failed to meet their demands for support, and Danilo decided that he would have to seek new sponsors if his state were to survive.[186]

It was at this point that Danilo turned to Russia for aid, citing the two countries' shared religion. Russia's early response to Danilo's overtures was characteristic of the nature of Russian- Montenegrin relations until the mid- nineteenth century: the Russians made vaguely enthusiastic promises, but ultimately followed a

[185] B. A. Val'skaia, *Puteshestviia Egora Petrovicha Kovalevskovo* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo geograficheskoi literaturi, 1956), p. 22. Kovalevskii was given 16,000 rubles by the government to cover the expense of his first trip to Montenegro. He was instructed to study the geography of the region, particularly to investigate the claims that there was gold to be found in the region of Zlatica. His plans were, however, made difficult by the Prince's claims that the region was too unsafe to risk extensive travelling in. The area was close to the border with the Turks, and was a frequent target of Turkish raids.
[186] N. I. Khitrova, *Chernogoriia v natsional'no-osvoboditel'nom dvizhenii na Balkanakh* (Montenegro in the national-liberation movement in the Balkans) (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo nauka, 1979), p. 59.

hard-headed foreign policy, which resulted in little concrete aid being provided to Montenegro. In this way, Russian relations with Montenegro were similar to their dealings with the Greeks: in both cases Russia promised more than it delivered. Nonetheless, whereas the Greeks tired of endless empty promises, the Montenegrins persisted in pursuing friendship with Russia, after being rebuffed by Venice and Austria.

Russian knowledge of and relations with Montenegro in the eighteenth century were problematical. The first contact between Russians and Montenegrins appears to have been during the reign of Peter the Great, who sent young men abroad to study the navies of foreign powers, including Venice. Some of these Russians travelled to the bay of Kotor, where they came into contact with Montenegrins. Amazed, one of the Russians reported, "although very far from the Motherland, there live a people with our same faith…brave and loyal."[187] Yet, despite such initially positive contacts, relations developed very slowly. Danilo travelled to Russia in 1714 in an effort to gather support for his cause. He was warmly welcomed, presented with numerous medals to honour his bravery, and given the funds to rebuild the Cetinje monastery, which had been destroyed by the Turks. However, the Russians denied him the political and military support he needed, and thus his trip produced few tangible results.[188] His successors were no luckier. Empress Elizabeth determined that more detailed information was needed and sent an envoy to the region. Thereafter, Russia would exercise an increasing influence over the region.[189] The report of her envoy, Colonel Puchkov, was far from flattering: "the people are wild; they live in disorder; heads roll for the least offence; the clergy are grasping; the churches are deserted; Russian assistance is distributed among the Bishop's cousins."[190] Catherine II issued warnings: "we advise the principal chiefs…to live together with their neighbours in peace, tranquillity and unity and as far as possible to eliminate all cause for discord, hate or warfare."[191] Thus, although the Montenegrins spent much of the eighteenth century making appeals to Russia for aid, there is little evidence to support the notion that there was a reciprocal relationship, and indeed the Montenegrins received very little for their efforts. Still, by the time the travellers under study here made their way to Montenegro, much of this history was being rewritten, not just by the Russians, but

[187] Quoted in Elizabeth Roberts, *Realm of the Black Mountain: A History of Montenegro* (London: Hurst and Company, 2007), p. 141.
[188] Roberts, p. 142.
[189] Seymour Stevenson, p. 141.
[190] Roberts, p. 151.
[191] Roberts, p. 154.

by the Montenegrins as well. Njegoš, ever the wily ruler, was quick to acknowledge Russia as able and potentially willing to play a significant role in his country's future, and he endeavoured to ensure that they received appropriate indications of the two countries' allegedly shared past.[192]

This situation changed, however, during the Napoleonic Wars, which brought Russian naval officers into the Adriatic, aligned with Montenegro. Some of the earliest Russian writing on Montenegro dates from this period, which proved a watershed in Russian-Montenegrin relations.[193] By the later years of Alexander I's reign, and especially by the 1830s and 40s, Montenegro became a popular destination for Russian scholarly travellers. The men who ventured to Montenegro at this time were a motley crew. Two were state employees in some capacity. Vladimir Bronievskii, of Polish descent, had been educated in a military academy before becoming a naval officer. He was stationed in the Adriatic, where he distinguished himself at the Battle of Tenedos against the Ottomans in 1807, and travelled home by land via Montenegro and Dalmatia. He later became an instructor at a military academy in Russia. Egor Kovalevskii was an engineer who travelled to the Balkans at the request of the government. He later served in the Asiatic Department of the Foreign Ministry.[194] Other travellers were future or recently established academics.

---

[192] Much has been written on Russian activity in Montenegro during this period. Soviet scholars A.P. Bazhova and I.S. Dostian argued that Russia played a significant role in helping establish and solidify the Montenegrin state by providing it with diplomatic protection, as well as material support. For more on their views, see Dostian, *Rossiia i Balkanskii vopros* (Russia and the Balkan question) (Moscow, 1972). Scholars from the former Yugoslavia have likewise studied this period closely. See P. Popović, *Crna Gora u doba Petra I i Petra II* (Montenegro in the reign of Peter the First and Peter the Second) (Belgrade, 1951). See in particular pp. 14-20. See also B. Pavićević, *Stvaranje crnogorske države* (The Creation of the Montenegrin state) (Belgrade, 1955); T. Nikćević, *Političke struje u Crnoj Gori u procesu stvaranje države u XIX vijeku* (Political building in Montenegro in the process of state building in the nineteenth century) (Cetinje, 1958); Vladan Đorđević, *Crna Gora i Rusija* (Montenegro and Russia) (Belgrade, 1914). This last work looks exclusively at Russian-Montenegrin relations between 1784-1814 and cooperation between the two peoples in the Napoleonic Wars. Interestingly, many of the works mentioned here cite the travellers mentioned in this chapter as sources: Đorđević cites Rovinskii on p. 21. Khitrova's 1979 work cites Rovinskii on pp. 54-55, and 61-6, while she also cites Popov on p. 60 and Bronievskii, p. 61.

[193] For more on Russia's activity in the region during this period, and on the cementing of Montenegrin-Russian relations, see N.I. Khitrova, "Iz istoriia russo-chernogorskih otnoshenii v nachale XIX v." (From the History of Russo-Montenegrin relations at the beginning of the nineteenth century) and Vinko Foretić's "Rusko-crnogorski rat s Francuskom, 1806-1807 godine" (The Russian-Montenegrin war with the French, 1806-1807) both in *Jugoslovenske zemlje i Rusija za vreme prvog srpskog ustanka, 1804-1813* (The South Slav lands and Russia at the time of the First Serbian uprising, 1804-1813) (Serbian Academy of Science and Art: Belgrade, 1983), Khitrova, pp. 307-326; Foretić, pp. 327-337.

[194] Kovalevskii was a keen travel writer, and one of the best travelled Russians of his time. In addition to his works on Montenegro, he also wrote several volumes on his travels through East

Ismail Sreznevskii and Petr Preis were both government funded young scholars seeking to improve their knowledge of the abroad Slav lands with the aim of returning to teach in the newly formed Slavic Studies departments in Russian universities. Vikentii Makushev was of a younger generation, who sought to follow in the footsteps of Sreznevskii.[195] Pavel Rovinskii and Alexander Popov were Russian trained historians interested in ethnography, both of whom spent considerable amounts of time travelling in Montenegro, describing the local traditions in their travelogues, and later in their academic texts. Ivan Aksakov, meanwhile, was a leading figure in the Slavophile movement, as well as a widely-read writer. In spite of their differences, many of the travellers examined here came from relatively conservative backgrounds, and were predominantly associated with the conservative Russian nationalism that was becoming increasingly virulent at the time.

Despite their different goals and origins, much of the travellers' works on Montenegro is strikingly similar. Their descriptions of the land, its inhabitants, their customs, and the locals' interpersonal and familial relations have much in common, with some of the same phrases regularly recurring. The travelogues also share an overwhelmingly positive representation of the local population, combined with a seeming reluctance to identify or criticise any aspects of Montenegrin culture that might be different from their home culture. While much of travel writing sought to exploit difference, these travelogues deliberately highlight the positive and the similar. Yet the works are not clones of each other, and the styles of writing vary enormously: Kovalevskii and Sreznevskii both had a fluid style that reads easily, and Sreznevskii even included illustrations of some of the places he visited. Bronievskii's prose is less florid. Makushev tends towards the pompous, while the works of Rovinskii and Popov are drier and more academic. Some men chose to emphasise certain aspects of the region over others, yet contradictions are few. Why do the texts mirror each other so closely? Although part of the explanation could lie in plagiarism, this explanation is really only plausible in the case of Makushev, who travelled slightly later than the others. Rather it seems that the similarities were more a reflection of attitudes back in Russia.

Excluding Makushev and some of Rovinskii's lectures, almost all travel works examined here were published in the 1840s, prior to the 1848 uprisings in

---

Africa, describing his voyage down the Nile and into what is today Kenya. Later his attention turned to China and Central Asia and he wrote another travelogue on his adventures there.

[195] Prior to travelling, Makushev read both Sreznevskii's travelogue and Preis's notes on their journey. Makushev, p.116.

Western Europe. Nicholas's reign was characterized by increasing conservatism, and by the 1840s, the government had turned positively reactionary, exercising censorship and other controls over society. Yet this conservatism had cultural as well as political manifestations. In conservative circles, there was a growing feeling that Russia, fortified by a strong autocracy, was indeed different from Western Europe. Travel reports on regions such as Montenegro provided Russian readers with a conservative alternative to the West, and foreshadowed the discourses of difference that would only increase as the Balkans moved ever more into a central position in Russian political and cultural life. The events of 1848-1849 heightened the atmosphere of mistrust, and convinced Nicholas that Europe was indeed corrupt and infirm, and that religion and autocracy were vital in preventing Russia from following such a path.[196] W. Bruce Lincoln has called this period the "apogee of autocracy."[197] This was a time of asserted "Russianness," with the results of 1848 only confirming the need for such a course. The writers in this chapter appear to have prepared this path, albeit not without contradictions, as we shall see. Of course, it must be noted that censorship prevented them from venturing too far from the official line.

This was a time when Russia's identity was still fluid. Russians were in the process of improving their knowledge of the abroad Slavs, and in Montenegro, they believed they had found an example of a model Slavic state, one in many ways superior to their own in that it had "preserved" supposedly ancient Slav traditions. However, this was a time when many of these traditions were being invented, and history in many cases was being rewritten based on scant sources. Thus the Russian affection for Montenegro in many ways anticipated trends that were becoming increasingly popular in Russia at the time, and which could also be found, according to some of the travellers, in Montenegro. Many of these travellers were of Russia's intellectual avant- garde. The supposed "Slavic ideals" they saw in Montenegro at times feature characteristics which were only just entering into Russian intellectual discourse, but which would increase in popularity, partly thanks to the visibility that travelogues afforded them.

Montenegrin Theocracy

[196] Wortman, p. 162.
[197] Lincoln, p. 151.

One example of "Slavic ideals" in practice could be found in Montenegro's political culture. In Montenegro, the travellers were able to witness a vision of power that they believed to be similar to that presented by their own ruler, but more widespread and authentic. In fact, some have described its Vladika of the time, Petar Petrović-Njegoš, as Europe's last theocratic ruler. As both head of the church and state, he held most of his government's power concentrated in his hands. His approach to governing was a highly personalised one, and he involved himself closely in every aspect of his citizens' lives.[198] Furthermore, Njegoš made a clear link between Orthodoxy and being Montenegrin. In his epic, fictionalized telling of his country's history, Njegoš wrote at length about the conversion of certain tribes to Islam, and how his ancestor, the then ruler Danilo forced such Montenegrins to reconvert or face annihilation. Njegoš's logic is clear: Montenegrins are Orthodox, to be otherwise is to be a traitor in his eyes.[199] The church was thus inseparable not only from the state, but from Montenegrin identity, a notion that found much approval among the travellers.

Above all, the image of Montenegrin politics presented by the travelogues suggests that the tiny Balkan nation was a highly personalized state, with many decisions decided by the personal views of the King and members of his family. As there was no separation between Church and State, there was also little separation of powers within the government, with everything being controlled by the same family. Kovalevskii described the Montenegrin monarch as being "patriarchal in character,"[200] while Sreznevskii presented Montenegro as a patriarchal state where the Montenegrins all "love their leader" who in turn loved all of his countrymen equally. Generally, Petar seemed to leave the Russians with a good impression. Sreznevskii was amazed to find the leader dressed in traditional Montenegrin attire, and described him as gigantic, good- looking, young, smart, and amiable. Petar had some degree of sophistication: he spoke Russian, French, Italian and German. He invited Sreznevskii and Preis for dinner, which led to lengthy debates and ample consumption of alcohol. Petar gave the Russians a tour of his palace, and Sreznevskii marvelled at the collection of guns taken from Turks, which were displayed on a wall, alongside portraits of Petar's heroes, including Karađorđe and Tsar Nicholas.[201] Kovalevskii was equally impressed by Petar, describing him as "the image of male handsomeness." and

---

[198] Khitrova, (1979), op cit. p. 69.
[199] For more on Njegoš's views as spelled out in his work *The Mountain Wreath*, see Zdenko Zlatar, *Njegoš's Montenegro* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2005), pp.140-144.
[200] Kovalevskii, p. 14.
[201] Sreznevskii, p. 229.

writing that he should become a model for artists.[202] Kovalevskii described Petar as having a "flame of love for his homeland and its glory,"[203] while his passion was the study of foreign languages and literature. Petar was, furthermore, an exceptionally kind leader, who would on occasion take off his own shirt and gave it to an impoverished subject.[204] Due to his kindness and generosity, Petar was reputedly loved by his people, which impressed several of the travellers[MSOffice1].[205]

The Vladika, with a certain degree of pomp and ceremony, personally granted Preis and Sresznevskii the right to travel freely in the country, assuring them that, should they ever be unable to find lodging for the night, it would be sufficient merely to knock on the door of any Montenegrin, who would be more than happy to accommodate them in his own house.[206] In the end, Petar decided to accompany them for part of the journey, introducing them to several members of his family along the way. Sreznevskii was equally impressed by the rest of the family. He described the Queen Mother as a "healthy, kind and simple" woman who "looks at her son as if at the sun." Sreznevskii was surprised however that the royal family conversed amongst themselves in French.[207] Makushev had a similar experience: the Vladika planned all of his travel for him.[208] After meeting with Njegoš, Makushev described how he went off to meet "the commander of the Montenegrin army, who was also head of the Senate and the father of the Vladika."[209] Makushev quickly realised that in such a personalised state knowing the Vladika was necessary to accomplish anything, and thus it was thanks to the Vladika that Makushev was presented to important members of Montenegrin society, such as the poet Jovan Sundečić.[210] Makushev became increasingly reliant on the royal family for all of his activities in Montenegro, and

---

[202] Kovalevskii, op. cit. p.17. Kovalevskii became extremely found of the prince. His second trip to Montenegro actually coincided with Petar's death, which Kovalevskii very much regretted and took very hard. Upon returning to Russia from that trip, Kovalevskii wrote the late Prince's biography, which he published in *Sovremennik*. Although both Lavrov and Rovinskii also subsequently wrote biographies of Petar, Kovalevskii's was regarded at the time as being the key work on the subject. For more about Kovalevskii and the death of Petar, see: B. A. Val'skaia, op. cit. p. 38.

[203] Kovalevskii, p. 16.

[204] Kovalevskii, p. 18.

[205] Sreznevskii, p.229. Sreznevskii was so impressed by the positive nature of the relationship between Petar and the people that he wrote "Chernogortsi-molotsy!" (Well done Montenegrins!). Kovalevskii meanwhile noted that the leaders in Montenegro function "in union with the people," p. 6.

[206] Sreznevskii, p. 230.

[207] Makushev, p.138.

[208] Makushev, p. 149.

[209] Makushev, p. 132. Kovalevskii made a similar comment, noting he was going to see "the president of the senate, the cousin of the leader." Kovalevskii, p. 9.

[210] Makushev, p. 134.

carefully observed the family up close.

The interesting merger of church and state intrigued and pleased some of the travellers who witnessed it first hand. Makushev credited the theocracy for saving the country, writing that Montenegro had been directionless until the Petrović-Njegoš family stepped in and made it an autocratic non-secular state. Makushev saw the non-secular nature of the Montenegrin government as being absolutely necessary to the survival of the state, claiming that it was necessary to bring the nation together around the Church in order to have the inner, spiritual strength to defend itself against the Turks. However, it must be noted that many of the Russians' observations on the country's political system were fed to them by their frequent dinner host Njegoš himself.

Many of the travellers felt such a form of government could be applied more effectively in Russia as well. At a time when many West European intellectuals were calling for a complete separation of church and state, certain conservative Russian intellectuals felt that such a course would not be appropriate for their country. Chief among them was Ivan Kireevskii, who argued in 1853 that the church and the state had to work together in Russia: "the job of the state is to put itself in agreement with the church, in order to give itself, as the principle purpose of its existence, the task of penetrating more and more into the spirit of the church.[211] Nostalgic for the Byzantine heritage of his imagination, Kireevskii felt that it was only "by sharing the faith and by submitting to it and by being inspired by it that the state can develop harmoniously and strongly, without destroying the free and legitimate development of individuals, and while remaining, with the spirit of people penetrated by the same faith, in free and stimulating agreement."[212] Kireevskii was not the only one in his group to hold such views, as other Slavophiles agreed in lamenting the way in which, since Peter I, the church had been made a branch of the government. This restricted the church and lessened the degree to which the government could "learn" from the church and merge spiritually into it. Such a degree of unity between the church and the state appeared to have been achieved in Montenegro, making it a model of what some of the travellers imagined a "traditional Slav state" should be like. Furthermore, while the Slavophiles might have accused Nicholas of harnessing the Church, he also extensively cultivated its image, building numerous structures in the supposedly "Byzantine style" which he

[211] Ivan Kireevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochineniie I.V. Kireevskogo* (Moscow, 1861), vol. I, p. 271.
[212] Kireevskii I, p. 280.

saw as being "intimately linked with elements of our nationality." Nicholas used religion to support the legitimacy of his rule, to link Russia to its Byzantine past and to underline the role that religion, combined with autocracy played in creating the Russian Empire.[213]

The complete lack of democracy or independent representative government did not bother such travellers. They saw the Vladika as adequately representing the interests of his people through benevolent rule. Again, in such a way the travellers were appealing to a theme that was growing in popularity within Russia, where Uvarov claimed that Autocracy was essential to ensuring Russia's future, and writers within the Slavophile movement portrayed Western democracy as inherently contrary to Slavic nature. Writing at a slightly later period, and strongly influenced by the abroad Slavs, Ivan Aksakov also had clear views on the pitfalls of democracy, which he saw as an empty mirage of a system. He argued: "what is democracy? …in our lives and in our history it has no meaning. In the West, democracy has been erected as a social construct of the lowest class of society….in other words, it is striving to give political power to the common people…but this is only the theory; in practice, democracy is just the desire of the democrats to take the place of the aristocrats. In reality, democracy is most vulgar…submission to the principle of the state, to the principle of outward and coercive truth.[214] Aksakov saw the West as representing the dangers of such a system, pointing to the example of France as revealing such failings, where "it is in the name of the people that a miserable minority of the country, taking advantage of the title of the representatives of the nation, and relying upon a parliamentary majority of some dozens of votes, contrive to outrage legally the religious beliefs of the real popular majority."[215] Since democracy never really exists, autocracy and unrestricted governmental powers are necessary as they "are part and parcel of every authority in the domain of its function. Without them, authority is no longer authority but a phantom, a fiction."[216]

Although he personally did not accept the merits of democracy, Aksakov acknowledged that "democracy in the West has a justified historical sense. It is the expression of the hostility and struggle between the oppressed conquered peoples and the conqueror aristocrats. All the European countries are founded on conquest."

---

[213] Wortman, pp.155-156.
[214] Ivan Aksakov, *Sochineniia I.S. Aksakova* (Essays of I.S. Aksakov) (Moscow: Tipografiia M.G. Volchaninova, 1886-1887), vol. II, p.87.
[215] Aksakov, vol. I, pp 403-405.
[216] Ibid., vol. V, p.13.

Russia and the Slav lands, however, had a very different history as they had always been founded on consensus rather than conflict. Therefore, Aksakov reasoned democracy "has no place in our life and history."[217] The Slav lands were meant for autocracy, as only that system could provide the people with the freedom they deserved. This autocracy, Aksakov argued, was superior to Western democracy, or rather, he writes "the Slavic races have completely democratic aspirations, in the true sense of that word, not in the revolutionary sense of the theories so fashionable in Europe."[218] Russia, Aksakov argued, had only two relevant bases in its structure- the Tsar and his people. From this, Aksakov imagined a system of governance by writing "the Russian ideal which is more or less common to all the Slav races, is that of local self government[219] without political powers, supported and crowned by a central and supreme authority, a personal authority, free and untrammelled in the government sphere…The people do not want sovereignty, nor do they seek to govern the state; but that which they do desire is a government which inspires them with confidence by its energy, its strength, its detachment and its national character." The state must be a personalised one, to the point of being patriarchal, led by the tsar, who "belongs to no party and to no social position, he is above and beyond all, he is the first man of the country, and stands for the people as their own personification."[220] This, Aksakov felt, was the leader the Russians wanted and needed, writing "that which the Russian people want is an authority possessing a human heart, a living being whose mind and soul are substituted for the formalism of the bureaucracy and the dead letter of the laws." Such a human approach to governing was presented by Aksakov as being in line with older Slavic traditions, which had been partly violated in Russia by the actions of Peter the Great and the influx of Western ideas, but had thus far been preserved in other Slav lands. Aksakov idealised this imaginary pre-Petrine world claiming, "before Peter the Great, who introduced into Russia Western notions about the relations between authority and the people, the jealousy of power was entirely unknown to Russian sovereigns." Rather, Aksakov claims the pre-Petrine leaders ruled by unanimous consensus and that "although autocrats, they did not believe themselves infallible." Aksakov idealised this system and argued it

---

[217] Ibid., vol. II, p.88.
[218] Aksakov, vol. I, p. 403. Interestingly, despite the fact that the letter from which this quotation was taken consists largely of an attack of Western culture and governance, it was originally written in French!
[219] Although this letter is originally in French, Aksakov has used the English term "self government," so the actual sentence reads "c'est un *selfgovernment* local." This certainly seems to indicate a high level of interaction with and knowledge of Western intellectual trends.
[220] Aksakov, vol. I, pp. 403-405.

should "be rehabilitated in Russia in a time not far distant."[221]

Aksakov held a romantic view of his own country's past, and was delighted to find such supposedly ancient Slavic traditions of governing alive and functioning in Montenegro. Furthermore, this delight in finding a living embodiment of their own country's supposed past was not limited to the political leadership. Several of the Russian travellers appeared to respect traditional aspects of Montenegrin society, especially in matters such as law. According to Kovalevskii, there were no written laws in Montenegro, but they were not needed, as the tradition of ancestors was unquestionable and determined the way in which society is conducted.[222] The "word of the forefathers" functioned as law, and was, in Kovalevskii's eyes, highly appropriate.[223] The ethical code in Montenegro was extremely strong. It was a patriarchal society, where the father ruled, not only over his wife, but also his children with an iron will. Insulting another person was regarded as a grave and punishable offence and it was unheard of for a man to threaten another's life.[224] Courts did exist, and they were scrupulously honest and adhered to the precedent set by tradition.[225] The death penalty existed, but only in cases of murder, which was rare.[226] For Bronievskii, such a system brought to mind that of ancient Greece, as he claimed "Montenegro is a republic where equality is maintained in poverty and liberty maintained by bravery, custom replaces law and injustice is restrained by the sword."[227]

In Russia, the Slavophiles used their intense dislike of Western legalism in order to justify autocratic rule in a Russian context, as "autocracy possesses the virtue of placing the entire weight of authority and compulsion on a single individual, thus liberating society from that heavy burden….this justification of autocracy remained historical and functional."[228] Yet, despite their preference for autocracy over Western legalism, and their frequent disappointment with the rule of Nicholas I, some of the travellers found in Montenegro what appeared to be a system more perfect than their own- one based on paternalism and tradition. This type of rule by tradition was frequently romanticized among mid- nineteenth century Russian Slavophile elites as

---

[221] Aksakov, vol. I, pp. 403-405.
[222] Kovalevskii, p.10.
[223] Kovalevskii, p. 6.
[224] Kovalevskii, p. 7.
[225] Kovalevskii, p. 10.
[226] Kovalevskii, p. 16.
[227] Bronievskii, p. 250, see also p. 240.
[228] Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Russian Identities: a Historical Survey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 154.

representing a reflection of paternalistic Slavic "traditions" rather than artificial, imported Western habits. Khomiakov had a negative view of man-made written legal codes, which he saw as artificial and unnatural. Instead, he believed custom and tradition represented a superior system by which to regulate society. He argued "custom is law, yet it is slightly different from law in the way that law is something external….whereas custom is an internal force pervading the entire life of a people, the conscience and thought of all." Since customs evolved organically, there was never any need to record them, as "the goal of every law is to become a custom, to merge into the blood and flesh of the people and to eliminate the need of written documents."[229] Aksakov largely agreed, and saw the difference between Western and Slavic approaches as rooted in history. He argued that the West had developed a different legal system due to the creation and inheritance of Roman Law, which remained the essential legal mental framework in Catholic and Protestant countries. This approach did not apply in the Slav lands, as he argued "for a Slav in general and for an Orthodox Slav in particular, judicial truth is less important than moral truth. All the strivings of his soul…are directed toward the inner truth." This quest for moral truth was based on Slavs' spirituality, since "Orthodoxy is, for the most part, a religion of the soul." This is in contrast to Catholicism, which Aksakov claims is based on the practical.[230] Thus, the law by nature needed to be more flexible than a written codex would permit. Since, as Khomiakov argued "foreign to the Russian land was the idea of any abstract justice which would be contrary to love."[231] Kireevskii was of a similar mind, arguing that written law had been artificially imported to Russia, and claiming that in the time of ancient Rus', custom had been the only law. He supported his argument linguistically, claiming "the word *pravo* was unknown in Russia in the Western sense, and meant merely justice or truth."[232]

Royal Family, King's Advisors

Significantly, the travellers did find aspects of Montenegrin culture which

---

[229] Aleksei Khomiakov, *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii* (Complete Collected Essays) (Moscow, 1878), vol. I, pp.163-164.
[230] Aksakov, vol. I, pp.560-562. While this example of non-written law would apply in the case of both Slavic Montenegro and Muslim Albania, it did not actually correctly describe all the South Slav lands. The medieval Serbian kingdom was one of the first territories in the region to develop an elaborate legal codex, know as the Code of Stefan, after the monarch under whose direction it was written. The codex spelled out not only all the acts that could be considered as crimes, but also the punishments that should be administered in every case. The Russians looking at the Montenegrin system of justice were perhaps unaware of the existence of this medieval codex, as none of them made any reference to it.
[231] Khomiakov, vol. I, p. 245.
[232] Kireevskii, vol. I, p. 115.

were either different from their own, or at least outdated versions of their own. They did not turn the Montenegrins into an Other. Instead, the Russian travellers presented themselves as wise uncles, visiting from afar, who saw themselves as uniquely qualified to enlighten their hosts. At the same time, they viewed themselves as also in a position to enlighten Western Europe: they were convinced that they possessed a superior level of knowledge and more profound understanding of Montenegro, due to religious and linguistic affinities. In his travelogue, Kovalevskii stated that one of his purposes for writing was to correct the mistaken views held in "Europe" about the Montenegrins.[233] This view was echoed by Popov, who complained that Western Europeans felt free to judge the Slavs, but never seriously studied them.[234] Popov called for more in-depth study of the region, which represented a problem that concerned all "Europe to which we belong," but especially concerned Russia, as a Slav nation.[235] In his text on Njegoš, Rovinskii was an even harsher critic of the West, arguing that it "knows nothing of Montenegro, and doesn't want to know anything." Rovinskii thus felt is was the duty of Russian scholars, such as himself, to open the eyes of the blind Europeans, forcing them to confront the importance of Montenegro.[236] Thus, the Russian scholars presented themselves as having the goal of collecting knowledge that would be relevant for their own country, but which would also help to educate West Europeans. Yet their travelogues were written in Russian and with the exception of parts of Bronievskii's work, none were translated, leading one to wonder whether the "Europeans" being targeted were not perhaps Russia's own.

As for the South Slavs, the Russian travellers felt qualified to offer advice. They had no difficulty gaining access to the Montenegrin leader (Vladika) and were often introduced to his entire family. If Sreznevskii appeared surprised to see the royal family speaking in French, Makushev was greatly disappointed. Of all the travellers, Makushev spent the most time with the royal family, and regarded himself as playing the role of enlightener. Upon arriving in Cetinje, which he described as a "village,"[237] he was informed that the King would like to meet him.[238] Although it was surely not commonplace for Russian travellers to be asked to grant an audience to a King while

[233] Kovalevskii, p. 123.
[234] Popov, p. iv.
[235] Popov, p. i.
[236] Pavel A. Rovinskii, *Petar II (Rade) Petrovich Njegosh: Vladika Chernogoriia* (Petar II (Rade) Petrović Njegoš: the Ruler of Montenegro) (St. Petersburg, 1889), p.1.
[237] Makushev, p. 124.
[238] Makushev, p. 127.

they travelled abroad, Makushev appeared to have found this quite normal. He described the royal palace as being a long building, but only one floor high. He was informed that it was built according to the taste of King Danilo's wife who was "used to living in European comfort."[239]

Makushev was frequently invited to eat with the royal family, and noted that they preferred French food and wine, although if these were not available, they easily switched back to traditional foods. Like Sreznevskii, Makushev noted that the royal family preferred to speak French, even though it was little understood outside the court. In fact, while travelling in Montenegro, he found that he had to make the effort to speak Serbian, which proved to be "quite easy" although he had never specifically studied it.[240] He was, however, disappointed to find that the royals did not really seem to know Russian, and seemed to prefer to study French language and culture rather than Slavic. He was upset to discover that the King was more comfortable in French than in Serbian. With apparently no sense of irony, he offered to arrange for books on Serbian history and language to be sent to them so that they could improve their knowledge of South Slav culture and further their enlightenment and not have to speak in a foreign tongue.[241] The Queen informed him that this was not necessary, explaining that Montenegrin history was rich and long, and Montenegrins absorbed it all naturally throughout their lives, thus precluding the need to study it specifically. Appalled by this logic, the Russian argued that educated Montenegrins should not bother with French, but should turn their attention to the systematic study of their own country.

This moral lecture is rich with irony: Makushev, like many Russian travellers, had created a romantic mental image of Montenegro as a provincial and rustic Slavic paradise. Confronting a royal family sipping French wine and conversing in this foreign tongue thus challenged his vision of the country and annoyed him. At no point did he attempt to confront his own line of thinking in an intellectual mirror, which would show the similarities in this case between Russia and Montenegro. While Makushev was trying to preserve Montenegrins in their "untainted" provinciality, the Russian elite, including at times the Russian royal family, were, like the Montenegrin elite, more comfortable in French than in their own tongue. After all, Pushkin's earliest poetry was in French, and even at the height of Russia's victory over

[239] Makushev, p.124.
[240] Makushev, p. 128.
[241] Makushev, p. 145.

Napoleon, Russian officers were sending letters home describing their victory, in French: many had a poor command of their native language. Thus, Makushev's argument to the Njegoš's that they should preserve their glorious tongue seems both patronising and wilfully blind. Perhaps the Queen felt this, as at one point in their discussion she asked Makushev if he would be less offended if she and her family conversed in Russian, rather than French. The scholar replied that this would not be necessary, as Serbian and Russian were close enough to be mutually intelligible, and that clearly there was no need for Russians to specially study Serbian or vice-versa.[242]

Makushev did, however, feel the need to offer his assistance in helping the Montenegrins develop. He noted the desperate shortage of schools and schoolbooks, and the difficulties of getting an education in the country.[243] After discussing the situation with the Archimandrite, the Russian proposed a series of measures he felt should be taken to improve the overall level of knowledge in Montenegro, including the suggestion that the best young men of Montenegro be selected and sent abroad, if not to Russia, then to the Habsburg lands to study under the Serbian church leadership there.[244] Makushev was thus proposing the gathering of knowledge through a model of study similar to his own; in other words using travel as a means of education. Interestingly, all of the advice he issued on educational reform centres around a strictly non-secular education. He never advised that Montenegrins go to Vienna, for example, to study medicine. Rather, he seemed happy to issue suggestions on education, but only in a limited way, perhaps for fear of spoiling the traditional "Slav" qualities he claimed to value in Montenegrin society.[245] Even if Makushev had encountered such secularly educated Montenegrins, he no doubt would have been disappointed, as he was by the Royal family, by their Western sophistication and lack of primitive Slav purity. His advice on education is filled with contradictions and hypocrisy: He speaks French and German fluently (and in other circumstances would no doubt be proud of this fact), yet he doesn't believe

---

[242] Makushev, p. 146.
[243] Makushev, p. 136.
[244] Makushev, p. 132.
[245] In fact, the model that Makushev was proposing had in a limited way already been adopted. Over the course of the eighteenth century, beginning in 1711, a limited number of specially chosen Montenegrin youths had been sent to Russia to study in seminaries, with the hopes of training an effective clergy for the region where many of the priests were illiterate. It was only, however, after 1840, and particularly after the Crimean War, that Montenegrins other than members of the royal family began travelling to Russia for secular education, often sponsored by private organisations, such as the Slavic Benevolent Committees. For more on Montenegrins educated in Russia, see Momčilo Pejović, *Školovanje crnogoraca u inostranstvu, 1848-1918* (Schooling of Montenegrins abroad) (Istorijski Institut Crne Gore: Podgorica, 2000), pp. 57-77.

those languages should be taught in Montenegrin schools, just as he enjoyed lengthy stays studying in Western cities, such as Vienna, but never suggests this for the Montenegrins. It is, furthermore, ironic that as a young man on his first educational voyage abroad, he felt so free to speak with confidence and authority to the Vladika, advising him as an older uncle would advise a favourite nephew.

Makushev's benevolently imperialist attitude was not limited to his interactions with the royal family: he often gave advice to Montenegrins he encountered during his travels. At one point, while stopping at an inn to rest, he noticed the innkeeper had dressed up in European clothes in his honour. Rather than seeing this as a compliment and an effort to please him, Makushev immediately told the poor woman that she should never dress in such clothes: she must not be ashamed of her traditional Montenegrin clothing, but rather should wear it with pride. Makushev was reflecting an idea very much in favour amongst his circle back in Moscow, as well as at the Russian court, which had under Nicholas taken to wearing "patriotic attire" in order to remember a time when "Russians were not ashamed of their splendid dress, proper for the climate, having a national character, and incomparably more beautiful than foreign dress."[246] Nicholas even held parties where guests were encouraged to "dress up as Russians."[247] It is ironic that in trying to force the Montenegrins to "be themselves" Makushev was in fact imposing the latest Moscow fashion. The way in which Makushev felt free to offer unsolicited advice differs little from Western travelogues, many of which present an intellectual reflection of the *mission civilisatrice* popular at the time. What is different is the Russians'seeming desire *not* to promote change, but rather to preserve an imagined status quo, which they see as representing purity, and perhaps an idealised version of themselves and their own imagined past.

Purity in Natural Paradise

In what way did Montenegro represent purity to the Russian travellers? Why was such an image so powerful to them? The descriptions of the region were highly idealised ones, depicting a heroic people living in a natural

[246] Wortman, p.140.
[247] Wortman, p. 163. It seems Nicholas was left to imagine what "dressing up like a Russian" might mean. At times, misinterpretation led to misunderstandings. During this period, some of the Slavophiles took to wearing beards, in their minds representative of "ancient" Orthodox traditions. Nicholas was quick to express his great displeasure at this move, seeing beards as a symbol of "Jewishness and radicalism." Despite his supposed cult of the "Russian" Nicholas retained a very Western concept of personal appearance.

paradise. This paradise was constantly threatened from all sides, yet its inhabitants persevered and remained true to themselves. A number of the writers addressed the subject of nature, geography and "natural character" in their writings, seeking to understand the source of the "purity" they felt they had encountered. In his ethnographic study of Montenegro, Pavel Rovinskii theorized that every nation has its own living worldview (*vozrenie*). He argued that this was created in particular by geography and history, which affected the national habits and traditions of a people and made them unique.[248] Seeking to construct a portrait of the Montenegrin worldview, Rovinskii used ethnography, combined with the study of national literature. He claimed that he attempted to use exclusively Montenegrin sources, although he discovered in the process that many Montenegrin traits were in fact "pan-Serbian" ones.[249] Consequently, he began his study by looking at Montenegro's particular geography. This proved to be a popular topic for all the Russian travellers: both Popov and Kovalevskii dedicated entire chapters of their travelogues to describing the region's geography, and the population's connection to it, arguing that the nation and its values had in part been formed by their physical surroundings.

Montenegro's geography is a harsh one, and in the nineteenth century it was particularly so. Although the country today enjoys a coastline, in the nineteenth century, much of that, such as the bay of Kotor, was under Austrian occupation, and from most of the country, the sea was completely inaccessible.[250] Furthermore, much of the country was covered by mountains. There were few roads, and Sreznevskii noted as he travelled around the country by foot and mule that the few that did exist had been built "with great effort."[251] Kovalevskii found that the terrain made travel difficult and slow.[252] Makushev, meanwhile, found that he was forced to travel by horse, since the terrain was so rough that "you have to be Montenegrin to go on foot."[253] However, he notes that Montenegrins might be better off without roads, which could only facilitate an invasion by the enemies that surround them.[254] The

---

[248] Rovinskii, "Mirovozzrenie chernogorskovo naroda," p. 2.
[249] While all the Russians write of the Montenegrins as a separate people living in a separate state, the connection between Montenegro and Serbia remained unclear to some. Rovinskii saw the Montenegrins as a Serbian subgroup which lived separately, yet shared the same religion and language as the Serbs living in the pashlik. Others shared his view, using the term "Serb" as almost a generic expression for "South Slav," although most, such as Makushev, separated the Bulgarians out from this term.
[250] Kovalevskii, p. 125.
[251] Sreznevskii, p.228.
[252] Kovalevskii, p.58.
[253] Makushev, p. 116.
[254] Makushev, p. 120.

region's landscape helped to shield the country from invasion.

While geography and lack of infrastructure helped protect the Montenegrins from the Turks, it also meant that they were totally isolated from "Europe." On the whole the Russians saw this as a defining and positive feature of the region. Kovalevskii noted that the mountains rendered the country "inaccessible for Europeans" and that the manners, habits, and unwritten laws of the Montenegrins would seem wild to a "so-called educated person."[255] Rather than seeing this as a sign of backwardness, the Russian travellers saw this isolation as a sign that the Montenegrins were more "pure" than other Slavs, and created a romantic myth around this supposed "Montenegrin simplicity."[256] As Kovalevskii notes, Montenegro "exists in complete alienation from Europe," living by its own means, own products, and almost without any form of trade. As a result, while the region is "totally alienated from Western education and taste" it is also free of "the West's delusions and weaknesses of the body and soul," a point he illustrates by claiming that in Montenegro "syphilis does not exist."[257] Popov also noted that Montenegro's isolation and separate history meant that it avoided many of what he saw as the worst aspects of Western civilisation, such as feudalism and the excesses of the Catholic Church.[258] Thus while the Montenegrins live in isolation and poverty, they represent many qualities the travellers admire such as natural purity, uncontaminated by negative outside influences. Makushev found this particularly true in the Montenegrin countryside, and at the end of his trip recommended to future travellers that they get as deep into the wilderness of the country as possible, writing "go to the mountain, to the lake….forget Cetinje," for it was in the most provincial regions that the most honest, brave, and hospitable people lived.[259] Kovalevskii echoes this notion of Montenegrin purity, using language as an illustrative example. He claims that "Montenegrin" is more pure than the language spoken in the Serbian *pashlik*, which had become contaminated by its exposure to foreigners and foreign languages, in particular Turkish. Kovalevskii argues that in their isolation the Montenegrin people, like their language, had remained more pure than other Slavs.[260] Bronievskii felt that the Montenegrins had in fact preserved their culture

---

[255] Kovalevskii, p.18.
[256] Sreznevskii, p.230.
[257] Kovalevskii, p. 124.
[258] Aleksandr Popov, *Puteshestvie v Chernogoriiu* (Journey to Montenegro) (St. Petersburg, 1847), op cit, p.xi. Cetinje was Montenegro's capital city in the nineteenth century.
[259] Makushev, p. 150.
[260] Kovalevskii, pp. 11-12.

better than the Russians themselves, and that by travelling amongst them, he could better understand his own origins, as "their mode of living, the purity of their behaviour, and the lack of every luxury, are indeed deserving of the greatest praise. The three days which I have spent with them have transported me, I would say, into quite a new world, and I have become acquainted with my ancestors of the ninth and tenth centuries. I have seen the simplicity of the patriarchal times."[261]

Despite its difficult terrain, the travellers describe Montenegro as being a natural paradise. Sreznevskii was so impressed by the beautiful views he saw that his journal is filled with drawings of the region's terrain, and he marvelled that, so vivid and impressive was the nature, everything in the country seemed to be "alive."[262] Although he noted that everything had to be built from stone and that there was little greenery.[263] The place was a "natural paradise" where the water was "like a mirror" and exotic fruits and nuts simply hung on the trees, waiting to be picked.[264] Makushev notes that the locals prize every speck of land they have and do not waste it: every possible surface is used for planting potatoes.[265] Kovalevskii was equally impressed by the remarkably "clean air"[266] and the natural beauties, such as Lake Scutari, which he described as a great "fantastic glass."[267] At another point in the trip, he was amazed to find at the end of a dangerous journey, beautiful waterfalls and flowers and is so moved by the discovery that he called Montenegro the land of wonderful evenings."[268] He also described at length the natural beauty of the mountains, and found that in such a setting, it was easy to see that "Montenegro is different from the rest of Europe." So magnificent was the setting that Kovalevskii could feel himself being submerged in "Asian inactivity."[269] At several moments through his trip, aspects of Montenegro remind Kovalevskii of Central Asia, where he had already travelled extensively.[270] He was not alone in this feeling. Rovinskii also noted that the Montenegrins had vision so remarkable that it could only be compared to the nomadic steppe people of Central

[261] Bronievskii, p. 295.
[262] Sreznevskii, p. 230.
[263] Sreznevskii, p. 229.
[264] Sreznevskii, p. 231.
[265] Makushev, p. 120.
[266] Kovalevskii, p. 11.
[267] Kovalevskii, p. 27.
[268] Kovalevskii, pp. 64-65.
[269] Kovalevskii, p. 3.
[270] Kovalevskii, p. 18. Kovalevskii did in fact have a solid basis for comparison. He was one of the best travelled Russians of his day, having made extensive trips to China, Central Asia and East Africa.

Asia.[271]

Despite their frequent denunciations of the West, the Russians, through such descriptions of the land, are in fact adhering to the canon of an already well-established European travel writing genre. As Susan Layton noted, the Alps, and with them the image of mountainous and dangerous regions of 'gloom and glory' gained a special place in European travel writing in the eighteenth century, as travel to the Alps region increased dramatically. This interest in the power of mountains coincided with the shift from the beautiful, "identified with order, harmony and regularity on a relatively small scale," to the sublime "marked by awe and veneration."[272] Layton argues that Russians also participated in this tradition of mountain-awe, although they came to it only later, at the start of the nineteenth century. However, whereas Layton, looking at Russian travel writing on the Caucasus, argues that Russian writers "effected a certain separation between the territory and the Asians who lived there,"[273] this is not completely the case in writings on Montenegro. True, the Asians, in the form of the Turks, are almost entirely absent from the travelogues, except as an omnipresent but invisible threat, yet the local population is seen as being organically part of their landscape. The Montenegrins are extremely attached, in a primitive, animalistic, warlike way, to their natural surroundings. With their "Asiatic" vision, Rovinskii claims that they see the teeth of their enemies from afar, and shoot them from 500 metres, despite the difficult terrain.[274] Makushev notes that they do not need roads, as they are used to navigating cliffs and rocks from childhood,[275] and can jump from rock to rock "like wild sheep."[276] They are one with their natural world, and see defending their territory as defending an extension of themselves.

This effort to link geography and national character was part of a larger trend current in Russia at the time, and the efforts of the travellers to link the Montenegrins to their geography mirrored the attempts of many artists and intellectuals in Russia to use representations of their country to create a similar understanding of the nation. What is striking in the Russians' descriptions of Montenegrin nature is the degree to which they use Western techniques precisely to reject all that is Western, and to promote their own, allegedly more pure vision of the Slavic world. As Christopher Ely has

[271] Rovinskii, "Mirovozzrenie chernogorskogo naroda," p.4.
[272] Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 40.
[273] Layton, p. 37.
[274] Rovinskii, "Mirovozzrenie chernogorskogo naroda," p.4.
[275] Makushev, p. 120.
[276] Makushev, p. 118.

noted in his seminal work *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*, there is nothing inherently "natural" about the way people perceive their physical surroundings, rather their perceptions and reactions are culturally constructed.[277] Ely argues that Russian perceptions of nature in the eighteenth century were strongly influenced by Western traditions, and he carefully documents the intellectual transfer of Western aesthetic ideas and their reception in a Russian context. By the nineteenth century, many of these ideas had been deeply absorbed by the Russian elite. Thus, even in their subsequent efforts to reject Western standards of aesthetic beauty, they relied exclusively on Western traditions and techniques to reinterpret their "meager nature" as a positive symbol of the endurance and strength of the Russian people. Travelogues, such as Pavel Svinin's *Notes of the Fatherland*, paintings, and the works of Slavophile thinkers such as Ivan Aksakov, all helped turn the bleak image of barrenness into a symbol of the Russian soul.[278] The Russian writings on Montenegrin nature are part of this trend: typically Western descriptions of the harsh geography, lack of infrastructure, and isolation are all rendered in a positive light, and reinterpreted as barriers which shield the country from Western contamination.

Tough people, freedom fighters

The Montenegrins' character mirrors their land: tough, defensive and uncontaminated. Security and defence are constantly mentioned as the threat of the Turks looms all around the region. In this respect, Montenegro presents a paradox for the Russian travellers. On the one hand they note that, due to the strong ethical code in place, society appears to be safe guarded. The Russians travel around everywhere safely, unarmed, and with no guards. In Cetinje, Kovalevskii even sleeps outside, which he notes is possible to do without any fear, as he was being protected by "the entire Montenegrin society."[279] Yet, at the same time, all of the travellers note with amazement that all Montenegrin men, without exception, are armed.[280] Makushev noted that even boys carry arms, saying "it is simply their way of life."[281] Moreover, these weapons are not merely decorative, they are constantly in use. As Bronievskii

[277]Christopher Ely, *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002), p. 9.
[278] For the travelogue's representation of the homeland, see p. 73. Aksakov is quoted on p. 133.
[279] Aksakov, p. 88.
[280] Aksakov, p. 23.
[281] Makushev, p. 119.

observed "a Montenegrin is always armed, and carries about, during his most peaceful occupation, a rifle, pistols, a yatagan, and a cartouche-box. The Montenegrins spend their leisure time in firing at a target, and are accustomed to this exercise from their boyish years."[282] Sreznevskii, for his part, is astonished to notice at a religious procession that the priest had not only a pistol, but also a dagger hanging from his belt during the ceremony.[283]

This omnipresence of weapons forms part of the Russians' image of Montenegro as a Slavic Sparta: all boys over the age of 10 are trained intensively in shooting, and this remains an inherent part of their identity throughout their lives. It was not just the strength that impressed the Russians. In addition, Montenegrin men are described by the travellers as being extremely physically impressive: they are tall, handsome and strong, physical personifications of Slavic attractiveness; they were "a nation of athletes."[284] Bronievskii made a similar observation, claiming that all Montenegrin men were "very manly-looking" being "tall, and wide-shouldered."[285] Furthermore, they were so physically strong that the Russian claimed that illness almost never occurred in Montenegro, as everyone seemed to stay healthy.[286] All the travellers agree that Montenegro is a warlike society. However the locals are not protecting themselves primarily from each other. Rather, they are armed against their external enemies, in particular the Turks. Although none of the Russians has any personal encounters with this evil Other, they all perceive the Turkish threat to be everywhere. This theme is even present when the actual Turks are not: when Kovalevskii asks to see a monument, he is taken to see one in honour of the heroes who had fought against the Turks.[287] Kovalevskii noted in amazement that in Montenegro there are no taxes and men do not work, protecting their nation from the Turks is their only task.[288] This they do well: Kovalevskii argues there can be no defence better than the chest of a Montenegrin.[289] While the country may be technically very poor, it possesses a greater treasure than that which can be calculated

---

[282] Bronievskii, p. 266. Chapters from Bronievskii's work had been published earlier in other Russian journals. See Vladimir Bronievskii, "Opisanie Chernogorii" (A portrait of Montenegro) in *Syn Otechestva* (Son of the Fatherland), 1818, No. XXVIII, pp. 54-56.
[283] Sreznevskii, p. 228.
[284] Kovalevskii, p. 60. The Russian was not the only person to see the Montenegrins as a nation of athletes. Many Montenegrins were themselves quite happy to perpetuate this image. Novak Jovanović has published a book on the role of sport and fitness in Montenegrin society.
[285] Bronievskii, p. 278.
[286] Bronievskii, p. 243.
[287] Kovalevskii, p. 66.
[288] Kovalevskii, p. 6.
[289] Kovalevskii, p. 29.

in financial terms: the

"deposit of freedom" that exists in the chest of every Montenegrin man.[290] Kovalevskii notes that, in a country of extreme poverty, freedom is all the locals have, and therefore they cling to it such great passion.[291] The fear of the Turks, combined with a fierce attachment to their freedom, is for the Russian travellers at the core of Montenegrin identity. Popov even argues that it was the Turks who, through their invasions, helped create Montenegro. In his view, the region had long been a Serbian province, and it was only when the Turks invaded and started oppressing Orthodoxy and killing church leaders that the Montenegrins asserted themselves, going to desperate measures to ensure the preservation of their faith,[292] and transforming the region out of necessity into a "Slavic Sparta" where armed struggle, or the constant threat of it was part of daily reality.

The travellers are clearly astonished by the way the entire society functions to produce a coherent fighting machine. Men are trained to fight from childhood, and when they do fight, they do so with an incredible ruthlessness that seems to both shock and impress the Russians. Their soldiers accept death as something completely natural, and show no fear of it.[293] As Bronievskii noted "they consider it a happiness, and a grace of God, to die in battle. It is in such a case that they appear as real warriors." The Montenegrins are described in idealised forms, they are classic heroes, seemingly without a flaw. Despite the glowing descriptions of Montenegrin bravery and physical prowess, some of the travellers did express unease over one aspect of Montenegrin warfare: the tradition of chopping off the enemies' heads. Bronievskii claims the Montenegrins "cut off the heads of those enemies whom they take with arms in their hands, and spare only those who surrender before the battle."[294] Kovalevskii notes that chopping off the heads of enemies is seen as a great source of pride.[295] Sreznevskii is also taken aback by this practice: while travelling to Cetinje, he was astonished to find several Turkish heads stuck on the top of poles, serving as a constant reminder to the enemy of what awaited them should they attempt to attack the nation's capital.[296]

---

[290] Kovalevskii, p. 125.
[291] Kovalevskii, p. 59.
[292] Popov, p. 123.
[293] Popov, p. 90.
[294] Bronievskii, p. 267.
[295] Kovalevskii, p. 89.
[296] Sreznevskii, p. 228.

The Russians were not the only foreigners to notice the exceptional nature of this custom; the French were likewise disgusted by it. During his visit to Montenegro, French envoy General Marmont apparently admonished Vladika Petar, evidently in response to rumours that the Montenegrins had beheaded French General Delgorges after the siege of Herceg Novi, and then used the unfortunate man's head for a football. Marmont called on Petar to put a stop to this habit, but met with little success. Allegedly, Petar accused Marmont of hypocrisy, reminding him that the French had beheaded their own King and Queen in a public square in Paris in the recent past.[297] Although apparently surprised by this practice and slightly disturbed, the Russians are not as morally outraged by it as the French, and comment on it only factually, without casting any sort of judgement. It seems some of the Russians believed such Montenegrin behaviour is acceptable in the context of the fear and oppression in which they lived. While the French tried to end the practice by arguing with the Vladika on moral grounds, and based on notions of "civilisation," it appears that Russian officers who did not personally like the practice were more pragmatic in their approach. Bronievskii notes that when the Montenegrins and Russians were fighting together, the Russian commander-in-chief managed to temporarily put a stop to the practice "chiefly by paying them a ducat for every prisoner."[298] This was a personal choice, however, made by one particular officer and there is no evidence to suggest that the Russians as a group particularly shared his views. Nor is there hard evidence to suggest that the Russians considered the practice "uncivilised," as the French did, although they refrained from engaging in such behaviour themselves.

Yet at no point do the Russians use this habit to question the "Slavness" of the Montenegrins, despite the fact that it was one the Montenegrins shared with the Mongols, who generally epitomized "Asianness" in the minds of many Russians. After several centuries of occupation, many Russians sought to separate themselves culturally from their former Asian occupiers.[299] In their nostalgia for their pre-Petrine past, the travellers are always referring to lost Slavic traditions, real or imagined, and the centuries of Mongol rule are never mentioned, nor is it allotted any role in the discourse of Russian culture. Yet many Russian travellers refused to condemn the

---

[297] Roberts, p. 173. For more on French travellers' comments on the Montenegrin habit of beheading enemies, see, for example, Vialla de Sommières's *Voyage historique et politique au Montenegro* (Paris, 1820).
[298] Bronievskii, p. 272.
[299] For more on the Mongol tradition of head taking, both in Russia and in Central Europe, see Christian I. Archer, John R. Ferris, Holger H. Herwig, and Timothy Travers, eds., *World History of Warfare* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), p. 180.

Montenegrins' habit of taking heads with the same passion as Western observers, or sought explanations to justify the habit, distancing themselves from the values of the West. It appears they were seeking to argue for the existence of a separate Slavic cultural space that belonged to neither the West nor the East, and that belonging to this space enabled them to understand the Montenegrins better than any Frenchman ever could.

Part of the image created by the Russians of Montenegrins as soldiers is that of a Slavic Sparta: the travellers often attribute super-man characteristics of the Montenegrins' strength and fighting skills. However, it is not the image of men of one nation respectfully observing the traditions of a different but equal nation. The image the Russians create of the Montenegrins is that of a nation of savage super hero-warriors. According to Bronievskii, the Montenegrins are immune to all forms of normal human discomfort: "being inured to hardships and privations, they perform without fatigue, and in high spirits, very long and forced marches…they climb the steepest rocks with great facility, and bear with the greatest patience hunger, thirst, and every kind of privation."[300] Bronievskii's Montenegrins are tough men with near super-human stamina. Arms, a small loaf of bread, a cheese, some garlic, a little brandy, an old garment, and two pair of sandals made of raw hide, form all the equipage of the Montenegrins. On their march, they do not seek shelter from rain or cold. In rainy weather the Montenegrin wraps his head with the *struka*, lies down on the ground, and sleeps comfortably. Three or four hours of repose are quite sufficient for his rest, and the remainder of his time is occupied in constant exertion.

Bronievskii's respect for the brute strength and courage of the Montenegrins is clear. He also notes that it is not only when facing the Turks that the Montenegrins are capable of demonstrating extreme bravery. The Russian officers who served with them in the Napoleonic wars were also impressed by the Montenegrin soldiers' toughness. Bronievskii wrote extensively in his own travelogue of the Montenegrins' noble-savage traditions:

> A Montenegrin never begs for mercy: and when one of them is severely wounded, and it is impossible to save him from the enemy, his own comrades cut off his head. When at the attack of Klobuk a little detachment of our troops was obliged to retreat, an officer of considerable girth and no longer young, fell on the ground from exhaustion. A Montenegrin, perceiving it ran immediately to him, and, having drawn his *yatagan*, said, 'you are very brave, and must wish

[300] Bronievskii, p. 266.

> that I should cut off your head: say a prayer, and make the sign of the cross.'
>
> The officer, horrified at the proposition, made an effort to rise, and rejoined his comrades with the assistance of the friendly Montenegrin. They consider all those taken by the enemy as killed.[301]

The picture painted by Bronievskii is similar to what Kovalevskii witnessed: the Montenegrins are consistently presented as a nation of brave, heroic savages. It was this savage bravery that enabled the Montenegrins to triumph over more powerful enemies, since "their extraordinary boldness frequently triumphed over the skill of the experienced bands of the French. Attacking the columns of the enemy in front and flank, and acting separately, without any other system than the inspirations of personal courage, they were not afraid of the terrible battalion fire of the French infantry." Furthermore, Bronievskii described in great detail the savage might of the Montenegrins in battle, writing "it was a terrible spectacle to see the Montenegrins rushing forwards, with heads of slaughtered enemies suspended from their necks and shoulders, and uttering savage yells."[302]

Despite their great courage, there were aspects of savageness that clearly disturbed Bronievskii, and which he felt ultimately hindered battle strategy. As he noted:

> [They] cannot withstand regular troops beyond their mountains; and the advantage of their courage in assisting our troops, and the fruits of victory, were lost by their want of order. During the siege of Ragusa, it was never possible to know how many of them were actually under arms, because they were constantly going to their homes with spoil, whilst others joined the army in their places, and after a few days of indefatigable exertion, returned to the mountains, to carry away some insignificant trifle.[303]

Thus, while the Montenegrins were undeniably brave and heroic in battle, Bronievskii seems to appreciate them most on their own soil, fighting in the guerrilla-style combat at which they clearly excel. When the Russians attempted to fight alongside Montenegrins in standard European-style combat, they ran into frustrations, as the untrained Montenegrin troops continued to fight in the irregular manner to which they were accustomed. Yet the irritation the Russians felt at such moments is contradictory. They routinely dismissed nearly all aspects of West European culture and politics, condemning democracy as a mirage and the culture as decadent and past its prime. They praised Montenegro as representing "traditional" values and ancient Slav ways. Yet, they were frustrated and left unsure of how to react when actually fighting

---

[301] Bronievskii, p. 268.
[302] Bronievskii, p. 272.
[303] Bronievskii, p. 271.

alongside the traditional Montenegrins. They do not condemn the savagery, but they themselves are seemingly too "European" to participate actively in it. None of the travellers produces a clear opinion on this matter; all seem equally unsure of how to write about it.

At times, even the savagery is idealised, perhaps in an effort not to spoil the super-human image of the Montenegrins. In addition to the brutal methods of war, Bronievskii also noted the Montenegrin habit of pillaging captured regions, claiming "the property they take from the enemy is considered by them as their own, and as a reward of courage."[304] However, this habit does not seem to bother Bronievskii excessively, as at least the Montenegrins are not hypocritical about their traditions: "[they] go on pillaging; in which we must give them the credit of being perfect masters; although they are not acquainted with the high-sounding names of *contribution, requisition, forced loans* etc. They call pillage simply 'pillage,' and have no hesitation in confessing to it."[305] With this Bronievskii again seems to emphasise the superiority of the Montenegrins' savage purity: they do not follow the Western habit of inventing fancy, yet hypocritical, names to make excuses for their actions, they commit them openly and honestly, without pretence.

Clans and Women

As the quotation above suggests, some of the travellers appear to have idealised the Montenegrins to the point that they justified acts which ordinarily would have been condemned had they been committed elsewhere. At times one senses an almost desperate need to deny difference: the Russians were so determined to create an idealised image of Slavonic brotherhood that large exaggerations of reality were permitted. Part of this is presented as a search for the past. Some of the travellers see Montenegro as representing a purer version of their own country, or as a reflection of what their country once was before the reign of Peter the Great and the subsequent Western influence. Yet despite determined efforts, some aspects of Montenegrin life proved hard to explain, and thus presented the Russians with a dilemma: how to address difference, or the incomprehensible, in a society they had identified as nearly identical to their own, albeit in a different stage of development? Montenegrin

[304] Bronievskii, p. 267.
[305] Bronievskii, p. 269.

personal life, that of the family, challenged the travellers constantly for a way to negotiate, or develop their values in light of what they encountered. All the travellers without exception write about the complexities of the Montenegrin clan system, and gender relations. Although seemingly unrelated, these two aspects of personal life both disturbed and intrigued the travellers, leaving them unsure how to view the situation. Some tried to explain it geographically (the mountains caused such behaviour!) while others concluded Russia must have been the same once in the distant past, but all feel the need to address these subjects in some way.

The way in which society was organised into clans, and the powerful roles these clans played in Montenegrin life, fascinated the travellers. As in certain other mountainous regions on the periphery of Europe, such as Scotland, Montenegrin clans were groups united together on the basis of blood relations, often claiming to be descended from one common ancestor. Montenegrin clans inhabited clearly demarcated geographical spaces, which were defended by arms. As in other clan-based societies clan rivalry and clan conflicts were common. In a desperately poor and resource-limited country like Montenegro, issues such as infringement on another clan's land often escalated into armed conflict between different families. At times, armed bands of men from one clan would conduct raids upon the territory of another, seeking to acquire resources, such as food and water, which would insure their economic survival for some period of time. This led to traditions, such as the blood feud which had the inevitable result of dividing the country and hindering the development of a coherent national identity.

After the arrival of the Turks, some clans even converted to Islam, creating groups of people with suspect loyalties within Montenegrin territory. As already noted above, these groups met their end during the early part of Danilo's reign, whether through an orchestrated mass killing or gradual emigration. Upon coming to power, Danilo quickly recognised the clan system as inhibiting the unity of the country and took steps to negotiate a stronger central role for himself, in hopes of promoting unity and making the country less vulnerable to invasion. A good degree of unity had already been achieved by the time the Russian travellers arrived in the region, yet they were still very aware of this traditional mode of living. Popov wrote extensively on the history of the clan system, arguing that clan enmity had seriously weakened the internal unity of Montenegro, and that this had made some clans susceptible to Muslim propaganda. Yet, Popov found in his travels that many towns

were still named after clans, and that despite Danilo's efforts, the tradition had not died out.[306]

Kovalevskii found that although steps had been taken to weaken clans' individual powers,[307] clan territory remained heavily protected, and much energy was spent ensuring such defences.[308] Makushev was surprised to find it common that people lived in communal habitation, with households often consisting of 30 people, living "in Turkish style" with no windows and no furniture.[309] Kovalevskii also noted the element of pride attached to clan membership, claiming youths with "famous names" were proud of their heritage and the reputation attached to their clan.[310]

Although clan rivalry was very much part of local life, by the time the Russians travelled to Montenegro, the threat of the Turks, and the desire to preserve Montenegrin independence from them, had largely taken precedence over clan rivalry. Bronievskii might have been rather optimistic when he wrote that "when the country is in danger, the Montenegrins forget all personal feelings of private advantage and enmity: they obey the orders of their chiefs" but he was correct in noting where the majority of loyalties lay. Furthermore, while clan territory remained heavily protected, so did Montenegrin territory. A complex system had been established by the nineteenth century to help shield the country from Turkish incursions on their land and reinforce the security of the Spartan-like state. As Bronievskii observed "they have on their frontier a constant guard: and the whole of their force may be collected within twenty- four hours, upon the threatened point."[311] Thus, while internal rivalries still persisted, the country had achieved the degree of unity necessary to defend itself effectively against intruders. On the day-to-day level, however, clans still formed a unit, which directed many aspects of quotidian life.

While clan life was seen as exotic, but perhaps understandable given the conditions, Montenegrin gender relations left the travellers truly baffled. Russia in the mid-nineteenth century was a conservative society when it came to issues of gender. The fact that all the travellers being considered here are male can attest to that. However, over the course of the eighteenth century, the Russian elite had been far

[306] Popov, p.127.
[307] Kovalevskii, p. 16.
[308] Kovalevskii, p. 125.
[309] Makushev, p. 124.
[310] Kovalevskii, p. 39.
[311] Bronievskii, p. 267.

more influenced by Western patterns of socialisation than many of the travellers would have conceded. By the 1840s, elite Russian women had enjoyed an accepted, albeit limited, role in the public sphere for several generations. The Russian travellers all appear to have taken this public role allotted to women in their home country as normal, despite the fact that it was a relatively recent phenomenon, dating back less than 150 years. The shock the travellers expressed at the lack of women in society in the Balkans reflects the degree to which many of their assumptions were based on Western, not "ancient Slavonic" traditions. Excluding the royal family, the travellers had little contact with women, not only in Montenegro, but elsewhere on their travels as well. None wrote letters home to women, other than their mothers, suggesting they had few platonic female relationships back home. Yet, although their society was, at least by Western European standards, a conservative one, the Russians were shocked by the nature of gender relations in Montenegro, and clearly felt unsure as to how they should interpret this cultural difference. Montenegro was a warrior state, and as such, women had no role within the framework of the heroic savage national image. The travellers agreed that the society was a highly patriarchal one where "the father makes the rules in the house"[312] and the husband was responsible for the behaviour of his wife, just as the father must answer for the actions of his children.[313] Kovalevskii noted that women were regarded merely as "things" and so restrictive was their place in Montenegro, that he hardly ever saw one.[314] The Russians commented with amazement that Montenegrin women kiss the hands of men, in direct opposition to the Western manner to which they were accustomed.[315] Furthermore, they seemingly did all the work in the country. Rovinskii complained that the women are all "too serious"[316] while Kovalevskii noted that only the women work in Montenegro, and that their lives are very hard. Makushev agreed, claiming that "the women are the real workers."[317] This is contrasted with the behaviour of Montenegrin men, who are "truly only ever active in battle"[318] and regard any kind of work other than fighting as a form of humiliation. According to Makushev, mens' only responsibility was to preserve the honour of women: insulting a woman was regarded as a very grave offence in the country, and therefore, a woman could walk anywhere she wished in

[312] Kovalevskii, p. 7.
[313] Makushev, p. 148.
[314] Kovalevskii, p. 72.
[315] Makushev, p. 119, and Kovalevskii, p. 60.
[316] Rovinskii, Mirovozzrenie chernogorskogo naroda," p. 7.
[317] Makushev, p. 119.
[318] Kovalevskii, p. 8.

complete safety.[319]

During his travels through the region, Kovalevskii was invited to attend a Montenegrin wedding.[320] The guests at the event were mainly friends and relatives,[321] and there were large quantities of food and drink for all to enjoy. This was followed by singing and dancing "*kolo*," a traditional South Slav dance which Kovalevskii found "quite boring."[322] Kovalevskii described the women as being generally dark and unattractive.[323] For special occasions, such as weddings they adorned themselves in jewellery, which was often made from Turkish coins.[324] The guests presented the couple with gifts, such as live birds, or other items to help them establish themselves.[325] While he claimed that all Slavic weddings are similar and differ only in the details, he found the way in which marriages are arranged in Montenegro to be different from what he was used to. Seemingly uncomfortable with the concept, the traveller tries to understand it in terms of different stages of development. He wrote that he felt that he was stepping back in time, imagining that Montenegrin marriages were like Russian ones in the distant past.

The travellers found there was no room for romantic love in nineteenth century Montenegro: generally, matches were arranged, either by the parents or by a matchmaker, and often when the couple were still children, or as Bronievskii noted "marriages are arranged by parents, not by love."[326] Kovalevskii observed that sometimes the future spouses were raised in close proximity, but more often they did not properly meet each other until the day of the wedding.[327] In order for a girl to be married, the Russian was told, it was essential that all other older sisters in the family had already been married -- it was impossible for a girl to marry before an older sister in any circumstance.[328] Although the couple might have been promised in infancy to each other, the actual wedding could only take place after they had reached the minimum ages prescribed by the Church, which Kovalevskii claimed was 14 for a boy and 12 for a girl.[329] If the parents had given their word and

[319] Makushev, p. 119.
[320] Kovalevskii, p. 33.
[321] Kovalevskii, p. 37.
[322] Kovalevskii, p. 36.
[323] Kovalevskii, p. 60.
[324] Kovalevskii, p. 24.
[325] Kovalevskii, p. 35.
[326] Bronievskii, p. 280.
[327] Kovalevskii, p. 33.
[328] Kovalevskii, p. 35.
[329] Kovalevskii, p. 34.

promised their child to another family, they were obliged to honour that, even if difficulties later arose between the two families: changing their minds would cause great shame on the family.[330] Furthermore, Kovalevskii claimed that it was possible to purchase a wife, which he saw as being an "Asian" habit. He noted that this custom used to be practised in Serbia as well, but it was outlawed by Karadjordje, in an effort to help poor men who were often condemned to a life of solitude as they could not afford to pay the high fees requested for a wife.[331]

Even after the marriage, the travellers observed that family life was very different in Montenegro than in Russia, which was again far closer to Western Europe. Unlike in Russia, or Paris, where it was common for young urban couples to go out publicly together to the theatre or *soirees* in Montenegro it seemed couples spend the first year of marriage shunning each other and hiding from one another. Kovalevskii claimed the newly-weds avoided being seen together in public, as this would cause great shame in the eyes of the society. The Russian was astonished that young couples did not speak to each other and that the wives were not referred to by name, but at best by "she." Kovalevskii concluded that this was because talking about one's wife is seen as shameful. Furthermore, he argued, it was not only the women who were excluded from their husbands' public lives: Montenegrin men regarded sex as an act of humiliation, and consequently they avoided their own children, especially in public, as offspring represented the fruit of their humiliation.[332] The woman was in charge of doing all the domestic work and raising the children, Kovelevskii noted she had no rights within the household: the father/ husband was the head of the family, which was his "sacred and inviolable right," his only responsibility was to protect them and their honour.[333] Bronievskii also noted the shame Montenegrin society seemed to attach to human relations, and claimed that Montenegrin men behaved "as though the husband did not like his wife, he is ashamed of all feeling…life after marriage is a secret."[334]

Again, here as in many other matters, the Russians did not condemn such gender relations, however, their constant mention of them and detailed observations testify to the social difference the travellers clearly felt in this matter. Yet, they were clearly puzzled and even worried by the difference. Except to note the inferior position of women, and their difference from those in Russia, the Russian travellers'

---

[330] Kovalevskii, p. 35.
[331] Kovalevskii, pp. 34-35.
[332] Kovalevskii, p. 34.
[333] Kovalevskii, p. 33.
[334] Bronievskii, p. 281.

Montenegro was an entirely male world. In their official depiction of Montenegro as a warlike Spartan state, women are excluded from the Russians' imagined national myth, and thus present a challenge for the writers, who appear to have been left unsure how to deal with such a dilemma. It appears in this respect, that the Russian travellers would have felt more comfortable and "at home" in the salons of Paris or London than in the land of their Slavic brethren. However, it was not purely the exclusion of women that left the Russians confused, but also the utter rejection of romantic love in Montenegrin relations. So internalized was the ultimately West European notion of romantic love in the Russians' mind that they never appear to even identify it as the source of their difference with the Montenegrins. Yet, the notion of romantic love only came to Russia in the post-Petrine period, at the same time as women entered the public sphere.[335] However, by the mid- nineteenth century, the concept had become so imbedded in the cultural world of these travellers that they had ceased to identify it as an imported Western habit, and perceived it as part of their own Russian culture. When they find the same standards lacking in Montenegro, with which they generally strongly identify, they are confused and at times even revolted, and while there are many aspects of Montenegro's political and social structure they would like to emulate, marital relations is never among them. As much as they would like to revive a supposedly "pure" Slavic past, it seems the Russians would like the ability to choose which aspects they would readopt, as the model as a complete whole posed certain discomforts.

The Russians were not the only travellers to find Montenegrin gender relations striking. In fact, the similarities their writing on the subject bears to contemporary Western travelogues demonstrate the degree to which this aspect of Russian society had in fact become "Westernised." The Viscountess Strangford also commented at length on the treatment of women in Montenegro, observing scenes that were very similar to those described by Kovalevskii. The Viscountess noted "unquestionably, in Montenegro, woman is the chief beast of burden and the hardest worker of the two sexes: she is in fact the slave of the man"[336] and that it is women

[335] Romantic love was not an inherent Western tradition either, and was not common or condoned prior to the twelfth century in Western Europe. Prior to that period, West Europeans also tended to see expressions of love as a symbol of weakness. Some background on the evolution of romantic love in the Western tradition can be found in Karen Lystra, *Searching the Heart: Women, Men, and Romantic Love in Nineteenth-Century America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[336] Viscountess Strangford, *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic in 1863 with a Visit to Montenegro* (London: Richard Bentley, 1864), pp. 156-157.

"who are invariably engaged in carrying all burdens great and small."[337] However, like Kovalevskii, she noted that women did have a certain position of limited respect in Montenegrin society, since "though humble, she is not humiliated: she is respected for her chastity. For this reason, and because of her being of the weaker sex, and therefore never attacked by the stronger, a woman is always given to the traveller as a guide: woe be to the stranger who should attempt to take advantage of her weakness." Women were regarded as slaves, but pure ones whose purity must be defended. It was unimaginable that they should be anything else. When meeting with the Prince, the Viscountess asks him what would happen if a Montenegrin woman were ever unfaithful to her husband. The prince is shocked even by the suggestion and notes "they never are; if they had been, in former days they would have been put to death: I should imprison them for life."[338]

Western men were also quick to pick up on the specific position of women. De Sommieres, notes that, although divorce exists in Montenegro, woman can never ask for it, only the husband has the right to separate himself from his partner.[339] Sir J. Garner Wilkinson, travelling in the 1840s had similar experiences, noting "though able, the men are seldom inclined, to carry anything, or take any trouble they can transfer to women, who are the beasts of burden in Montenegro; and I have seen women toiling up the steepest hills, under loads which men seldom carry in other countries."[340] Wilkinson also noted the Montenegrin male habit of "avoiding all mention of his wife before a stranger" which he sees as an "Eastern habit." He reiterates this statement by comparing Montenegro to Turkey, saying that "in Turkey, and in Montenegro, man is equally a despot, and woman a slave."[341] Like the Russian travellers, Wilkinson notes specific features of Montenegrin life, such as the fact that all men are armed, all the time.[342] Wilkinson also acknowledges the Montenegrins' courage, noting they are "deserving of respect for the preservation of the independence, in defiance of all the efforts of the Turks."[343] Montenegrin gender relations is one aspect of the country that continued to perplex Western travellers for several generations, even becoming the subject of an academic study, published in

[337] Strangford, p. 136.
[338] Strangford, pp. 156-157.
[339] De Sommieres, pp. 272-273.
[340] Sir J. Garner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (London: John Murray, 1848), p. 420.
[341] Wilkinson, pp. 421-422.
[342] Wilkinson, p. 432.
[343] Wilkinson, p. 407.

Milan in 1896, at a time when there was very little literature on the region.[344]

Less than 150 years after Peter's reforms, the Russians appear to have been so thoroughly Westernised that Montenegro's gender relations shocked them, leaving them as confused as Western travellers in the region. Even in the reactionary court of Nicholas I, women had been allotted a place, albeit a limited one. Nicholas practised what Richard Wortman has described as a "moral cult of women" in which he saw himself as the white knight, shielding the allegedly weaker sex from harsh realities. Women, in Nicholas's mind, were in need of both respect and protection. As a result of such a message, a cult of medieval-style chivalry became fashionable at the court.[345] While such a fashion was, like much else in Nicholas's time, reactionary, it was also profoundly indebted to Europe, where women had long had a more visible view in the public sphere. Clearly, no such trend existed in Montenegro, leaving the Russian travellers to challenge the social world they had grown up with.

Russia in Montenegrin Eyes

While the travellers present a positive, if paternalistic, view of the Montenegrins as a nation of heroic warriors, who are also at heart hospitable simpletons, the image the Russians create of themselves is dramatically different. Yet the way in which the Russian travellers describe the view of their homeland is one of the major recurring themes of the travelogues on Montenegro. The Russia the travellers claim to see, represented supposedly through the eyes of Montenegrins, is a great and heroic super power. All the Russians comment at length about their positive reception in the country, and all are clearly conscious of the image of their country in Montenegro. Kovalevskii was surprised when, arriving in a village, crowds rushed to welcome him, making him feel as though he is arriving home and being welcomed "by his own native family."[346] Makushev had a similarly dramatic moment when he arrived in Montenegro. Crowds surrounded him and, noticing that he is foreign, asked if he is an Englishman. Indignant, Makushev responded "I am

[344] After several trips to the region, Italian Giuseppe Marcotti decided to write an entire monograph on this subject, and his work *Il Montenegro e le sue donne* (Montenegro and its women*)* was published in Milan in 1896. It was translated and republished over a century later as *Crna Gora i njene žene* (Montenegro and its women) (CID: Podgorica, 1997). The work gives particular emphasis to the representation of Montenegro women in literature and epic poetry. Part of a chapter, however, is dedicated to highlighting the unique role played by Russia in the region, and cites a letter, supposedly from the Tsar claiming "Montenegro, you are the same blood as Russians, and the same faith, and the same language." See pp. 211-214.
[345] Wortman, pp. 166-169.
[346] Kovalevskii, p. 4.

not English, I am your brother, a Russian." The crowds then gasped "my God" in amazement.[347]

Makushev found that popular affection for the Russians was so widespread that even the simplest people were knowledgeable about it. While travelling through the countryside, Makushev came across a small boy of six or seven with fruit. Makushev stopped to question the boy, who explained his mother had gone to the bazaar in Kotor to try to sell some of the fruit. Makushev then bought a piece of fruit from the boy, and insisted on greatly overpaying for it. The child was astonished and says "if everyone paid as generously as you, my mother would not have to walk to the bazaar in Kotor." Makushev then decided to quiz the child, asking him what he knew about the "the Russian nation and the Russian Tsar." The child dutifully responded "Russians are our brothers and the Russian Tsar is a great friend of our leader and without him our leader can do nothing." Makushev was so astonished by the tremendous feeling he senses in the child's voice that he gave him more money. The child was again amazed by such generosity, and asked Makushev who he was, to which the Russian responds with pride "I belong to those brothers you were just telling me of."[348] The passage typifies Makushev's attitude of paternalistic superiority to the Montenegrins and thus serves as an allegory for Russian-Montenegrin relations. In his encounter with the child he depicted himself as being a personalised representation of how he imagined his homeland to be: towards a poor village boy he demonstrated tremendous generosity by giving the child far more money than necessary. This dramatic and flashy display of generosity was followed by quizzing the child who informed him of the greatness of his people and his homeland. Typically, Makushev responded to hearing what he wanted to hear by giving the child more money: a common pattern in Montenegrin- Russian relations. In the passage, Makushev presented himself as a sort of imperial lord travelling around the barbarian countryside of a dependent land, spreading his generous sums of cash among the poor but honest peasants, who dutifully sing his praise.

The Russians cited several reasons for this feeling of brotherhood they saw existing between their two nations. Several of the travellers paid great attention to connections allegedly shared between the two nations, in an attempt to portray an "old" and "historic" alliance. As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, there is little historical evidence to indicate that such an "old alliance" ever existed. The travellers

[347] Makushev, p. 118.
[348] Makushev, p. 139.

chose to see things differently, however. Kovalevskii dated Montenegrin-Russian friendship as going back to the time of Danilo. Although Kovalevskii described in detail the Montenegrins' endless suffering at the hands of the Turks, he painted a rosy picture of Russia's role in the situation. According to Kovalevskii, when Vladika Sava, Danilo's successor, travelled to Russia to ask for aid, Peter immediately came to his assistance and offered his help.[349] Makushev also looked at Montenegrin-Russian relations in the eighteenth century, and saw this period as a time of great love between the two nations. He claimed Catherine the Great made herself the protector of Montenegro and offered the country help in putting its government in order. Makushev then noted that the Montenegrins and Russians fought the French together in 1805-1807, and claimed rather triumphantly that, "besides financial subsidies, Montenegro owes its borders to Russia."[350] Popov's view of the two nations' historic relationship was rosier still. He dated the friendship going as far back as the start of the eighteenth century, and described how Peter the Great sent two envoys of South Slav origin, Ivan Lukačević and Mihajlo Miloradović to Montenegro in 1711, bearing with them a grammar book (*gramot*) which claimed that Russia was going to start a war to free the Orthodox Christians. Popov then cites a speech, alleged to have been made by Danilo upon receiving the envoys, in which Danilo addressed his people saying:

> We, Montenegrin brothers, have heard, that God knows that, far away, somewhere in the north, there is a Christian Tsar. We have always wanted to know about him and his Kingdom, but locked in these mountains, we could get no information from anyone. Hitherto, we thought, about ourselves, a small society, surrounded by snakes and scorpions, that it was not possible that he knows about us, and his envoys could reach us. Yet, now we see his envoys, here is his grammar in our hands, and it is not with foreign envoys that we are speaking, but with our own brother Serbs, and they tell us that there exists a Peter the Great, Emperor and Autocrat (*Samoderzhavets*) of All Russia, and that his Kingdom is by God more blessed, strong and extensive than all the Kingdoms in the world. He fights with the Turks, and seeks no other glories than to free the churches and monasteries of Christ, to erect the cross and that the Christian family may be rid of the heavy Turkish yoke. We must pray to God that to him will be helpers, and we ourselves, taking arms and uniting with them [the Russians], will go against our common enemy. With the Russians we share one blood and one language. Arm yourselves, brother Montenegrins, and I…shall accompany you in the service of the Christian Tsar and our Homeland.[351]

The speech is a loaded one and must be read with a healthy degree of

[349] Kovalevskii, p. 53.
[350] Makushev, p. 122.
[351] Popov, p. 83.

scepticism. Popov cited a Montenegrin source where he apparently came across this speech, but that source's date of publication is 1835, 124 years after the speech allegedly took place. It is unclear where the Montenegrin source acquired a copy of this great speech. Furthermore, Popov presumably cited the speech with his Russian home audience in mind: the speech once again supports the Russian travellers' ongoing theme that Montenegro is a heroic country devoted to Russia, and long dependent on it for survival. Popov's chapter on Montenegrin history goes on to mention all the visits made by Montenegrin leaders to meet with various Tsars/ Tsarinas over the course of the eighteenth century, and the warm welcome these Montenegrins supposedly received in the land of their "brothers."

The Russian "efforts" on behalf of Montenegro were not the only reason cited by the travellers for their warm reception: religion and ethnicity were also important. As the travellers note frequently throughout their texts, the Montenegrins were extremely devout as a nation: Popov even cited religion as the defining aspect of their identity, claiming it gained such a central role because the Montenegrins were surrounded by "Muslims and Latins."[352] The persecution that Turkish rule entailed no doubt also helped to strengthen their faith. So strong was this feeling that Makushev feels certain it could never be "subverted by foreign intrigue or francophilia."[353] Makushev claimed that the locals, in their pure-hearted and simplistic way, firmly believed that Orthodoxy depends on Russia, and were certain that their king would never do anything on his own, without first consulting "the advice of the Russian Tsar, who in their understanding, loves his Montenegrin brothers as his own citizens." According to Makushev, the Montenegrins were convinced that if there was no Russia, "Christianity would fall in the East" and that a strong Tsar was needed to shield the people.[354] Montenegrins regarded Russia as the preserver of both their religion and nationality, and Makushev claimed he frequently came across a local saying "if there was no Russia, there would be no three pointed cross" which for him typifies the Montenegrins' complete trust in and reliance on his homeland.[355] Kovalevskii also notes that the Montenegrins are "under our protection," which he seems to think of as only natural, as they are "our brothers by spirit and tribe."[356] Interestingly, while the Russians all emphasise the Montenegrins' supposed devotion to their faith, this was not a universally held view: an Austrian report observed "except that they keep the fast,

[352] Popov, p. 124.
[353] Makushev, p. 151.
[354] Makushev, p. 152.
[355] Makushev, p. 139.
[356] Kovalevskii, p. 19.

they have no religion."[357] The Russians seemed to have drawn different conclusions.

Besides a supposedly shared common history, the theme of brotherhood based on ethnicity is common. It is hard to know exactly how the Russians perceived issues like race and nationality in the nineteenth century, but they expressed it repeatedly by talking about "common blood" and in particular by using the term "tribe" (*plemia*). However, beyond claims that the two people share one blood and faith, this notion remains poorly defined. Some of the Russian claims to "brotherhood" based on similarities seem exaggerated, in an attempt to deny any element of difference between the two peoples. Bronievskii described the Montenegrins as "a people, so close to us, and so little known, speaking the same language, having the same faith, coming from the same blood as we, their own native brothers."[358] This statement, in its attempt to portray the Montenegrins as similar to the Russians as possible, is typical of these travellers. It is, however, a great exaggeration: Serbian and Russian are closely related languages, but it is hard to believe the travellers really thought they were *the same*. Furthermore, it is hard to imagine exactly what Bronievskii imagined when he claimed they were "coming from the same blood." If he envisioned a great Slavic past, where all Slavs belonged to a one-blooded tribe, he fails to spell this belief out. Instead, what the quotation illustrates is the Russians' desire to create an image of brotherhood with Montenegro based on their alleged similarities, but a relationship where Russia has a role of paternalistic superiority, and Montenegro one of dependence.

Myth and Musical History

The Russians who travelled to Montenegro were all educated men, and many of them, such as Rovinskii, were established scholars who went on to publish numerous academic works on Montenegro as well as on other topics. Except for Bronievskii, the naval officer, all the travellers were in the region with a scholarly purpose, and with the intention of improving their level of knowledge about the local people and their culture. Some, such as Popov, even saw themselves as having a mission to improve the level of knowledge of the Slav lands in Russia, and travelled with this aim. However, whereas Russian travellers to other Slavic regions, such as the Czech lands, spent their time researching various aspects of Slavic history, language and literature in libraries, archives and universities, the Russians in

[357] Roberts, p. 161.
[358] Bronievskii, p. 295.

Montenegro did very little book- based scholarship during their journey. Some, such as Kovalevskii, clearly tried to seek out archives and written sources on local history, but the results do not appear to have been worth recording in any of the travelogues.[359]

The methods of historical research which worked well in Prague or Vienna were useless in Montenegro, as the scholars soon came to realise. In the mid nineteenth century the overwhelming majority of Montenegrins were illiterate, including members of the clergy. Written sources were thus very rare, and those that did exist were most likely predominantly religious texts. As already noted, the country had no written legal system, and the only book on Montenegrin history written by a local had been published in Russian by Vasilije, clearly not with a local reading audience in mind. However, simply because the Russians were not spending their time sitting in archives does not mean that they were not conducting research, or that their trips were not predominantly academic. Rather their work was largely ethnographic and was based upon the knowledge they extracted based on their interactions with the local population. Upon leaving the wedding he had clearly shrewdly observed, Kovalevskii claimed that he felt he had, in one afternoon, greatly expanded his scholarly collection of knowledge.[360]

With regards to the supposed historical connections between the two communities, Russians do claim to find Montenegrin sources to verify the claims of historical brotherhood. All the travellers note the importance of songs and epic poems in Montenegrin society. Rovinskii described the Montenegrins as a "musical people" and claimed that "no one has wilder songs" than they.[361] In their works, both Makushev and Popov draw heavily on Montenegrin epic poetry to underline the close bonds between Russians and Montenegrins. To read Makushev's analysis of Montenegrin poetry, one could easily get the impression that Russia and the Russian tsar's heroism against the evil Turks were the two major themes of the genre. Makushev provides numerous examples of poems, but none move substantially away from these ideas. Makushev claims that Montenegrin literature is heavily focussed on "brotherly love and agreement"[362] and it is for that reason that the theme of

[359] Kovalevskii, p. 45. Kovalevskii claims he deliberately sought out archives and manuscripts as part of his effort to construct an accurate overview of Montenegrin history. It is not clear what he actually found and studied.
[360] Kovalevskii, p. 37.
[361] Rovinskii, Mirovozzrenie chernogorskovo naroda," p.6.
[362] Makushev, p. 190.

Russian-Montenegrin brotherhood is so prevalent.[363] However, the passages quoted by Makushev seem to be more aimed at pleasing a home audience than providing concrete (or realistic) examples of Brotherhood.

The musical view of Montenegrin-Russian relations is as rosy as the Russians' "historical" findings. According to Makushev, the Tsar occupies a central role in many epic poems, and is thus one of the most important figures in Montenegrin poetry, a point that surely must have pleased the government authorities funding Makushev's travels. In the poems, the Tsar is depicted as being the model of a "strong, great and Orthodox" leader, who is the "ideal tsar."[364] The poems, at least in Makushev's interpretation of them, and to a large degree in defiance of historical realities, emphasise that the Montenegrins are infinitely grateful to Russia for defending them against the Turks during the eighteenth century. The endless homage that the poems pay to Russia appears to have no limits. One poem tells its listeners "don't fear, brothers, the glorious Tsar Alexander, the Tsar who gives all, that the leader asks, he loves his Montenegrin brothers, as his own Russians in Rus."[365] This reiterates the notion that Montenegrins and Russians are virtually the same nation, with the same generous Tsar watching over both peoples, and bestowing favours on the Montenegrins, as represented through their Vladika. Under the watchful eyes of the kind Tsar, the Montenegrins are told they can live without fear, as they will be taken care of.

The person of the strong Tsar preserves not only Montenegro as a territory, but the entire Orthodox world as well, since "there would be no cross with three points, were it not for the great eagle, the great Russian Tsar."[366] The Tsar is thus defender of Orthodoxy against the threat of the infidel Turks. Recognising this connection, poems instruct their listeners to drink "in the name of God the Great, and to the health of the Russian Tsar."[367] This faith is fast and unshakable in Makushev's view. So pure in spirit are the Montenegrins that the Russian claims that nothing, even the region's unfortunate history, is capable of disturbing their belief: "they still love their homeland, their faith and the Russian Tsar" regardless of

[363] Makushev, p. 187.
[364] Makushev, pp. 154-155.
[365] Makushev, p 163. For the word "Russia" Makushev has actually used the term "Rus" which, as Michael Cherniavsky has noted, has strong religious connotations, linking the country to a non- geographically defined spiritual past based on common Orthodox faith.
[366] Makushev, p. 185.
[367] Makushev, p. 186.

all hardships."[368] Perhaps it is precisely due to their strong faith that they recognise that "for the Slavs without Russia there is no future."[369] Although it seems more plausible that this is Makushev's view: he claims to be speaking on behalf of an entire nation.

Makushev's analysis poses interesting questions about the position of Russia within Europe, which is further complicated by the views presented by the other Russian travellers. On the one hand, the Russians claim to be Europeans when they are comparing their images of themselves and their home country to certain things they find different in Montenegro. These points, however, tend to be superficial, focussing on issues such as Montenegrin dress, which is "wild and savage" compared to European attire, and eating and drinking habits, which reflect Mediterranean and Turkish influence, such as the consumption of strong coffee.[370] In these cases, the Russians present themselves as Europeans in contrast with the "Asiatic" habits of the Montenegrins.

At other times, the travellers seem to refer to their country as standing apart from Europe. Interestingly, this is generally the case when they wish to demonstrate their superiority to the West. Several of the poems quoted by Makushev claim that "Russia is stronger than all of Europe" of "Russia is more terrifying than all Europe combined," clearly implying that Russia not only stands apart from Europe, but is superior to it.[371] This claim of Russia's superiority is illustrated by numerous examples of Russian heroism in battle against the Turks. According to the poetry, Russia defended the Montenegrins from the Turks, and would have been prepared to free the nation entirely and permanently, had the French and English permitted them.[372] The generosity of the Russian Tsars was not limited to the Slavs: another poem credits Tsar Mikhail for liberating Vienna from the Turks.[373] Thus the Russians are portrayed as being the saviours, not only of Slavdom, but of the entire Christian world, having defended Vienna from Islam. Yet, Makushev's study, while giving Russia the maximum attention and positive review in the context of Montenegrin poetry, does not see the contradictions of such a discourse. While Russia is referred to in such instances as being separate from "Europe," no geographical alternative is proposed. At no point do they ever directly claim that they are in any way Asians. Although they at times feel

[368] Makushev, p. 146.
[369] Makushev, p. 137.
[370] On dress see Makushev, p.151; on coffee see Makushev, p. 141.
[371] Makushev, pp. 153-154.
[372] Makushev, p. 153.
[373] Makushev, p. 155.

reminded of Asia in Montenegro, they also refrain from ever suggesting that Montenegrins are, as a people, Asiatic. Rather this term, which is largely used in a derogatory fashion, is generally reserved for the Turks, and is seen as a definition of inferiority. Yet, if the Montenegrins are not Asian, it is not clear what they are in the Russians' minds, as they frequently imply that Montenegro is not part of Europe.

This conflict recurs throughout the Russian travelogues on other regions as well as Montenegro: no clear notion of geographic belonging is ever consistently identified by the travellers, instead the travelogues reflect the genuine confusion that was widespread in Russian society at the time. Russians had effectively mirrored Western manners and dress, yet they recognised that they were still somehow apart from Western society. When it suited them, they took advantage of this difference by using it to demonstrate their superiority over the Western society they so imperfectly attempted to join. Yet, even while arguing their superiority over Europe, they never attempted to adhere to an alternative society, such as Asia. Instead the separation of Russia from the Other is imperfect and incomplete.

As Susan Layton notes in her work *Russian Literature and Empire*, the Mongols "loomed large in national consciousness as barbarians who had oppressed the homeland" for several centuries. Despite this view, Russia maintained a complex relationship with its Eastern neighbours. Many Asian peoples (and others) were incorporated into the Russian Empire under Catherine the Great, while the Empire maintained strong trade connections with both India and China. In their expansions, and in the cultural manifestations of expansion such as travel writing, the Russians "assumed a Western stance of superiority over the Orient. To build an Empire in Asia was to behave as a European dedicated to the spread of Christian civilisation."[374] In her example, Layton looks at Russian travel writing about the Caucasus and the way in which an Oriental identity was imposed on the region, allowing the Russians "to intensify their sense of Europeanness in religious, moral, and economic terms." Yet, even while doing so, Russians never succeeded in creating a completely Other version of Asia, as it represented an "organic part of Russian history." The result of these opposing backgrounds was a mixed sense of identity based on contradictory views about Asia and Europe.[375]

The Russians' writing on the Balkans reveals many of these tensions, albeit

[374] Layton, pp. 72-73.
[375] Layton, pp. 74-75.

not in an identical way to that outlined by Layton. The Russians' writings about aspects of Montenegrin culture tacitly acknowledge the organic connections to Asia, even if in an oblique way. For example, Kovalevskii writes within the space of a page that the Montenegrin tradition of buying wives is "Asiatic," but a few lines later he notes that similar traditions used to be common in Russia, seemingly thus implying that Russia was once itself "Asiatic." The notion that Russian is not part of Europe is also used when proclaiming superiority over the continent, either militarily, arguing that Russia is "stronger," or else intellectually, by claiming Russia must teach Europe about the Slavs. However, there is no doubt that the Russians see themselves as representing a Christian Empire, with a duty to save the Montenegrins from infidel domination.

In proclaiming their brotherhood with Montenegro, the Russians thus identify with a people who also have a complex relationship with Asia. Like Russia, the South Slavs had a myth of themselves as Christians who had been occupied by Asian barbarians in the form of the Muslim Turks. However, the fact that many South Slavs converted to Islam and accepted the official culture of the Turks complicated this view, as aspects of "Asia" were thus absorbed into the Slavic self. The Balkans was a perfect arena for this conflict to be played out. In Montenegro, the travellers found, and emphasised a local population living in terror of the Turks, a common non-European enemy against whose example the Russians could present themselves, through dress and manners, as Europeans. At the same time, in Montenegro, the Russians encountered a literature that neatly confirmed their discourse of superiority over Europe. No doubt this is a complication with which the Russians could identify, as they constructed an identity for themselves as the brothers of the Montenegrins, united in mutual opposition to the Asian, Turkish Other, and yet ever suspicious of the distant and often disdainful Western Other.

Chapter Three: Race versus Religion in Bosnia

Of all the travellers considered here, only two, Aleksandr Gil'ferding (1831-1872)[376]and Mihail Chaikovskii, ventured as far as Bosnia- Herzegovina and Old Serbia.[377] In part, this lack of travel to the region was due to the difficulties of transport, given the lack of roads and the Dinaric Alps, which blocked the region off from the coast. Additionally, the Turkish authorities seem to have obstructed and discouraged Russians from visiting the region in a way they did not in Serbia or Bulgaria, and could not in Montenegro. However, the main reason why so few made it to this region appears to lie in their perception of the area. Bosnia-Herzegovina and Old Serbia were regarded as "a wild and unknown land" or a "secret land," an image Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii both actively promoted. When Gil'ferding was trying to collect information on the region, prior to moving there, he claimed everyone he encountered spoke of it with "great fear," repeating it was "terrifying."[378] In his enquiries, Gil'ferding claimed that "all Slavs everywhere" speak of the region with terror, noting that the "fact" that the region was inhabited by "wild people is well known."[379] He went on to argue, not entirely accurately, that the region as "the least known and studied" in Europe, as it had been "for a long time completely inaccessible to foreigners" and there was nothing written about it "in European literature."[380] The little information he had managed to gather prior to his departure came from traders who had dealt with the region, but he complained that even that

---

[376] Some, in particular older, sources, spell Gil'ferding's name with an H (Hilferding), which was probably the original spelling of his German ancestors. As the writer under study was, however, born in the Russian Empire and spelt his name in the Russian fashion with a G, that spelling has been used here, as it has in more recent works on the writer.

[377] Old Serbia refers to the lands that comprised Serbia in medieval times, when the Serb lands expanded from Raška (Sandžak) to encompass Kosovo as well.

[378] Aleksandr Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia* (Bosnia, Herzegovina and Old Serbia) (St Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Imperialisticheskaia Akademiia Nauk, 1859), p. 7.

[379] Gil'ferding, p. 8.

[380] Ibid, p. v. This statement is not accurate. For example Edmund Spencer's *Travels in European Turkey in 1850: Through Bosnia, Servia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thrace, Albania and Epirus, with a visit to Greece and the Ionian Isles* was published in 1851 (London: Colburn and Co., 1851), while Croatian traveller Matija Mažuranić's book *A Glance into Ottoman Bosnia* was written earlier still, during the winter of 1839-1840. It is not clear if Gil'ferding was aware of these other works, and deliberately chose to market his book as "the first" on Bosnia in order to increase its exotic appeal, or if he was genuinely ignorant of Western literature on the subject. In a letter to his friend Khomiakov, he claims "no travellers from the West Slav lands or Russia" had been to the region. See Aleksandr Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Putevye Zametki: Pis'ma k A. S. Khomiakovu* (Bosnia, travel notes: the letters to A. S. Khomiakov) (Moscow: Semena, 1858), pp. 1-2.

was limited.[381] Understandably, such descriptions would discourage the majority of scholars. Yet Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii seem to have found this element of risk both appealing and marketable, one of the few common points they shared. Despite, or more likely because of, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Old Serbia's inaccessibility, and the lack of information on the region, the travelogues of these two writers were among the most popular of their time, albeit for very different reasons.[382]

The texts of Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii serve as an ideal medium for examining the ways in which travellers explored issues such as race and religion. The region was in many ways a microcosm of Russia itself: it was highly diverse, with Muslim, Orthodox, Jewish, and Roman Catholic populations and Turkish, Slavic and Albanian speakers. Furthermore, both Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii were clearly and deliberately writing for a home audience, and slanting their work to maximise their reading public, although they pitched their works in very different ways. How the two writers used language and religion to create their definitions of race and Slavdom illuminate similar efforts taking place in their home country. Their writing also shows how each imagined their Empire to be: Gil'ferding felt strongly that his was an Orthodox Empire and he saw Orthodoxy as essential to being a Slav; to adhere to any other religion, in his eyes, was to be a traitor to Slavdom. Chaikovskii, in contrast, wrote little of the Russian Empire as a political entity, as he saw Slavs as a race, existing both in and outside of Russia, and practising different religions. How these concepts emerged and were applied, and how notions of the Self were defined and perceived, form the topic of this chapter

Difference and Parallels

Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii were unique in that they were the only Russian travellers to have written of their travels in the Balkans during the

---

[381]Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p.8.

[382] Both Gil'ferding's and Chaikovskii's works were published abroad and translated into German shortly after they appeared in Russian. Chaikovskii's other books enjoyed considerable popularity and were published in Polish and German as well as Russian, in particular *Wernyhora*, which was published first in Polish in 1837 and then in German in 1843. In the 1870s, a number of Chaikovskii's works were serialized and published in the Russian press, including "Bolgariia" ("Bulgaria") in *Russkii Vestnik* (serialized in Nos. 6-11) "S ust'ev Dunaia" ("From the mouth of the Danube") in *Kievlianin* in 1873 and "Bosniia" ("Bosnia") in *Moskovskie Vedomosti* in 1875.

1850s. Generally there is a gap in travelogues during this period. After the revolutions of 1848, Tsar Nicholas I became increasingly paranoid about the spread of revolution to Russia, and he attempted to prevent such an occurrence by imposing a near total ban on foreign travel: all those wishing to venture abroad required the Tsar's personal written authorisation, which was rarely granted. As a result of this ban, combined with the strains of the Crimean War, travel to the Balkans nearly ceased, and even after Nicholas's death it took several years for travel to resume. However, neither Gil'ferding nor Chaikovskii were typical Russian travellers. As striking as their differences are, Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii's biographies also reveal striking similarities: both had strong connections to Poland and both became government functionaries. Yet the two men responded to their backgrounds in very different ways, with each reflecting debates and ideas current in Russian thought of the time. For this reason I have chosen to study their works comparatively, using their contrasting reactions to their own world to shed light on the debates in Russia on the issue of identity.

Of the two, Gil'ferding's background seems the more straightforward: he studied Slavic Studies at Moscow University, finishing in 1853. During this time he became very close friends with Slavophiles, in particular Khomiakov, and began publishing articles on Slavic history in journals such as *Moskvitianin* and *Moskovskie vedomosti*. In the mid 1850s, he joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and was made consul in Bosnia. Those who knew him suggest he was more interested in travelling and exploring the South Slav lands than he was in his government assignments, and possibly as a result he was transferred back to Russia and assigned to the State Chancellery in 1861, by which time he had already published the work for which he is best known, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia* (1859). In Russia, his views appear to have been consistent: He was anti-Polish and a devout Orthodox believer. He later became president of the St. Petersburg section of the Slavic Benevolent Committee and continued to publish extensively and teach on Slavic history. In his later years he became increasingly fervent in his Orthodox beliefs and dedicated himself to charitable work. It was during such voluntary activity among the poor that he contracted and died of typhus in 1872, age 41.

At first glance, his background appears that of a classic Slavophile,

similar to that of Ivan Aksakov or Khomiakov: like the other two, Gil'ferding attended Moscow University and was active in Moscow's publishing circles based around influential intellectuals of the day, such as Pogodin. Yet, closer examination reveals that his background was not as straightforward as it appears. Despite his views on the Poles, he had been born in Warsaw, and like Chaikovskii, was fluent in Polish. Furthermore, although he spent his public life as a firm Orthodox believer, he was a convert, his family having been from Saxony and Catholic by origin. Gil'ferding was baptised and raised a Roman Catholic until the age of 15, when on his own initiative, he converted to Orthodoxy,[383] making one wonder to what extent he was motivated by the "zeal of the convert" in his expressions of religiosity.

After his conversion, Gil'ferding moved to Moscow in 1848 to pursue his studies at Moscow University, where he was a student of well-known travellers Osip Bodianskii and Victor Grigorovich.[384] Early in his studies, Gil'ferding chose to focus on Slavonic Studies, and soon was actively involved in the so-called "Slavophile circle," becoming friends with the Kirevskii brothers, the Aksakov brothers, and in particular with Aleksei Khomiakov, with whom he maintained a lengthy and animated correspondence on the subject of the abroad Slavs.[385] Not a theorist, Gil'ferding was never a central member of the Slavophile group, but his letters to Khomiakov demonstrate that he was aware of, and sympathetic to, their beliefs. They were equally aware of his work. Iurii Samarin once wrote of Gil'ferding, "His is not a great intelligence, but a font of science, an indefatigable worker, fundamentally honest, and whose simplicity disarmed

---

[383] Ludmila Pavlova Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke* (The History of Slavic Studies in Russia in the nineteenth century) (Moscow: Indrik, 2005), p. 258.
[384] While still students in the late 1830s, Bodianskii and Grigorovich had been some of the earliest government sponsored scholars sent to the Slav lands with the aim of improving the level of teaching of Slavic Studies in Russia. Bodianskii subsequently taught at Moscow University, and Grigorovich at Kazan University. However, Grigorovich happened to be guest-teaching in Moscow when Gil'ferding was beginning his studies there and the two men worked closely together on several projects. See Ludmila Pavlova Lapteva, *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX- nachale XX veka* (Slavic Studies at Moscow University in the nineteenth to the beginning of twentieth Centuries) (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1997), p. 91.
[385] Lapteva, *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX- nachale XX veka*, pp. 92-93.

even the most hostile."[386]

While Gil'ferding's background differs in some ways from that of other travellers, it is at least well known, and has been the subject of considerable study in Russian historiography.[387] This is not the case for Mikhail Stanislavovich Chaikovskii, about whom little is known. It seems that part of the appeal of his writing is in the mystery of the writer. Despite the fact that he published his autobiography, numerous questions remain about his origins. Some documents refer to him by the clearly Polish rendering of his name "Czajkowski," while many others use his Islamicised name Sadyk Pasha. He published under the name Chaikovskii [Чайковский], yet he published both in Polish and Russian, clearly writing both comfortably. According to his memoirs, he was born in1808 in Ukraine, although he claims his parents were both Polish *szlachta*, and thus presumably Catholic. He wrote that his mother had sung songs to him as a baby about the wonders of the Danube, and that he grew up dreaming of seeing it. Telling his family he had found work in Kiev, he and a friend ran off to the Danube, crossing into the Ottoman Empire.[388] Yet other sources present a different story. Thomas Prymak concluded that Chaikovskii was born in 1804, in Halchyn, in what is now Ukraine, and that he was the descendant of Ukrainian Cossacks who had been Polonized.[389] He apparently participated in the 1831 Uprising, and after its failure fled to Paris. While in Paris, he flirted with both the extreme left and the extreme right of the Polish exile political groups. From here, the truth becomes murkier still. It seems he moved to the Ottoman Empire in the 1840s, and worked there to assist the Polish cause against Russia. He entered Turkish state service in 1851, after converting to Islam, possibly to escape extradition to Russia. He fought in

---

[386] A. Gatieux, *A.S. Khomiakov et le mouvement Slavophile: les hommes* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1939, vols. I, II.) vol. I, p. 174, see footnotes on Samarin.

[387] Ludmila Lapteva has written extensively on Gil'ferding's life and works, see for example the chapter devoted to Gil'ferding in her work *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX-nachale XX veka*.

[388] Mikhail Chaikovskii, *S Ust'ev Dunaia* (From the mouth of the Danube) (Kiev, 1973), pp. 11-13.

[389] Thomas Prymal, "The Strange Life of Sadyk Pasha." *Forum: A Ukrainian Review*, No. 50 (1982), pp. 28-31. According to Prymal, Chaikovskii held a fascination for the Cossacks his entire life, and wrote several books about them, some of which, such as *Powieści Kozackie* (Cossack Tales), enjoyed considerable popularity at the time and were translated into French and German.

the Balkans against Russia in the Crimean War, and spent most of his Ottoman career in the Balkans, in particularly in Bosnia. Equally mysteriously, he was granted amnesty by the Russian government in 1872 and in 1873 he converted to Orthodoxy and went to live in Kiev. It was there that he committed suicide, possibly because his wife was unfaithful, in 1886.[390]

The two men wrote very different kinds of works, both in terms of style and prospective audience. Yet both represent attempts to move the genre of scientific travel writing away from the strict statistical style of travellers such as Grigorovich and towards a more popular approach. Gil'ferding's is a travelogue of his voyage around the region, Chaikovskii's purports to be the same, yet in reality it blurs the lines between fiction, travel and autobiography, leaving the reader to wonder which parts are actually true, and which the products of a creative imagination. Gil'ferding's opus became a seminal work of Russian scholarly travel writing, and is cited as an example by many other Russian travellers, such as Ivan Aksakov, as well as in many Western sources, including works by Western travel writers, such as Georgina Muir Mackenzie.[391] Gil'ferding himself was quite clear about his purpose in writing: his goal was to make Bosnia and Herzegovina better known to Russian audiences. He argued that the region was of particular significance to Russian readers because it was populated by Slavs who were "especially close to Russia and important to her."[392] He stated in the preface that his work would disappoint those looking for "technical detail on the region" as it concentrated on local traditions and

---

[390] For more on Chaikovskii's complicated biography, see Prymak's above cited work.

[391] See for example, Georgina Muir Mackenzie and Adelina Paulina Irby, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (London, 1866), p. 252 and p. 687. Gil'ferding's activities attracted attention abroad. Of Gil'ferding's activity regarding education in Bosnia, the *Scottish Guardian* wrote in 1865 "The Russian traveller and author, Hilferding, deserves the thanks of civilized beings for having induced the Empress and other benevolent persons to send some help to these female schools." See *The Scottish Guardian: Volume the Second*, Aberdeen, (1865), p. 168. Sir Arthur Evans also makes several references to Gil'ferding's travelogue in his own work *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot During the Insurrection* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1877). See in particular the introduction,p. xxviii. He is also cited in several Western academic sources from the nineteenth century, including Georges Perrot, *Gli Slavi meridonali* (1875), p. 108; Celeste Courriere, *Histoire de la literature contemporaine chez les Slaves* (Paris, 1879), p. 116; Donato Fabianich, *Il presente e il passato de Bosnia, Erzegovina e Albania* (The Present and past of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Albania) (Florence, 1879), p.272. Many of these travelers accessed Gil'ferding's work via the German language translation *Bosnien: Reise- Skizzen aus dem Jahre 1857*, which was published in 1858, however Muir MacKenzie refers to a partial Serbian language edition which she claims to have come across during her travels.

[392] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. v.

habits, not geographical tables with complex figures.[393] Instead of citing quantitative facts, Gil'ferding drew his authority from his emotions, describing how he felt in various situations, and how he responded emotionally to the people he encountered on his journey. Despite his self-proclaimed appeal to the masses, Gil'ferding's work remained a serious piece of writing and was published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, one of the Empire's most prestigious scholarly presses. It appealed to educated circles. Gil'ferding later tried to publish some articles that moved closer to fiction in genre, such as his *Letopis' Bosnii*, in which he claims to have found a "real Bosnian" to tell him the history of the region, which he then translated and recorded, yet this work is more of a fictional justification for telling his own version of the region's history. These minor works, however, did not reach the fame and popularity of his better-known travelogue.

Chaikovskii, meanwhile, aimed his writing at a much more popular audience. His most famous work, *Turetskie anekdoti*, was published by, and dedicated to, the Moscow publicist Mikhail Katkov, who first serialised the work in his daily newspaper and then later republished it as a whole on the eve of the Eastern Crisis. It is a highly commercial work, and features chapters with sensational titles such as "Murder in the harem," seemingly a world away from Gil'ferding's more high-brow approach. Some of the events described in the work might stretch the imagination, yet in his introduction Chaikovskii claimed that these events were true, and the result of more than thirty years spent living and travelling in the Ottoman Empire. He wrote that the work only contains events "at which I myself was witness" and "observed with my own eyes" and that he decided to record them and his various adventures in order to preserve the memories "for my grandchildren."[394] It is entirely possible that large sections of his work are more fiction that fact, yet such discrepancies were not original to Chaikovskii. Rather, sensationalizing travelogues were increasingly common (and popular) in nineteenth century Europe. The lack of truth does not necessarily detract from the work's merits, as Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs have argued; such forgeries "continue to exert fascination and to

[393] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. vi.
[394] Mikhail Chaikovskii, *Turetskie anekdoti (*Turkish Anecdotes) (Kiev, 1873), p. 4. All following Chaikovskii citations are from this volume unless indicated otherwise.

cast light on their legitimate brethren."[395] Ultimately, Chaikovskii's work is valuable as it illuminates his views of Russia, not only the accuracy of his descriptions of the Ottoman Empire.

In addition to aiming at different target audiences, the two works seem to differ in perspective. While Gil'ferding's work followed the approach of many of the books considered here, in which the writer presented himself as a Slavic insider travelling amongst his brethren, Chaikovskii took a different approach. His work was clearly aimed at a Russian audience: for example, it sought to explain "exotic" details of Turkish life, which would be superfluous were the target audience itself Turkish. Yet, while presenting these details, he derived his authority by repeatedly citing his position as a Turkish insider. He claimed to have converted to Islam, and thus travelled throughout the Ottoman Empire using his Islamic name, Sadik Pasha, which allowed him to experience a world inaccessible to most Russians. Throughout his writing, Chaikovskii claimed to have enjoyed a position very close to the highest levels of the Ottoman administration, becoming friends with members of the Sultan's inner circle. He even "complained" that every time a new war looms on the horizon, all Western diplomats in the region turn to him for advice.[396] It is never explained how he came to enjoy such a rare and distinguished position. One possibility is that he invented the entire scenario so as to lend credence to his writing and make it appear more believable, and thus sensational. Whatever the truth of his position in the Ottoman lands, however, he did clearly spend enough time amongst Ottomans to gain a unique insight into their customs. The degree to which he later embellished on these experiences is a separate issue, which does not necessarily detract from the value of his work. Much like Gil'ferding's, Chaikovskii's book is filled with ethnographic detail and observations of Ottoman civilisation, but while Chaikovskii observed Muslim society and traditions, Gil'ferding concentrated on the Orthodox community.

Despite his claim to being a Turkish insider, Chaikovskii took pains to assure his audience that his many years away did not change his true loyalties,

---

[395] Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, "Introduction," in Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, eds., *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 6.
[396] Hulme, p. 105.

for “I myself am a Slav, and a man of the East by heart, soul, birth and liking.” What he meant by this last phrase is unclear. It appears that Chaikovskii used the term as a way of reconciling the complexities of his diverse background, creating a definition that encompassed the Polish and the Russian, the Catholic and the Orthodox. While his autobiography revealed that he was in contact with Polish exiles in the Ottoman Empire, he stopped short of identifying himself as Polish. He also refrained from identifying specifically with Russia, referring to himself simply as being “a Slav.” What this reflects about his background is perhaps its ambiguity and sheer lack of clarity. One possibility is that he was ashamed of his Polish origins, and chose to downplay them. Yet this seems unlikely, for unlike Gil’ferding’s travelogue, Chaikovskii’s does not reveal the zealousness often thought to characterise the convert. Given Chaikovskii’s approach to literature, it seems more probable that he decided to write in Russian in order to tap into the larger market of the Russian reading public, which was craving literature on the Balkans at the time, and that in light of the recent 1861 uprising, emphasising his Polish origins might have hurt his book’s sales. It is also possible that issues regarding national identity and religion were not of great importance to Chaikovskii. References to religion or a national identity in a political sense are minimal, while references to “Slavs” are numerous. Chaikovskii’s vision of Slavdom extended beyond the borders of empires and was not restricted to defined political borders. As a result of their different approaches and backgrounds, it is hardly surprising that the works of Gil’ferding and Chaikovskii provide contrasting views of the same land, yet the popularity enjoyed by both works suggests that even in their difference, they contained messages that appealed to Russian audiences, and highlighted various aspects of Russians’ relationship to its southern neighbour, as well as of Russia itself.

Both Gil’ferding and Chaikovskii used the Balkans as the forum in which they debated the importance of race and religion in defining concepts such as brotherhood and Slavdom. Yet, despite their similar choice of location, they reached drastically different conclusions, suggesting that at this time these categories were still elastic and debatable. Furthermore, the works are often internally inconsistent. Gil’ferding’s writing in particular is filled with

contradictions and paradoxes. Rather than seeing this as the product of a confused or unreliable mind, it seems that these inconsistencies reflect the genuine ambiguity of Russia's position in the world, and Gil'ferding's interpretation of this position. Although he was strongly attached to his ideology, always presenting his views with dogmatic conviction, Gil'ferding's ideology was a flexible and constantly evolving one, lacking the rigid parameters that generally characterise a belief system. The contradictions in his work must thus be studied for what they reveal about Gil'ferding's times, rather than dismissed as illogical.

These contradictions found in Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii's writing reflect very similar contradictions taking place in the Russian Empire at the time. Although both models were debated, no decision was ever reached over whether Russia should be defined as a nation or an empire. Paul Werth has argued that Russia became a 'strange hybrid' in a relationship to three available state models- dynastic composite, national, and modern colonial empire."[397] While no consensus emerged, there was no lack of intellectual debate on the subject, and at different times, Russian government officials experimented with different models in different parts of the empire, with the result that it is nearly impossible to come up with an easy definition for how the empire dealt with its different nationalities. For example, there is evidence that, at times, Muslim leaders cooperated with the tsarist government, and even used the regime to their benefit. Rather than antagonising the empire's numerous Muslims through forced conversions, which "stirs irrational passions,"[398] Catherine the Great instead "sought to transform religious authority in each community into an instrument of imperial rule."[399] Her approach was not the only one, however. In his book, Werth examines how the Russian empire attempted to deal with religion in the Volga-Kama region, where it absorbed a large number of non-Christian and non-Slavic people. In this area, the government sponsored

---

[397] Paul Werth quoted in Jane Burbank and Mark von Hagen. "Coming into the Territory: Uncertainty and Empire," *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700-1930*, ed. by Jane Burbank, Mark Von Hagen, and Anatolyi Remnev (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), p. 19. See also Werth's article, "Changing Conceptions of Difference, Assimilation, and Faith in the Volga-Kama Region, 1740-1870" in the same collection.
[398] Robert Crews, *For Prophet and Tsar* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), p. 40.
[399] Crews, p. 2.

missionaries in an effort to use conversion to Orthodoxy as a means of assimilating people into the empire. Among the local populations, some accepted Orthodoxy as a means of joining the empire's mainstream, while others clung even more steadfastly to their native beliefs. In some places, efforts to push conversion aroused resentment, and provoked strong resistance, such as the jihad launched by the Bashkirs against the Russians in the early eighteenth century. In many areas, such as in Dagestan, the Russians allowed local religious traditions to remain intact. This appears to have been largely for practical reasons; it was easier to pacify people by letting them keep their faith than to risk outright conflict by attacking it. The contradictions of the Russian approach were often personal as much as institutional. Although the Minister of Education, Sergei Uvarov attempted to establish a firmer concept of Russianness through his 1832 "Official Nationality" definition of Orthodoxy, Nationality and Autocracy, he himself was fascinated by Chinese and Japanese spirituality and philosophy, which he saw as "a font of wisdom for all the world."[400]

Central to the debate was the problem of definitions and perception. How did one define a Slav? Were all members of the Orthodox Church to be considered as Russia's brothers? If not, why? What was the connection of Slavness to Orthodoxy and to "brotherhood"? These problems were central to Russia's perception of itself. They also revealed one of the central paradoxes of defining both Russianness and Orthodoxy. The Orthodox Church, following the Byzantine tradition, proclaimed that all believers were one, and distinctions should only be made between believers and non-believers, not amongst the faithful. Yet, as the first chapter has shown, Russians did not identify Greeks or Romanians as their brothers in the way they did the South Slavs. At the same time, Russia is the world's biggest country, heir to the Mongol tradition, which saw peoples of various religions and ethnicities bound by adherence to a common ruler and political institution. Thus, the dilemma that has never been resolved in Russian history is whether a Russian can be defined as someone living in Russia, or must he be an Orthodox person, living in (or outside) of

[400] Robert Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), p. 158.

Russia? In sum, does he need to be Orthodox and of Slavic origin?[401]

Furthermore, the term Slav was hardly transparent. Though much used at the time, there was little agreement as to what the term actually meant. These questions are especially relevant for Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii, given their complex relationship to Poland. Chaikovskii saw Poles as "Slav" on grounds of language and "race," but Gil'ferding dismissed Poland as a land of traitors, due to their Catholic religion, implying that for him Orthodoxy was an essential part of being a "proper" Slav. Equally ambiguous is their use of the term "Turk": Chaikovskii defined it in linguistic terms, whilst Gil'ferding applied it to apply to any Muslim, except the Albanians, who for some reason emerge as a separate, and in Gil'ferding's mind, inferior people. In their struggle to define peoples, the Russians were not alone, but rather participating in a European-wide inquiry. In the eighteenth century, scholars sought explanations, not only to account for the origin of men, but also for the large diversity found among human beings.[402] Some argued that all humans had a common origin but due to conditioning factors had evolved differently, while others argued for a polygenic version of men's origins. In the nineteenth century, scientists sought to categorize people by their taxonomic differences in hopes of gaining a greater understanding. Techniques used included craniometry and anthropometry, whilst Sir Francis Galton, English tropical explorer, anthropologist (and cousin of Charles Darwin) used questionnaires and surveys to collect statistics on African populations. This "scientific racism" and its finding were frequently used by certain colonial powers to justify their ongoing domination of foreign peoples, while in the United States, scientific arguments were used to justify the continuation of slavery. On a popular level, "human zoos" enjoyed great visibility in cities such as New York, London and Mexico City.

Within a European context, Johann Herder applied the term "race" to nationalist theory. Herder focused on language and cultural traditions as the ties

---

[401] The problem of identifying Russianness remains a current polemic. The Soviets claimed that everyone was a Soviet citizen, regardless of nationality. The question re-emerged under Yeltsin's government. For more on this topic see Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia and the Russians* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), especially chapter 15.

[402] For example, Montesquieu argued for the importance of geographic factors such as climate on the development and character of a people; for more see *Spirit of Laws* (Paris, 1748). Meanwhile, Kant also debated the possible origins of men in his influential essay "On the Different Races of Men" (1775).

that created a nation. Herder's ideas were influential in Russia, but they do not appear to have held much sway over Gil'ferding. The two Russians being examined here defined their terms in different fashions. Gil'ferding adhered to a religious-based concept of identity, defining a Slavic- speaking Muslim as a "Turk" and an Albanian-speaking Christian as a "Serb." Obviously, the vast majority of people Gil'ferding referred to as "Turks" were actually Muslim Slavs. He seems to use this expression as an alternative to saying "Muslim." He rarely distinguished between Turks from what is today Turkey and Slavic Muslims, and when he did, he indicated regional origin. Chaikovskii's references were closer to Herder's in that they were based on linguistic grounds, arguing that anyone speaking a Slav tongue was a Slav. Yet, they differed from Herder in their apparent disregard for the inclusion of "folk" factors, such as dance, music and poetry in defining the nation. In this respect, Chaikovskii's definitions are closer to a modern definition of race based on bloodline, which he is adamant should not be allowed to be contaminated.[403]

Interestingly, while the Russians struggled to define these terms, the Ottomans did not. In Bosnia, as elsewhere in their empire, they consistently refused to acknowledge the existence of ethnicity and/or race, using religion as the sole means of classifying people. The followers of different religions were organised into millets, with each millet having its own leadership, and providing for its community's schools, hospitals and places of worship. Religion was the only determining factor in deciding to which millet one belonged, and conversion to Islam offered the opportunity to change millets and advance in Ottoman society. For several of the Russians seen here, including Gil'ferding,

---

[403] Chaikovskii frequently speaks in terms of the Slavs all belonging to the same "tribe" (*plemia*). The *Dal'* dictionary from the time defines *plemia* in slightly different terms than the word "tribe" might indicate, claiming it refers to " a nation (*narod*), language or local roots." See Vladimir Dal', *Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka* (St. Petersburg: Volf Editorial, 1882). The travellers do not actually use the term "ethnicity" to describe the feelings of kinship they feel with the South Slavs, although the sentiments they express fit many, although not all of the criteria often cited for such a definition. John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith have defined an ethnicity as people sharing: 1. A common name, 2. A common myth of ancestry, 3. Shared historical memories, 4. Elements of a common culture, 5. A link to a homeland, 6. A sense of solidarity. Using such criteria, it is clear that such definitions do not present a perfect fit: Russian never shared a common homeland with the South Slavs, and many other features are tenuous at best, such as the notion of shared historical memories. Thus while it is tempting to see Chaikovskii's text in terms of modern notions of ethnicity, it is not really an appropriate model. For more on defining ethnicity see John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith, eds., *Ethnicity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 6-8.

being Orthodox was not enough to be considered part of the imagined Self- it was necessary to be Slavic as well. For the Ottomans however, being Muslim was enough, at least until the *Tanzimat*, to be included in the ruling Self.[404]

This issue was central to Russian debates on identity, even if it was not unique to Russia. Refuting Gil'ferding's claim that he was the first traveller to Bosnia and Herzegovina, is the travelogue of Matija Mažuranić, who travelled in Bosnia in 1839-1849, over a decade before Chaikovskii and Gil'ferding. Matija was the youngest of five brothers, several of whom (notably Antun and Ivan) played significant roles in Croatia's Illyrian movement. By 1839, a new generation of Croatian intellectuals was busy defining the intellectual framework that would give Croatia its own cultural identity within the Habsburg Empire and lay the foundations of a modern nation. Their investigation into the definitions of terms like "Slav," "Croat," and "Illyrian" led to an increased interest in neighbouring Bosnia.[405] According to many young Croatian intellectuals, such as the Mažuranić, brothers, all South Slavs were the descendants of the ancient Illyrians. In the era of the Illyrians, they believed, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina were all part of the same land.[406] Yet, by 1839, much of the population of Bosnia was strongly Muslim, although speaking the same language as Croats: were these people Illyrians or not?[407] It was for this reason that Antun and Ivan Mažuranić decided to despatch their younger brother Matija to Bosnia in the winter of 1839 to determine the

---

[404] Justin McCarthy, "Ottoman Bosnia, 1800-1878," in Mark Pinson, ed., *The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 58. By the last century of the Ottoman Empire's existence, this system was starting to look outdated even to the Ottoman leadership, some of whom advocated moving to a more modern, secular and Western way of defining the inhabitants of the empire. In an attempt to achieve this, the men of the *Tanzimat*, who had been charged with reforming the empire, favoured the use of the term *Osmanlilik*. The *Tanzimat* however was never well received in Bosnia, and the concept of *Osmanlilik* never managed to become widely accepted in any part of the empire. Much has been written on the *Osmanlilik* and its failure. See, for example, George Gawrych, " Tolerant Dimensions of Cultural Pluralism in the Ottoman Empire," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol 15, No. 4 (Nov. 1983), pp. 519-536; Nesim Seker, "Identity Formation and the Political Power in the Late Ottoman Empire and Early Turkish Republic," *HAOL*, No. 8, (Autumn, 2005), pp. 59-67. Also see Fatma Muge Gocek, *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[405] Branka Magaš. "Introduction" in Matija Mažuranić, *A Glance into Ottoman Bosnia* (London: SAQI, 2007), p. 8, (Original date of publication 1846).
[406] Magaš, p. 9.
[407] Many, such as leading Illyrian Janko Drašković, argued not, although the reasons specified for this exclusion were never clearly presented, except for the obvious religious divide.

sentiments and national inclinations of the local population. Matija Mažuranić concluded that although there was widespread discontent among the Bosnian Muslim population with the Porte, their movement was nevertheless mainly Muslim-focussed in its nature, and that the possibility of a pan-Illyrian movement involving the participation of the Bosnian Muslims was slight. Like Mažuranić, both Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii struggled with these issues, and each reached dramatically different conclusions.

Islam: Absence, Destruction and Ruin

The feeling of difference hit Gil'ferding instantly as he crossed into the Ottoman Empire. Even before setting off from Dubrovnik, the traveller said he felt pangs of fear, writing he was headed for an "enigmatic region."[408] After he crossed the border, he was instantly aware that he was not in a friendly or brotherly place: everyone in the vicinity came to stare at him, as they had never seen a real, live "Muscovite" before. According to Gil'ferding, the Turks, like many of the Russians in Gil'ferding's set, saw Russia as a symbol of Christianity, and the Russian Tsar as the defender of the religion and its practitioners. However, while conservative Russian intellectuals such as Ivan Aksakov saw this role as both a duty and a point of honour, Gil'ferding claimed the Turks saw it as a symbol of all that was wrong with Russia. They assured Gil'ferding that "all infidels are evil, but the most evil infidel is the Muscovite." Gil'ferding noted furthermore, that the term "Muscovite" was used in Turkish as a slander. He attributed this to the fact that the Turks, much like himself, identified Russia as a symbol of Christianity. Rather than be offended to hear such things said of his country, the Russian seemed rather pleased at this seemingly universal acceptance of his homeland's position, and neither challenged nor questioned the Turkish guards' views.[409] Gil'ferding's notion of

---

[408] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p.3.

[409] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia* , p.6. Gil'ferding was not the only traveller to note this use of vocabulary. Matija Mažuranić also overhears the Turks using the term "Moskov" to speak disrespectfully to a prisoner, yet he identifies the term with different connotations than Gil'ferding, explaining "Ever since the Bosniaks fought the Russians at Istanbul and many became Russian prisoners of war, the word Moscow has remained embedded in their minds. This is why Bosnian gentlefolk when angry will call a Christian 'Moskov,' meaning someone who is stubborn, disobedient, arrogant or insubordinate." See Mažuranić, p. 107.

Russia as a symbol of Europe and Christianity was reinforced by his descriptions of Turkish dress. He claimed Bosnian Muslims hated the new style of Turkish dress recently introduced. This vaguely European-style outfit was dismissed as "Muscovite" by the traditional Bosnians who spurned it, once again reinforcing the idea of Moscow, or Russia, as a despised but immediately recognisable symbol of Europe in the Turkish mind.[410]

After leaving the border behind and setting off on the road to Mostar, Gil'ferding wrote "and here I am on Turkish land, amongst the wild people, but at first the people are not visible, and everything is stone." Gil'ferding's initial reaction to the land was one of emptiness, destruction and ruin. Like the numerous West Europeans who would travel in the region, Gil'ferding's reaction was that of a European traveller: a representative of the "civilised world" confronting what he saw as an inferior model. The inferior nature of Ottoman rule was clear to Gil'ferding immediately at the border crossing. He found the border guards to be very corrupt, obeying a "master" whom they changed every year in an attempt to win material gain, although Gil'ferding thought it hardly mattered which "master" they served, as trade at the border crossing was so minimal that no amount of bribery would ever lead to riches. Gil'ferding saw this as a sign that the whole Empire was rotten with "corruption everywhere." The Russian condemned the presence of corruption with the moral indignation, in his own words, of a "civilised" European.[411] Gil'ferding was certainly not alone in this view. Rather, he was expressing one variant of a common Western stereotype of Ottoman officials. Articles in such magazines as the influential *Macmillan's* wrote of the Ottoman Empire, "the officers of the government are, with scarcely an exception, corrupt. And the ministers are universally distrusted."[412] This view was seconded by Western travellers such as Edmund Spencer, who wrote that the sad state of affairs in the Ottoman Christian lands showed "how far a corrupt, enfeebled

---

[410] See letter to Khomiakov in Aleksandr Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Putevye Zametki: Pis'ma k A. S. Khomiakovu* (Bosnia, Travel notes: Letters to A.S. Khomiakov) (Moscow: Semena, 1858), p.9.
[411] Gilderding, ibid, p. 6. Gil'ferding's accusations of corruption on the part of Turkish authorities is especially ironic as Russian border guards were well-known for similar excesses in the nineteenth century.
[412] "The Christian Subjects of Turkey," in *Macmillan's Magazine*, edited by Sir George Grave, David Masson, John Morley and Mowbray Morris (Edinburgh, 1860), vol. II, pp. 452-463, quote p. 462.

administration has contributed to their ruin." Adelina Paulina Irby and Georgina Muir MacKenzie reached similar conclusions, also complaining of "corrupt Turkish officials."[413] It is interesting that Gil'ferding identified himself here with Western "civilisation," attacking corruption with the same vigour as his Western counterparts, and seeing the presence of corruption among Turkish officials as symbolic of their supposedly general state of degeneration.

There is no trace of irony in his writing: Gil'ferding wrote with the conviction of a man who was truly disgusted by what he had witnessed. Yet the fashion in which he described Ottoman corruption was very similar to the way in which many Western travellers described Russia. The same Macmillan article cited above claimed one of the chief threats facing the Ottoman Orthodox population was "the despotism of Russia."[414] The article painted the Russian Empire as a demonised Other interfering with European peoples, who were equated with democratic traditions, something Russia was seen to lack. Not only did some Western travellers see Russia as playing the despot in the region, they also complained frequently of Russia's endemic corruption. An article in *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Arts* proclaimed that Russian state officials were "the most corrupt body in the world. Bribery has increased, until it became one of the national institutions."[415] Another Western writer and traveller marvelled that "the police in Russia are as corrupt as the other government officials. It is asserted that acknowledged thieves possess in St. Petersburg perfect security in their pursuit of their vocation. The police derive such vast sums from their plunder that they dare not arrest them."[416]

Gil'ferding saw Ottoman corruption as representative of Islam's inherent degeneracy, yet he never questioned the practices of officials in his

---

[413] See Spencer, op. cit., p. 451 and Irby and Muir Mackenzie, op. cit., p. xxiv.
[414] The article describes the Russian government as one "which does not admit even any expression of opinion contrary to the views of the administration." The author finds this contrary to the supposedly democratic tradition of the West. Interestingly, the author includes the Greeks in his mental map of the West, since there is "a love of personal freedom inherent in the Greek race." *Macmillans*, p. 459.
[415] In *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Arts*, edited by William Chambers and Robert Chambers (1864), vols. 21-22, p.310.
[416] Samuel Mosheim Smucker, *The Life and Reign of Nicholas the First, Emperor of Russia, with Descriptions of Russian Society and Government* (Philadelphia: J.W. Bradley, 1860), p. 205.

own country. Nor did he ever equate being "civilised" with democracy, as did several of the Western travelogues. It is thus unclear what his intention was in including the incident of corruption in his book. Was it a moment of blindness to the happenings in his own country? Or a deliberate attempt to write himself and his people into the civilised West? Or simply a way of creating a distance between himself and the Muslim Ottomans? Though his aim remained unclear, the episode clearly served to buttress one of Gil'ferding's central arguments, the degeneracy caused by Islam, and the belief that pre-Islamic, "pure Slavic" traditions had been superior.

References to the supposed degeneracy of Islam are numerous. As soon as he enters Turkish territory, Gil'ferding was aware of the deterioration in the quality of the roads, complaining that Turks "seem to think building roads is not their business."[417] He was surprised that even the roads are made from stone, noting "Europeans would be horrified" if they saw them, apparently including himself among this appalled mass. At the border post, Gil'ferding spotted a "devastated *izba*" and was shocked when the guards told him that it was in great condition by local standards.[418] This would be the first of many times Gil'ferding reported such an encounter. Later while travelling through the village of Ljubinje, he saw an utterly destroyed *izba* and enquired who could possibly live in such a place. The answer was "a Muslim." Gil'ferding concluded that the Muslims bring with them massive destruction. He complained that everything that belonged to Muslims got destroyed and deserted, as Muslims in his view were not capable of constructing or creating, only of tearing down. Gil'ferding claimed their settlements consisted of houses without windows, doors or roofs, and he concluded, "everywhere a Muslim lives, that place goes to pieces."[419] Unlike the Christian population, the Turks were generally dirty, and the towns poorly constructed: everything was built with stone and "sad looking." The streets were narrow and the buildings so close together that they blocked walkways.[420] The houses were

[417] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 5.
[418] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 6.
[419] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 31.
[420] On Turkish construction and living conditions see Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia* , pp. 26-27. On supposed Christian cleanliness in contrast to Islamic dirtiness, see ibid, p.113.

constructed in such a way so as to divide the inhabitants by gender and maintained separation between men and women, which Gil'ferding found exotic.[421] He found neither the architecture nor the conditions in which he claimed Muslims lived to his taste. Even the air in Turkey turned one fatalistic, Gil'ferding concluded.[422]

Gil'ferding tried to emphasise the supposedly destructive nature of the Turks through a quasi-scientific study of linguistic borrowings. He claimed that Serbian, though it had generally remained pure to its Slavic origins, had over time adopted certain words from Turkish. Gil'ferding claimed this reflected the role the Turks had played in the region. He wrote that the chief words that had been borrowed were those to do with destroying things, since that was what the Turks generally did, and their destructive streak was reflected in their language, unlike the Slavic language, which prior to the Turkish invasion did not possess such vocabulary.[423] He also claimed that the Serbs had no verb equivalent to the Russian *ekhat'*, as they had no real understanding of the concept of roads, having been denied them, apparently by the Ottomans' poor infrastructure planning.[424] This argument in particular was a deeply flawed one. It ignored the huge number of, for example, culinary terms that even today can be heard in modern Serbian, which would imply, according to Gil'ferding's rudimentary application of linguistics, that Serbs had no refined cuisine prior to Ottoman rule. It is also an ironic line of investigation for a Russian: at no point did Gil'ferding consider the large number of non-Slavic words in his own language, borrowed from Western languages such as French and German, as well as those terms taken from the period of Mongol occupation. Were his linguistic logic to hold true, he would be implying his own culture did not possess concepts such as money prior to the Mongol invasion, something he doubtless would have denied.[425]

---

[421] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 21.
[422] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 29.
[423] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 36.
[424] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 34. The verb *ekhat'* in Russian means "to go by transport" as opposed to going by foot. This implies, at least in Gil'ferding's mind, the existence of roads by which to travel by transport. For some reason, Gil'ferding does not apply this same logic to other languages: many European languages, French, English, Italian and Spanish among them, lack this distinction but certainly did not lack for roads.
[425] Such as the Russian term for money, *dengi*, or the word for dog, *sobaka*.

Yet Gil'ferding's use of language in history was not as far fetched as it may seem: such approaches were hotly debated at Moscow University, where Gil'ferding chose to spend several years studying linguistics. It appears such attempts at linguistic analysis on Gil'ferding's part were the result of Khomiakov's great personal influence. Strongly believing that language reflected a people's psychology, Khomiakov argued that individual words represented oral monuments, capable of testifying to a peoples' past. Language was thus an invaluable tool for the historian, as the thoughts and customs of a people could be located through their vocabulary.[426] Khomiakov frequently used linguistic examples to back his own theories of history and had encouraged Gil'ferding to do the same, while the latter was still a student at Moscow University. Gil'ferding had, at Khomiakov's suggestion, studied Sanskrit, apparently to demonstrate the supposedly Iranian origins of the Slavs. According to his correspondence with Khomiakov, this effort seems part of a general idea the two men had to trace the origins of the Slavic language family to its earliest Indo-European origins.[427] These studies were often flimsy and loaded, but were so numerous that their significance cannot be overlooked.

Like many of his Western contemporaries, there was no doubt in Gil'ferding's mind that the Turks were Others, and that they were born with a set of inherent traits that could never be modified. Gil'ferding was also clear that there was a sharp divide between Bosnia and Europe. As he wrote to Khomiakov, "a Bosnian can go twenty times to Europe…and even study commercial science at the University of Vienna, and yet nothing will change

---

[426] Gratieux, pp. 67-68. Gratieux's study addresses Khomiakov's interest in linguistics, and his attempts to use linguistics to "reconstitute the first ages of humanity." The Slavophile also sought to use linguistics to establish the supposed Aryan origins of the Slavs. Khomiakov was not the only Russian to have attempted to study language for this purpose, clumsy attempts had been made by Venelin a generation earlier.

[427] Ludmila Lapteva, *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX- nachale XX veka* (Slavic Studies at Moscow University in the nineteenth to the beginning of twentieth centuries*)* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1997), p. 93. So influenced by Khomiakov's linguistic ideas was Gil'ferding as a young student that he even chose to write his Master's thesis on "the relationship of the Slavic languages to Sanskrit" in a further attempt to demonstrate the allegedly "pure" origins of the Slavs. Meanwhile, in one of his letters to Gil'ferding, Khomiakov claims he had identified early links between Sanskrit and Lithuanian.

from that at all, not in his appearance, not in his soul."[428] He observed that the Turks clearly had different notions of what constituted politeness, as well as different customs, eating habits and food.[429] Although his feelings towards Islam were largely negative, Gil'ferding did not lump all Muslims together. Rather, he tended to divide them into manageable categories that could easily be explained to his readers, and perhaps to himself. Examining the Turkish elites in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Gil'ferding concluded they were all "wild"[430] and hot-tempered but that there were variations amongst them.[431] He concedes that some of those occupying the highest posts of the administration were educated and could seem "almost like one of us." A few of those elites had even tried to curtail the perpetual violence against the Christians.[432] Interestingly, in a limited way, Gil'ferding appeared to respect, or at least to understand, those Muslims who were devoted to their faith, such as a local leader he met who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca. While he attacked the damage he saw "Muslim fanaticism" as having done to the local Christians, he was capable of accepting that some had a faith to which they devoted themselves, as he was devoted to his. He admitted that some Muslims were uncivilised yet good-hearted. Some, however, were inherently evil. He accused some in the Ottoman administration of being hypocritical, such as the local leader of one of the towns he visited, who greeted Gil'ferding warmly and pretended that he was kind to the local Christians, but who, as Gil'ferding learned, "has spilt much Christian blood."[433] Another Ottoman regional leader assured Gil'ferding of his kind nature, telling the Russian he treated all his people well, regardless of religion. In spite of these sounds of enlightenment, however, Gil'ferding learnt the same man once killed his own brother and dismissed him as another example of Islamic cruelty and hypocrisy.[434]

Despite his condescending comments on the Turks, he regarded them as superior to local Albanians. This latter group represented a "wild and

---

[428] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Putevye Zametki*, p. 4.
[429] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 26.
[430] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 24.
[431] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 180.
[432] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 181.
[433] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 23.
[434] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 38.

animal- like" people, who are described at times as more beast than human. He portrayed them as an essentially godless people who, after the Ottoman invasion, proved to be morally weaker than the Balkan Slavs. Whereas the Slavs were devoted to their God and refused to convert, preferring "religion to freedom," the treacherous Albanians were the other way around, and easily converted to Islam, because they were both indifferent to religion, and selfishly seeking to improve their situation.[435] While travelling in the region, Gil'ferding repeatedly emphasised the fact that Albanians were Other and repulsive to him. He attempted to understand the dynamics of the Albanian clan '*fis*' system and the relations within it.[436] He noted that all of Albanian society was controlled by the *fis* and feuds between rival *fis* were common, and always bloody: Gil'ferding claimed 30 were killed in a recent spat. Boys were required to marry outside their *fis*, as Islam forbids marrying relatives, yet they were forbidden upon death from even looking at a girl from a different *fis*. Thus, all marriages were arranged, and a girl could only return to her native *fis* if she became a widow and childless.[437] The clans all had different characteristics, and Gil'ferding was apparently warned to stay away from the Gheg tribe, as they had "no brains and no hearts."[438] Gil'ferding portrayed Albanian society as being controlled by mindless traditions and rituals, with even the lines of speeches being devoid of meaning.[439] He saw this as a sign of backwardness, rather than romanticizing it as "pure" as many Russian travellers did while travelling through the Orthodox Slav lands. As the previous chapter has shown, Montenegro was also a clan-based society heavily dominated by ritual and tradition at this time. Yet, Gil'ferding found no heroic or rustic charm in Albanian society: his efforts to understand the dynamics of Albanian culture were superficial and he dismissed the entire people as a savage mass, which knew nothing of "law and the courts, and which is accustomed to unlimited self- determination and tyranny." He concluded by writing "the Albanians must be restrained."[440]

---

[435] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 178.
[436] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 197.
[437] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, pp. 198-199.
[438] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 24
[439] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 199.
[440] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 181.

Gil'ferding's view of the Turks and the conditions of Ottoman infrastructure share similarities with many Western travelogues. Commenting on the poor state of the roads was a standard feature of all Western travelogues on the region, and comments about the Ottoman Empire's political state were rarely complimentary. British traveller James Henry Skene thought political reform would be unrealisable given that the "North-Western provinces of European Turkey [were] in a state of constant anarchy and confusion of authorities."[441]

Yet, as a Russian, Gil'ferding argued that the land of Bosnia and Hercegovina, along with Old Serbia and much of the Balkan region, was Slavic land. Gil'ferding wrote that "the Turks are occupiers" and he appeared to place the blame for the region's backward state on their presence. He underlined his feelings by frequently contrasting the two cultures. While Serbian society was plagued with illiteracy at the time, Gil'ferding still maintained that the Christians "may be called cultivated by comparison with the social life of the Muslims."[442] In addition to being incapable of construction, the Turks are also culturally barren, incapable of attaining higher levels of sophistication or producing cultural artefacts of lasting importance.

In addition to lacking creativity, Gil'ferding also wrote to Khomiakov that the Muslims were inherently lazy, which he saw as a reflection of their degeneracy. Wherever he travelled, he had the impression that no Muslims ever worked. When he finally asked one Muslim man what they all do all day long, the man replied "*tak, vot, sidim"* (look, we just sit).[443] Looking around, Gil'ferding wrote that he had become aware that everywhere he went, he saw men simply sitting, in either cafes, with friends, or even just in front of their shops. This supposed laziness is then contrasted to the hard-working ethics of the Orthodox peasants in the region. In addition to being disinclined to work productively, Gil'ferding concluded that that Turks were even incapable of serious thought. In a letter to Khomiakov, he quoted British traveller W.K. Loftus, who described his visit with an Ottoman functionary by writing "ask a

[441] Skene, p. 247.
[442] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Putevye Zametki,* p. 7.
[443] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Putevye Zametk,*. pp. 7-8.

grave old Turkish gentleman what he is thinking about, and his answer will invariably be: 'by Allah, what should I think of? Nothing!' So doubtless, Abdi Pasha thought of nothing."[444] With such examples, Gil'ferding seemed to imply that Bosnia and Herzegovina were not inherently ruined; rather their destruction was the product of a corrupting Turkish occupation.[445] This argument allowed the reader to hope that, were the negative influence of the Turks removed, the region would return to its supposedly "pure" Slav and Orthodox ways and would thus flourish, as it had in Gil'ferding's numerous descriptions of Bosnia and Herzegovina's pre-Ottoman past.

Throughout his text, Gil'ferding made a sharp division between the morally and culturally debased Turks and the Slavs, who represented the complete opposite image of their "occupiers." The Orthodox, in Gil'ferding's mind, had a tremendous sense of community spirit.[446] Arriving at the Duza monastery, the first of many Gil'ferding visited, the Russian was delighted to be warmly welcomed. The local monks told him he was the first Russian ever to visit. Gil'ferding found the monastery utterly impoverished, which he blamed on the Turks, who he claimed looted and destroyed all the churches in the area, leaving them bare inside. Despite such hardships, however, the monks were industrious and hardworking.[447] Although they were poor, Gil'ferding described them as kind and strong, and while they were not educated, he argued that they were rich in a variety of tangible skills, which he saw as a virtue. Furthermore, despite the lack of formal education and instruction in the tenets of the church, Gil'ferding claimed the Bosnian clergy possessed such tremendous internal strength that they remained strongly attached to Orthodoxy.[448] Gil'ferding was similarly impressed by the monks he met in Mostar. Again, they lacked formal education, but had made up for it in Gil'ferding's mind through their efforts to educate themselves, learning to read via religious texts.[449] In Mostar, the whole Orthodox community were supposedly "delighted to have a Russian in their

[444] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Putevye Zametki,* p. 7.
[445] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p.184.
[446] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* pp. 10-11.
[447] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 13.
[448] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 14.
[449] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 46.

midst"[450] and one of the monks told Gil'ferding that it was his dream to go to Russia one day, so that at least once in his life he could put his feet on Christian soil. Gil'ferding was deeply moved by this statement, which was not only a testament to the monk's deep piety, but also once again reinforced Gil'ferding's image of his homeland as the centre and defender of Orthodox Christianity.[451] The local Orthodox Slavs' attachment to their religion strengthens the bond Gil'ferding feels with them. "What strength this nation has!" Gil'ferding exclaimed, arguing that Orthodoxy was inside the entire nation, as an irrevocable internal "feeling."[452] In his use of the word "nation," Gil'ferding appears to refer not to the Slavs in general, but to Orthodox Slavs exclusively. At no point does he imply that either Catholic or Muslim Slavs might be included in this "nation."

Gil'ferding saw Orthodoxy as the basis of the local Christians' feelings towards him. He wrote that the locals looked at him as "a native brother," as he shared their faith. All the locals wanted to see him, as he was Russian, and yet appeared to want nothing of him other than to kiss "an Orthodox person from a faraway kingdom." The reaction was so dramatic that for a moment even Gil'ferding was filled with doubt. He wondered if the whole riposte was merely a bid to attract the attention of strong and powerful Russia, for the locals' own benefit. However, Gil'ferding dismissed this thought almost immediately, concluding that the locals knew so little about Russia that the whole scenario was implausible.[453] Instead, he concluded that the warm welcome was due to no other motive than "Orthodox brotherhood." Furthermore, he noted that, as a nation of peasants/villagers, the locals could have no egotistical goals, since they knew not of such things, demonstrating his apparent belief in the purity of rural simplicity over urban sophistication.[454] Gil'ferding wrote that the living conditions would be "bad for a European," but the locals found them just fine.[455] Such statements complicate Gil'ferding's view of himself, and his place between Europe and

[450] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 53.
[451] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 47.
[452] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 14.
[453] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 14.
[454] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 15.
[455] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 11.

the Balkan Slavs. When it came to personal comfort, he identified with the convenience of Western Europe: he liked comfortable beds and well-built roads. Yet, intellectually he rejected all the West stood for, advocating instead the superiority of the more hard-working and allegedly pious South Slavs. When writing of the South Slavs' living conditions, he converted their primitive conditions into a romantic vision of purity, cleanliness and moral virtue, yet he himself seemingly sought to be excluded from physical suffering.

Gil'ferding's notion of geography became even more perplexing as he attempted to describe the church architecture to his readers. He began by claiming that, in this Muslim occupied land, he saw "Europe" and its influence in the church construction.[456] However, he then seemingly contradicted himself, defending the purity of Orthodoxy in "the land of the infidels." He complained that in Austria, even in an Orthodox Church, he still knew he was in Austria, whereas the Orthodox in Bosnia had escaped completely from "the influence of Catholicism" and had remained pure to their supposed tradition. He was satisfied to note that churches in Bosnia and Herzegovina were "exactly the same as at home."[457] Such statements, in the space of three pages, appear contradictory: Gil'ferding saw the influence of Europe in the churches, and was simultaneously relieved they had escaped from the impact of the Catholic Church? Such an argument would surely be difficult even for a zealot to defend. Did he see Orthodoxy representing a superior example of Europeanness? Did the influence of Europe in the architecture make the Christian inhabitants ofBosnia and Herzegovina Europeans? Gil'ferding failed to clarify any of these questions, leaving the reader to place himself within the paradigm of Europe.

Consistently, Gil'ferding divided the populations of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Old Serbia into a series of stereotypes, presenting Muslims as the force of destruction and oppression, and the Christians as their victims. The examples are numerous. Gil'ferding argued that the Christians lived in an environment of constant fear, and saw ramifications of this everywhere. For

[456] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 11.
[457] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* pp. 13-14.

example, visiting a church, he claimed the poor condition of the structure "bears the signs of the fear in which the Christians live."[458] He wrote that the Greeks and Turks had both conspired to keep the Orthodox Slavs under their power. Gil'ferding also claimed the Turks tried to prevent the local Slavs from singing their traditional folk songs, which Gil'ferding stressed were central to Serbian culture and historical memory.[459] He noted that many had fled the Turkish persecution: in addition to those who followed Arsenije into exile in the late seventeenth century, he claimed many had gone to Montenegro to hide, or, since the First Serbian Uprising, to Serbia.[460] At times, he felt he was being deliberately prevented by the Ottoman authorities from having any contact with the local Orthodox population. In Ljubinje, he claims the locals are not allowed to meet him.[461] In Stolac, he claims all the Orthodox in the region had been rounded up and kept away by the Muslims. He claims some had even been imprisoned to prevent them from meeting with him. As a result, he doesn't meet a single Christian except for the local representatives of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, and even then he feels he is being watched and forced to talk more with the Catholic than the Orthodox leader.[462] Why would this be the case? Gil'ferding certainly did not underestimate his own importance. He never for a moment questions his homeland's role as defender of the Orthodox worldwide. Furthermore, although he was writing in the wake of Russia's humiliating defeat in the Crimean War, never for a moment did he

---

[458] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 44. He repeats on p.116 that all the Orthodox live in fear of their Turkish neighbours.
[459] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 40.
[460] On Slavs, in particular men wanted by the Turkish authorities, fleeing to Montenegro, see Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 24. On Slavs going to Serbia, see, for example, page 133. At the end of the seventeenth century, Arsenije, Serbian patriarch of Peć, led a disputable number of people north into the Habsburg Empire. Exactly how many Serbs followed Arsenije into exile is unknown, and numbers vary widely from 30,000 to an unlikely half a million. This migration is, however, important for several reasons. Serbs have claimed, and Gil'ferding follows this assumption, that this was the moment when Kosovo was emptied of Serbs, which made it possible for Albanians to flock in and claim abandoned land (see p. 177), contrary to evidence which suggests that the region emptied of Serbs over a lengthy period of time and for a number of reasons, chiefly economic. Gil'ferding puts great emphasis on the large migration led by Arsenije at the end of the seventeenth century, claiming it occurred as "Arsenije could not bear to see his people under the Ottoman yoke" (p.180). He also notes that many later left the Habsburg lands to resettle in Russia (p. 177). The migration of Serbs to the Habsburg lands at the end of the seventeenth century is also important as it established a Serbian population in that empire, which would, in the nineteenth century, produce a Serbian intelligentsia.
[461] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 32.
[462] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 40.

suggest that Russia was not capable of fulfilling its duty to the abroad Slavs. On the contrary, he constantly emphasised the strength of his country, and the role he felt it had and would continue to fulfil in the region.

What Gil'ferding did not seem to take into account is the possibility that the Ottomans could have in any way influenced Christian Slavic culture, other than in the limited linguistic fashion he examined. Gil'ferding observed, apparently with surprise that Christian houses were almost identical to Turkish ones in their construction, yet he did not seem to accept that this was the result of trans-cultural borrowing, reflecting a degree of exchange between Christians and Muslims in the region.[463] In Gil'ferding's view, the influence of the Turks had been an exclusively negative force on the Slav population. In addition to supposedly destroying buildings and roads, he accused the Turks of attempting to destroy Slavic culture and traditions. He found the language in Bosnia to be less pure than in Serbia, complaining that the Bosnian Slavs' language had been corrupted by their proximity to the Turks. Gil'ferding claimed that other "typically Serbian" traditions, such as the *Kolo*, had been "all but forgotten" in Bosnia, which he again attributed to Turks.[464] Gil'ferding was apparently opposed to trans-cultural interactions of any kind. His writing presented a dichotomous world divided between Christians and Muslims, Slavs and Turks, brothers and others.

Kosovo and Orthodoxy: The Heavenly Kingdom

No myth is greater in Serbian history than that of the Battle of Kosovo Polje. So enduring is the myth that the historical reality of the event is often obscured. As Christos Mylonas has noted, "sacredness, morality, destiny and sacrifice thematically delineate the mythopoeic depiction of the Kosovo battle, which is painted in the Serbian national consciousness as a pivotal, symbolic moment, in fact, the abrupt conclusion to their prosperous, sovereign, medieval kingdom in 1389."[465] Orthodoxy was a central component of this myth. As

[463] For notes on housing and housing construction, see Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 32 and p.22.
[464] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p.117. The *Kolo* is a traditional dance still performed today in many parts of the former Yugoslavia.
[465] Christos Mylonas. *Serbian Orthodox Fundamentals* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2003), p.152.

Mylonas noted, several of the songs, such as *The Fall of the Serbian Empire* "conceptualised the Orthodox Christian faith in a thematic motif of a 'sacrificial' choice presented to the slandered hero (Prince Lazar) and in the 'passage,' through death, to eternal salvation and life." The poem presents Lazar as having been given a choice between building an earthly kingdom, or a heavenly one. If he chooses the heavenly kingdom, he is told

"then you must build a church at Kosovo.
Do not build it upon a marble base,
But on pure silk and costly scarlet cloth,
And give your host orders to holy mass.
For every man, all soldiers, will perish,
And you, their prince will perish with your host."

After some reflection, the song claims "*Lazar chooses the promised heavenly kingdom, he refuses the earthly kingdom here.*" Mylonas wrote that Lazar's decision to die for his faith has been represented as an Orthodox decision and has thus "conferred an instructive and enduring dimension to the mythical narrative. The apparent connotations of the heroic act with the 'passion' of the Crucifixion of Christ preserved the associative and cognitive function of the myth."[466] Lazar's sacrifice came to be seen as the sacrifice of the Serbian people, and of Orthodoxy. Thus, prodigious individual and social qualities were bestowed upon the adherence to the Orthodox faith, patrimony, loyalty and the family."[467] The Kosovo myth came to unite all these aspects into a mythical concept of identity, upon which national pride could be based.

---

[466] Mylonas, p.156. The poem *The Fall of the Serbian Empire* is reprinted in English in Mylonas pp.155-156 as well as in Tim Judah. *The Serbs: History, Myth and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p 34. A similarly patriotic equivalent can be found in Serbian and Russian in Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia.* pp. 244-263.
[467] Mylonas, p.157.

The significance of this myth certainly did not escape Gil'ferding, who travelled to Kosovo, or Old Serbia, in search of this defining moment in South Slav history. According to Gil'ferding, even after 500 years, Serbs still "remembered" the heroic fight.[468] This is partly possible as songs existed to remind the Serbs of the battle's central position in Serbian history.[469] Gil'ferding found that in this land of absence and destruction, those songs were all that remained to keep the memory of the battle of Kosovo, and the sacrifice of the Serbian people, alive.[470] Furthermore, he argued that since all written sources had been destroyed by the Turks, the songs are the only form of historical record that the Serbs had.[471] Gil'ferding would have been aware of the songs prior to reaching Kosovo, as they were widely heard throughout the South Slav lands where he had already travelled extensively. Furthermore, in the early nineteenth century scholars such as Vuk Karadžić had extensively transcribed such epics, often embellishing and applying a process of careful selection in the process.[472] Karadžić's work had been translated and circulated outside the Slav lands. German scholar Ranke had read Karadžić's works with interest, noting the importance songs played in the Serbian lands. He claimed the songs functioned as an effective form of oral history so that "the history of the nation, developed by its poetry, has through it been converted into national property, and is thus preserved in the memory of the people."[473] There were certain circular aspects to the crafting of images in the region. While Gil'ferding was making his views on the South Slavs known to Russian audiences, he was also partly absorbing images that had already been crafted by a South Slav, Vuk Karadžić. Yet, Karadžić for his part had spent considerable time in Russia and had also been strongly influenced by the Habsburg scholar Jernej Kopitar. Thus ideas were circulating actively between Russia, the German lands and the South Slav lands, not merely flowing

---

[468] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 299.
[469] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 153.
[470] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 154.
[471] On the destruction of all old books, see Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 238. For more on the destruction of old Serbian documents, see p.176. For the destruction of the Serbian past and the role of songs, see p. 277.
[472] Mylonas p. 155. Karadžić compiled Serbian epics into a six-volume collection called *Srpske narodne pesme* (Songs of the Serbian people). Those recounting the Battle of Kosovo were among the most celebrated.
[473] Judah, p. 34.

unidirectionally.

Gil'ferding would certainly have been familiar with Karadžić's work, which had enjoyed mild success in Russian academic circles. He saw folk songs as representing a crucial difference between Serbs and Muslims. He claimed to have questioned Turks at some length about their music, and their national instrument the *tambura*. Yet, like Karadžić, he found it revealing that Muslims had melodic and lyrical songs, in which they sing mainly of love, while Christian songs were largely of history, war and heroism. Muslims, of course, had their own heroes, but told Gil'ferding that they were never revered in song the way Christian heroes are. Gil'ferding speculated that this was due to the fact that the Turks, having been on the winning side for several centuries, had other sources in which to record the memories of their peoples, while the Christians did not.[474] Gil'ferding noted that the Serbs he met interpreted these songs as representing a "completely historical event" rather than as a myth. While he acknowledged that the modern representation of the battle is more "historical legend" than a collection of facts, he made no value judgement on this elaboration of the truth.[475] Instead he seemed to largely subscribe to the myth, seeing it as reflecting the collective trauma that the Serbian people underwent, rather than national megalomania, or attempts at identity construction.

Of all the places he visited on his trip, it is Kosovo that Gil'ferding wrote the most about, and it seems to be the area that left the greatest mark on him. Gil'ferding was horrified by what he witnessed in Old Serbia. Rather than being an historical trauma locked away in the past, the Serbs left in the Kosovo region were surrounded by the ramifications of the event. Gil'ferding described the land as being nothing but a ruin. He described himself as being filled with nostalgia for the "Slav life" which was "almost gone" having been pushed out of the region by what he called the "Albanian torrent." The region had become "flooded by Muslim barbarism" and only the churches remained as a monument to Orthodoxy. Myth and travel blended as Gil'ferding contemplated the historical significance of every site he sees. As he

[474] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, pp. 39-40.
[475] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 226.

approached the region, he noted that "every step is full of blood and speaks of the tragedy and destruction of the Serbian Kingdom, the destruction of the Serbian people."[476] In an example of mythical history, he paused in front of a mineral water source, noting it was surely the one where "Miloš bathed before battle."[477] Yet, given the lack of historical records pertaining to the battle, we can assume Gil'ferding was attributing significance to the spring based on his knowledge of Serbian myths rather than historical reality.

Gil'ferding found Kosovo to be the land of loss and full of history. The land where the Serbs lost their empire had been systematically emptied of Serbs. For example, Gil'ferding was surprised and appalled to discover that in Priština, one of the ancient seats of power for the old Serbian government, there remained only 300 Orthodox families, alongside 1,200 Muslim ones.[478] In Prizren, Gil'ferding's visit was a purely historical one: although the area was filled with sights of great importance to Serbian history, no Serbs lived there anymore.[479] The few Serbs that remain in Old Serbia lived in constant terror of their Albanian neighbours,[480] who, according to Gil'ferding, were imported by the Ottomans to occupy the holy land of the Serbs. Gil'ferding attempted to ask directions of one man he meets on the street, and was horrified to discover that the local did not understand a word of Serbian, and this happened, as Gil'ferding lamented, "right on Kosovo Polje, that cherished part of Serbian land."[481] In parts of Kosovo, Gil'ferding kept having the feeling that he must surely be in Albania, since there were no Serbs anywhere. The Albanians clearly did not see Gil'ferding as representing a brother nation. The Russian noted that people kept wondering what he is doing in their midst.[482] The Orthodox Christians in the region were "constantly insulted and oppressed" by these Albanians, who were "armed from head to toe" while the Christians were forbidden to carry any weapons.[483] Gil'ferding went to a monastery where the Serbian monks lived in a state of near-siege. The area around the church was

---

[476] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, pp. 226-227.
[477] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 286.
[478] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 239.
[479] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 197.
[480] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 163.
[481] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 294.
[482] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 166.
[483] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 227.

completely surrounded by Albanians, and Gil'ferding felt that the church must be protected, as myth claims, by magical powers to defend itself.[484] The Albanians exploited the monks relentlessly by showing up at the church and demanding to be fed. If they were not pleased with the hospitality they receive, they killed the monks.[485] Gil'ferding was appalled that one group was able to live in such a way, while the monks, whom he saw as symbolising hard work, humility and honour, were so abused. Gil'ferding claimed that Christian women had to cover themselves as Muslim women did in the towns merely in order to avoid humiliation and insults.[486]

Yet Gil'ferding's statements are internally contradictory, as well as being at odds with Chaikovskii's findings. Chaikovskii claimed that both single Muslim and Christian women went around with open faces and are "free, like in England or America." He stated that they are friendly with males, and spoke openly with them on "comradely terms." This freedom only changed when they got married, and assumed more limited roles. At no point did Chaikovskii indicate that Christian women were subjected to humiliation or fear, nor did he present the Albanians as posing a threat to the Serbs' well-being.[487] This discrepancy between Gil'ferding's and Chaikovskii's writings could be the reflection of different encounters and experiences, although given how much time both men spent in the region, this seems unlikely. More probable is that each man was promoting his own personal agenda.

In the case of Gil'ferding, his argument remained an un-nuanced insistence that the Orthodox Slavs are being persecuted by Muslim oppressors. Yet, maintaining this stance so unequivocally results in numerous contradictions. For example, Gil'ferding presented Kosovo in black and white terms in which the Christians are the victims and the Muslims, in particular the Albanians, are the oppressors. This ignored the fact that Albanians and Slavs fought together on the same side on Kosovo Polje. After the fall of the region to Ottoman rule, the majority, but not all, of Albanians converted to Islam, as did some Slavs. This religious confusion does not fit into Gil'ferding's

---

[484] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, pp. 191-192.
[485] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, pp. 194- 194.
[486] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 172.
[487] Chaikovskii, p.106.

dichotomous categories easily, and he often attempted to deny such wrinkles in his narrative. Thus he wrote that *most Orthodox Christians in Kosovo are Albanian speakers*.[488] Yet, in his mind, such people are Serbs, not Albanians, due to their religion. If they did not speak Serbian, it was because of centuries of oppression and living in proximity to Albanians that they had forgotten their "native" tongue. The Catholic and Muslim Albanian speakers were, however, referred to as Albanian, yet the only difference between them and the afore-mentioned group was their religion. At the same time, the Slav-speakers Gil'ferding encountered in Bosnia are also divided according to their religion: Slav- speaking Muslims are Turks, Slav-speaking Christians are Serbs. It thus appears that Gil'ferding's definitions were based exclusively on religiously defined terms, completely independent of other factors.

For Gil'ferding, Orthodoxy and Serbdom were intertwined: it was not possible to be Serbian and not be Orthodox, as the religion formed the basis of the nation. As the people could not be divided between religions and nationality, neither could their history; the history of Serbia is an Orthodox history, and Gil'ferding made no secular divisions between the two. Travelling through Kosovo, Gil'ferding repeatedly brought nation and religion together, often in one building, such as during his trip to the Dečani Monastery. Gil'ferding saw the Dečani Monastery's fortunes as reflecting those of Serbian history: it was looted after the Battle of Kosovo, restored by Lazar's widow Milica, only to be looted again in the wake of the Great Migration of Patriarch Arsenije, then restored again by donations of Serbs in the Habsburg Empire. During his visit, Gil'ferding found the monastery in poor condition, and saw it as the duty of Russians to restore it, given its significance, not only to Serbian history, but to all of Orthodoxy.

In reality, little is known today about what really happened at Kosovo Polje. The only actual facts are that there was a battle in which both the Serbian and Turkish leaders, Lazar and Murad died.[489] The first known historical record of the event, written by a Russian monk who happened to be travelling nearby, notes only the death of the Sultan. Early sources did not present the battle as a

---

[488] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p. 171.
[489] Judah, p. 31.

clear Turkish victory and it is probable that in the immediate aftermath of the battle, both sides concentrated on consolidating power, a process that could be facilitated through the propagation of myths. Other than these simple facts, the rest of what we know of the event has been doctored by imagination, political opportunism and fantasy. Tim Judah argues that the Turks managed to consolidate quickly: Bayezid murdered his brother and claimed the title of Sultan for himself. He claims that Lazar's widow, Milica, was anxious to secure the succession for her son Stefan, who was at the time too young. Judah claims that Milica attempted to strengthen Stefan's position by ordering church scribes to write poems/ songs sanctifying Lazar, who was quickly made a saint. Given the central position of the church in Serbian life, Stefan's claim to the throne could be made stronger by claiming he was the son of a saint.[490] Judah cites this moment as giving rise to the myth of holy Lazar, who choose the heavenly kingdom over the earthly one. It is understandable how such myths could appeal to Serbs, both in the late 14th century and today. Yet, why did Gil'ferding take up this cause? What was it about the Battle of Kosovo that he felt was so important to Russians, who had no presence on that battlefield?

Although people at the time might have seen the battle of Kosovo as having ended in a draw, with both the Serbs and the Turks losing their leaders, the event has long been regarded in European historiography as the moment that Serbs, and all Balkan Christians lost their freedom, and were condemned to 500 years of Turkish rule and oppression. In this case, the facts appear to matter far less than the myth; few remember that in reality many parts of the Balkans continued fighting the Ottomans for several decades after the Battle of Kosovo, with Bosnia falling only in 1463 and Montenegro in 1499.
Gil'ferding did not worry over these details, preferring instead to see Kosovo as the dramatic and defining moment in Serbian history. For Gil'ferding, it was also a central moment in *Russian* history, and the basis of Russia's duty and obligation to its South Slav brothers. He presented Kosovo as representing the last stand of the South Slavs against the Turks, and thus the last stand of the old Byzantine Empire against Islam. With Byzantium in Muslim hands, the torch of Orthodoxy had passed to Moscow, the capital of the only free Slavic

[490] Judah, pp. 32-33.

country, and the Third Rome. As the Third Rome, it was the duty of Russians to defend the Orthodox Slavs everywhere, as the Orthodox South Slavs once defended Orthodoxy against the Ottomans. For Gil'ferding, Russians had a responsibility to support the South Slavs and their dilapidated institutions. While visiting the Dečani Monastary in Kosovo, Gil'ferding was shocked by the conditions: the monastery was crumbling, the people were growing poorer all the time and they had to build everything for themselves, with no assistance from the authorities. Clearly upset, Gil'ferding blamed the Muslims for this state of affairs, but also his own people, who had not done enough to help the South Slavs. Incensed, he wrote that "it is the duty of all Orthodox to support the Dečani Monastery."[491]

Chaikovskii's Vision: Race and Slavdom

While Orthodoxy was the central motif of much of Gil'ferding's work, and the basis upon which he deemed locals to be "brothers" or not, it was not so for Chaikovskii. Chaikovskii argued that his work portrays people of "the Slavic East" in which he appeared to include both himself and the Slavic inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. In his account, Chaikovskii classified people in a very different fashion than Gil'ferding, using race, not religion, as the defining characteristic of brotherhood and Slavdom. There were many reasons why he would take such an approach: during his lifetime, Chaikovskii went through three religions, he was born a Catholic, converted to Islam as an adult, and to Orthodoxy as an old man. Despite these conversions, and the avoidance of religious egoism in his texts, he repeatedly emphasised that he was "a Slav and a man of the East."[492] Chaikovskii's definition of the "Slavic East" was vague and never explained, yet his writing suggests that his definition of Slavdom was not tied to one religion, but to a common blood or race. By including Poles in this category, he seemed to imply that all Slav lands constitute part of his "Slav East," a category separate from Western Europe, yet from the Turkish and Arab world as well.

By placing his emphasis on race rather than religion, Chaikovskii, unlike Gil'ferding, was able to include Bosnia's Slavic Muslims under his umbrella of

[491] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p.196.
[492] Chaikovskii, p.4.

brotherhood. While Gil'ferding claimed that the Turks murdered the Bosnian elite, and seems to deny the existence of a Slavic- Muslim ruling class in Bosnia, Chaikovskii took a dramatically different view.[493] He argued that the Bosnian Slavic Muslims do exist, and should not be regarded as traitors as history explained their conversion. He claimed that, as they were the last region to be conquered, the Bosnian elite already knew what had happened to the Serbian and Bulgarian elite as a result of their refusal to convert: they had been completely decimated. Not wanting to suffer their fate and *lose their culture*, the Bosnian elite converted on mass. Thus Chaikovskii depicted the conversion as a *defence* of Slavdom. Had the Bosnian elite not converted, they would have been killed, while by converting, they were able to preserve their language, habits, and customs. Chaikovskii claimed that even after centuries of occupation, few Bosnians knew Turkish. Despite seemingly defending the Bosnian Muslims' choice to convert, he did seem to feel badly for those who remained Christian, and thus were condemned to suffer under the "yoke" of their own converted "fellow tribesmen" who spent their days "hunting, singing, and listening to music."[494]

Chaikovskii's interpretation provided justification on ethnic grounds of an event denied by Gil'ferding: Gil'ferding's obsession with Orthodoxy led him to conclude that an Orthodox believer would rather die for the faith than convert. Yet both Gil'ferding's and Chaikovskii's version of events reflected their Russian base. Other travellers justified conversion on far more pragmatic terms, without overly contemplating the ramifications of race or religious origins. British traveller James Henry Skene saw the matter in largely economic and opportunistic terms, writing "the nobles, thus taught to regard their confession of faith as a means of social domination, readily embraced mahometanism, in the hope of retaining their prerogatives when the Turks became their masters." Furthermore, Skene did not see conversions as being limited to the nobility, nor did he have an idealized view of the peasants being simple and pious souls as Gil'ferding did. Skene claimed that "vast numbers of

[493] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p.22. Gil'ferding appears to believe that the pre-Ottoman Bosnian aristocracy was annihilated, and does not seem to accept that many actually converted to Islam. Chaikovskii on the other hand acknowledges, and justifies the conversions.
[494] Chaikovskii, pp.86-87.

peasants as eagerly abjured Christianity, with the view of escaping from their onerous vassalage."[495]

The Bosnian Muslims were also to be included in Chaikovskii's Slavic world due to his definition of race. His understanding of the term is derived from "blood" which he saw as being the essential ingredient of race. He claimed Bosnians themselves put race above religion in importance (*rod vishe veri*), and paid close attention to keeping their Slavic bloodline pure, believing "Slavic blood should be mixed with Slavic blood."[496] This bloodline could remain pure regardless of religious belief, and was infinitely more important than religious ties. Chaikovskii claimed that in Bosnia, Christian and Muslim Slavs lived together peacefully, even celebrating holidays together, something which contradicts Gil'ferding's depiction of a Bosnia where all Christians lived in fear of their Muslim neighbours, as well as the findings of Western travellers such as Skene.[497] Chaikovskii claimed Bosnians of different faiths often intermarried,

---

[495] James Henry Skene, *The Frontier Lands of the Christians and the Turks; Comprising travels in the regions of the Lower Danube in 1850 and 1851,* vol II (London: Richard Bentley, 1853), p. 223. Skene argued that conversion allowed for social mobility and claims that frequently the converts "became fanatical in fervour of the faith which secured to them power on the one hand and protection on the other." He also appears to imply that large numbers of conversions were not surprising, not just because of the advantage it brought, but also due to the lack of one official religion prior to Islam. Skene, like many twentieth century scholars of the Balkans, blamed "the violence of the German [ie Habsburg] bishops, against both these inroads on the Orthodox faith, produced a state of doubt and confusion in the religious creed of the people," it was this vacuum that Skene felt Islam filled.

[496] Chaikovskii, p.109.

[497] For more on how the various religious communities mingled and participated in each others' celebrations, see Chaikovskii, p.111. For more on how the Muslims lived at peace with "Serbs, Bosniaks and even Montenegrins" see p. 53. For Gil'ferding, see for example *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia.* p.116, among others. Skene claimed that Christians and Muslims in Bosnia lived in very separate worlds, writing that the "chasm between Mahometans and the Christians is wider in Bosnia than in other parts of the Ottoman Empire," see p. 224. The degree to which the various different religious communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina interacted has been hotly debated in historiography, particularly during the 1990s Bosnian War, as historians attempted to understand how communities which had seemingly lived peacefully together could suddenly turn on each other so viciously. Justin McCarthy argues that the divisions existed under Ottoman rule, due to the presence of the Millet system, and claims that the perception of unfair treatment of one millet by another in the nineteenth century did periodically lead to intercommunal violence. See "Ottoman Bosnia, 1800-1878" in Mark Pinson, ed., *The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 58 and 73. Other Western scholars, including Noel Malcolm, see the Ottoman period as being one of relative tolerance, with the communities interacting in a generally peaceful, if distant manner, and also acknowledges that class at times represented a division at least as deep as religion. See Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: a Short History (*London: MacMillian, 1994), pp. 126-130. Robert Donia and John Fine have similarly argued that the region actually served as a testament to the ability of different groups to live together with sympathy and tolerance, noting that Bosnia was "for centuries a pluralistic society" and that the region's "distinctiveness has

and that it was especially common for Muslim men to marry Christian women, who may or may not then convert "according to their desire." Such tolerance was possible as he argued that Bosnians were not seriously religious.[498] Chaikovskii provided numerous examples of how race outweighed religion in the region. At one point, he witnessed an elderly Slav, who heard army commands being shouted in "Slavic." The man sighed and exclaimed to Chaikovskii, "Allah, how I would like to serve with you" so as to follow orders issued in a Slavic tongue.[499] The man then told Chaikovskii that if he had a daughter to spare, he would give her to him so that "the Slavic family and Slavic blood do not come to an end" upon the old man's death.[500]

Such quotes certainly differ from Gil'ferding's accounts of the region, according to which the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina were portrayed as religious fanatics with no apparent sense of Slavdom. Chaikovskii's description also contradicted travelogues of Western travellers, such as Skene, who observed the supposed "zeal of the convert." Skene claimed that Bosnian Slavs were far less tolerant than "Osmalis" and that, apparently due to their conversions, Bosnian Muslims had become "fanatical in fervour of their faith which secured to them power on the one hand, and protection on the other."[501]

Interestingly, neither of the Russian travellers examined divisions between Christian groups, as some Western travellers such as Edmund Spencer did. Spencer found the divisions between Catholics and Orthodox to be deeply entrenched, writing:

> However violent the spirit of sectarianism may be in more civilized countries, the hatred existing here among the benighted followers of these rival creeds, Greek and Latin, fostered by ignorant fanatic priests, is almost incredible; and how humiliating to the traveler and his religion, to be repeatedly told by a Mahometan, that were it not for the districts occupied by the Arnouts,[502] which separate them, these fanatic Christians, headed by their priests, would ere this have fought till one party had

---

continued in many ways through the centuries and is shared by members of all three national groups," suggesting the existence of a Bosnian identity that existed independently of religious affiliation. See Robert Donia and John Fine. *Bosnia and Herzegovina* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 9.

[498] Chaikovskii, p.112.

[499] Chaikovskii, p.110.

[500] Chaikovskii, p.111.

[501] Skene, p. 223.

[502] Albanians. Spencer uses both terms, Albanian and Arnouts interchangeably in his book.

exterminated the other.[503]

The notion of sectarianism is almost entirely absent from Chaikovskii's account, while Gil'ferding devoted very little time to the Catholics in the region at all, although both Chaikovskii and Gil'ferding appeared suspicious of the Roman Church in general, and the Franciscan friars in particular. Chaikovskii noted that although the friars provided education and knowledge to members of their community, they lived exceedingly well.[504] He claimed they were funded by "foreign powers" especially by Italians. Both Chaikovskii and Gil'ferding saw the Catholics in neighbouring countries using their own religious communities to manipulate the situation in Bosnia. Yet neither seemed to think that the local Catholics pose a threat to the Orthodox, and they certainly did not see the Albanians as being a buffer between two warring Christians sects, as Spencer implies. Instead, Gil'ferding in particular saw Albanians as one of the main aggressors against the local Christians.

Unlike more conventional travelogues, such as Gil'ferding's, Chaikovskii's work consists of numerous anecdotes and situations he claims to have experienced. Yet, the style in general recalls that of *1,001 Nights*, and Chaikovskii had himself clearly read the book, which raises the possibility that he might have attempted to base his own writing on that style, with the addition of a Slavic perspective.[505] Like *1,001 Nights*, Chaikovskii used a thin narrative frame (in his case, his travels) into which his stories are incorporated. Despite the existence of a framework to bind the plots together, some could stand alone without reference to the larger story, while others are woven together. Despite his attempts to construct the concept of a separate "Slavic" people, by using this literary device of combining fiction and travel, Chaikovskii was participating in a pan-European narrative fashion. Many Western travelogues used techniques, including a "spy" character of "the voice of the Eastern informant…construed to provide evidence of a kind of 'signature' derived from stereotypes associated with the informant's

---

[503] Spencer, p. 7.
[504] Chaikovskii, p.113.
[505] On the popularity of *1001 Nights*, see Chaikovskii, p.110. The work had been translated into European languages in the nineteenth century, with German and English translations appearing in 1838, and those in other European languages thereafter.

culture."[506] Chaikovskii attempted a slightly different variation on this tactic by playing the role of "informant" and traveller simultaneously, yet the voice of his "informant" was similar to those found in contemporary Western works.

While the stories read like fictional ones, they provide an illuminating perspective on Chaikovskii's view of the world, and the place of Slavs within it. For example, he began his work by telling the story of the two sons of Sultan Mahmut. After the birth of his two sons, the Sultan decided to conduct an experiment that "will show us who is fit to rule, the East or the West."[507] Therefore, the older son, Abdul-Madjid, was entirely French educated: he was taught to be humane, fair and just. He grew up in a European bubble within the Ottoman Empire, and developed into a generous young man who was kind to the poor. The younger son, Abdul-Aziz was raised "in the Islamic way," receiving what Chaikovskii described as a "Tatar-Mongol education." He studied gymnastics and hunting. He spent his days perfecting his physical strength, and was entertained by wild beasts. He developed into a cruel and vicious young man incapable of empathy.[508] As a result of this experiment, Chaikovskii claimed the older son was filled with sympathy for the West, whose values he parroted. He identified exclusively with Western institutions and people, and was thus something of a progressive stranger in his own land. The younger son, however, was the powerful one, as he could "threaten both the West and the East with the claws of a falcon."[509] Chaikovskii did not inform his readers as to the end result of this alleged experiment, but a clear image of his vision of the world emerges nonetheless: the West may have been humane, but it was also weak, while the East was cruel, barbaric and strong. The Ottoman Empire was a purely Eastern one in Chaikovskii's view, an empire where cunning was needed to dupe people in order to survive in a "world of intrigue."[510] Furthermore, Chaikovskii questioned the ability of the Ottoman Empire to ever change, seeming to believe that the characteristics he ascribed to the country were inherent in the people. He noted that Abdul-Medjid, the

---

[506] Rosalind Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 41.
[507] Chaikovskii, p.8.
[508] Chaikovskii, pp. 6-7.
[509] Chaikovskii, p. 9.
[510] Chaikovskii, p.15.

product of Westernisation could "put on the act" of a good European, thus implying the Sultan's son's level of Westernisation had remained superficial.[511]

It appears that Abdul-Medjid's Westernisation was superficial because it was fake, an ideology imported essentially as part of an experiment. Yet Chaikovskii went to great lengths to emphasise that the Turks were neither ignorant nor ill-educated. He claimed that the West looked at the Ottoman Empire and saw only the lack of Enlightenment education and values, but what they really *should* see were different values. Chaikovskii claimed the Turks had a great thirst for knowledge and that even in small towns in remote areas, people were able to discuss intelligently politics and history.[512] Chaikovskii cited the example of the Sultan's much-beloved younger sister, who was exceptionally well-educated and fluent in several foreign languages.[513] He also stressed that many of the Ottoman elite were well-travelled and had visited Europe, sometimes on several occasions.[514] However, their education followed a different model than the Western one, and Chaikovskii refrained from analysing it in terms of superiority and inferiority. He did note that attempts to bring Western style education outside of the Sultan's immediate family had at times met with strict opposition from the imams. In one of the Sultan's other social experiments, the Ottoman ruler decided to see what would happen if he set about educating the members of his harem. It seems in doing so he greatly upset the "fanatics" and religious members of his entourage.[515]

Chaikovskii's argument was that Turks were educated differently, not uneducated. Attempts to educate them in an imported Western fashion were only ever partially successful. In this respect, Chaikovskii was of the same mind as Gil'ferding, who also found Europeanised Turks to be artificial. In Mostar, Gil'ferding met a Turk who no longer wore the *chalmi* and considered himself to be a man of European education. Yet Gil'ferding found this appearance both hypocritical and superficial, observing that the Turk made an effort to eat with knife and fork when he was in the presence of European

[511] Chaikovskii, p.57.
[512] Chaikovskii, pp. 60-61.
[513] Chaikovskii, p. 41.
[514] Chaikovskii, p. 36.
[515] Chaikovskii, pp. 33-34.

guests, but with his own people he "cannot deny himself the pleasure of putting his hands in the plate."[516] Yet Gil'ferding never used this supposed example of Turkish falsity to question his own culture, which was frequently the target of similar criticism by Western travellers. If mimicking Western manners made the Ottomans hypocrites, what about the Russians? At the beginning of his 1839 travelogue, the Marquis de Custine notes that he encountered various types of Russians who all seemed to be putting on a show for him and writes that he seeks "the completely natural Russian, I am looking for it."[517] Apparently the Marquis did not find what he was looking for. On leaving Russia, he observed that "a sincere man in that country would pass for mad."[518] Russians' imitation of French behaviour seemed to grate on the Marquis, who exclaimed in frustration that he would prefer "barbarians of the North rather than apers of the South.[519]

In another anecdote, Chaikovskii reiterates the theme of Ottoman Eastern cruelty, while also demonstrating their lack of religious conviction. Chaikovskii claims that the Sultan loved his hunting dogs to the point of obsession, and permitted them to lounge freely about in his room, and even on his sofa, in contradiction of Islamic traditions. One day, a pious village imam comes to visit and is so horrified by the presence of unclean animals that he "almost loses his mind." The Sultan is not persuaded by the imam's religious argument and calls upon his servant to chop off the imam's head.[520] To write a similar example in an Orthodox context would be unthinkable, as all the Russian travelogues under study present the Tsar as the defender of Orthodoxy, and a scenario in which he beheaded an Orthodox priest for the sake of his dogs' honour would not have been acceptable to either Russian audiences or censors. Yet, Chaikovskii appears to conclude that it would be perfectly conceivable to his audience that a Turkish leader could commit such an act against a religious figure. This example thus serves both to underline the supposedly inherent cruelty of Turkish rule, as well as their lack of

---

[516] Gil'ferding. *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia*, p.52.
[517] Marquis de Custine. *Journey for our Time* (Chicago: Gateway, 1951), p.57.
[518] De Custine, p. 349.
[519] De Custine, p. 50.
[520] Chaikovskii, pp.15-16.

genuine devotion to their faith. Unlike the Russian Tsar, the Ottoman Sultan is not willing to sacrifice all, or even his dogs' comfort, for his faith, suggesting his devotion is superficial indeed. Yet this depiction of Chaikovskii's appears to contradict Gil'ferding's view that Islamic fanaticism was widespread in the Ottoman Empire. It is possible that Chaikovskii's view represents his greater contact with, and thus presumably greater knowledge of Ottoman Muslims. Yet it appears more likely that each man interpreted the religious environment in the empire according to his own paradigm, with Gil'ferding seeing Islamic fundamentalism as threatening the well-being of his "brother" Christian Slavs, and Chaikovskii seeing the whole matter as essentially irrelevant.

Men of Contradiction

Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii clearly had very different interpretations of the conditions in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Old Serbia. Yet, rather than attempting to determine in each instance of disagreement which of the accounts is "right" it seems more productive to accept that both men perceived the world around them through the prism of their educations and backgrounds. Yet these perceptions were not without flaws and exceptions. Many of the contradictions of Chaikovskii's work are due to the mystery that shrouds his origins, and his role in the Ottoman Empire. He claimed on the one hand to have travelled through Bosnia and Herzegovina while in Ottoman state service, supposedly as a high –ranking officer with access to the highest levels of power. Yet he did not praise the Turks, and wrote with apparent satisfaction that the territories of Abhazia and Svanetia were "practically already under Russian rule."[521] It is hard to grasp the motivation behind such statements; they may reflect Chaikovskii's views, or they may be an effort to please his Russian audiences. In such moments Chaikovskii appeared to classify himself as a Russian. Yet much of his work attempted to emphasise his close relation to the Ottoman Other as well. More significant perhaps is Chaikovskii's apparently clear-eyed assessment of the Ottomans' shortcomings. While refraining from religiously-motivated accusations in the style of Gil'ferding, Chaikovskii claimed that the Ottomans' chief failure in

[521] Chaikovskii, p. 23.

the Balkans was their inability to understand the different peoples under their rule, such as the Slavs.[522] He also claimed that the reforms purposed by the Tanzimat could have been effective, especially as the people were ready for them, but failed in Bosnia and Herzegovina as they were poorly carried out.[523]

Gil'ferding's writing is more dogmatic and ideologically motivated than Chaikovskii's, and is consequently more riddled with contradictions. He was for the most part devoted to his conviction in the endless suffering and righteousness of the Orthodox, but he was also a man accustomed to physical comforts which were not generally found among his Serbian brothers. Early on his travels, as he bumped along Herzegovina's poor roads on his way to Trebinje, he confessed to dreaming longingly of a nice European hotel.[524] Despite claiming he was travelling amongst brothers for much of his journey, he felt the need to be accompanied by a bodyguard, an unusual precaution for a Russian traveler.[525] Like Chaikovskii, he was extremely suspicious of the Franciscan friars who lived in Bosnia and Herzegovina, noting that for men of God they lived extremely well, always had large portions of meat on their table when such luxuries were out of the reach of their Orthodox and Muslim counterparts. Yet when travelling through Travnik, which had a Muslim and Catholic population, but not an Orthodox one, Gil'ferding was delighted to be offered a comfortable "clean European bed" by one of the Franciscan friars, who lived in a "European house" with civilised items such as tables, chairs and books.[526]

On many occasions, Gil'ferding praised the virtues of the Orthodox clergy in the region for their resourcefulness, community spirit, and their ability to continue despite adverse circumstances. Yet at other moments, he was clearly frustrated by their lack of standard education. After trying to explain to one semi-illiterate heguman the difference between manuscripts and

---

[522] Chaikovskii, p. 102.
[523] Chaikovskii, p. 98.
[524] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p.27.
[525] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 28.
[526] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 370. Both Gil'ferding and Chaikovskii were suspicious of the Catholic clergy in the region, and of the Franciscans in particular. Chaikovskii argued on p. 22 that the Austrians exploited the Orthodox Serbs and even Bulgarians through unfair trade deals and intrigue.

printed matter, and finding that after explaining it several time over the heguman still had no idea what he was talking about, Gil'ferding finally announced in frustration that this had happened to him "hundreds of times in these countries!"[527] Gil'ferding was then disappointed to find that the heguman he had failed to enlightened behaved coldly towards him, forcing him to have a "cold conversation about commonplaces, as with Turks."[528] Clearly even Gil'ferding sometimes tired of playing the educator, and also expected the local Christians to feel grateful and appreciative of his instruction.

Given his equating of Orthodoxy with Serbianness, and his seeming linking of Russian-Serbian brotherhood on the basis of their common religion, it is significant that Gilderding excluded the Greeks from favour. As has been seen in previous chapters, Gil'ferding was not the first Russian to write negatively of the Greeks, yet it is interesting that he also did so, given his supposedly firm Orthodox convictions. He argued that the Greeks, like the Turks, conspired to keep the "Serbs" in submission and dependency.[530] This was done by replacing the Serbian religious hierarchy with a Greek one in 1775, undermining the "spiritual importance" of the independent Patriarch of Pec, exiled in Austria, and thus attempting to undermine what Gil'ferding saw as the national nature of the Serbian Orthodox Church.[529] Like many other Russian travellers, Gil'ferding saw the Greeks as untrustworthy and was suspicious of their intentions. At one point travelling in Old Serbia, Gil'ferding was at first delighted to meet a man he assumed was Bulgarian, but when he realised the man was in fact Greek, and believed in the Greek predominance over Slavs, Gil'ferding immediately became wary, writing that the man was not trustworthy.[530]

He criticised both Serbs and Turks who affected Europeanness through their dress and speech, yet he certainly did not apply such demands for

---

[527] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 289.
[528] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 288.
[529] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 176. After Arsenije went into exile in the Habsburg lands, his old position as Patriarch of Pec was continued for some time in exile, as a national rallying point for Serbs in the Austrian Empire. Gil'ferding claims the Orthodox hierarchy in Austria lived under "constant surveillance" but he does not explain how he came across this information.
[530] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p 208.

cultural purity to himself, given his preference for European comfort. He did not even apply these standards evenly to locals. He met a self-confessed stupid Bosnian who told him, "I figured out already a long time ago that we Bosnians are stupid, we know nothing and understand nothing, but the Germans and the French and other people live smartly, so I took from them what I could and last year I went to the German land [Austria]. There I saw many miraculous things." Rather than advocate primitive simplicity, Gil'ferding here assumed the role of the sophisticated European traveller, and told the Bosnian that he should go instead to Paris or London, where he could see even more miraculous sights.[531]

Gil'ferding's views on "development" are generally contradictory. He noted that although the Christians were behind in terms of development, they used what meagre funds they had in order to improve their circumstances by building roads, and especially churches. He seemed to think this shows the Christians had some subconscious urge towards civilisation and development. This was in contrast to the Muslims, in particular the Albanians, who were capable only of destruction. Yet what kind of development did Gil'ferding envision for the region? One would assume not an imported Western model, given how opposed he appeared to be towards such "artificiality." Yet at the same time, he seemed to want some sort of recognition of what he perceives as the Christians' superior intellectual faculties, and by extension, of his own superior faculties. His statements on education are equally puzzling. He wrote that some limited school facilities exist for Christians in Sarajevo "not in the European way" but in a manner that is "good enough for the locals."[532] It remains unclear how he thought the locals should be educated, or if they should be educated at all.

Both Gil'ferding and Chaikvskii's texts are riddled with contradictions and inconsistencies. The Russia that appears reflected in their writing is neither a Slavic nor an Orthodox land, but one that is deeply internally

---

[531] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p 373.
[532] Gil'ferding, *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia,* p. 183. Gil'ferding claims on p. 184 that there is education in Sarajevo even for Christian girls. Yet these numbers appear to have been minute, as he exclaims, with apparent excitement, that at least ten girls in the city know how to read.

conflicted about its perception of itself, and actively engaged in an interior debate with regards to both the country's image and future. The fact that both Gil'ferding's and Chaikovskii's works enjoyed considerable popularity suggest not only that the Balkans was a commercially viable topic for writers, but also that the two rival worldviews presented in the works each met with a receptive audience. This suggests in turn that the target audiences were equally engaged in the process of self-definition as the writers whose works they purchased. A Russian approach to the Balkans was rapidly solidifying, and would consequently emerge as a reflection of what certain elements in Russia wanted their country to be.

Chapter Four: The Aftermath of the Crimean War

Travel to the Balkans resumed in the late 1850s, but much of the writing from that era differed significantly from the period prior to the Crimean War. These new travellers were coming from a land that had only recently been defeated and humiliated. However, far from accepting the image of Russia as impotent and ideologically bankrupt, as some foreign commentators sought to portray it, they articulated a view of their homeland as duty bound to play an activist role in the Balkans. In fact, it was in the aftermath of the Crimean defeat that Russian travel writing began to solidify not only its discourse in support of the South Slavs, but also in its defining of Russianness in opposition to the West. Several writers, such as Ivan Aksakov and Ivan Liprandi, highlighted their moral superiority in contrast to the decadent West they felt had betrayed them in the war. Furthermore, they used the South Slavs as a model of superior Slavic values, even as a means to incite their own people into action to uphold those values, at home as well as abroad. To Ivan Aksakov, among others, this was a matter of national pride and honour.

Pre-war writing on the region had enjoyed considerable success among the empire's educated public (*obshchestvo*), and certain stereotypes had emerged in the discourse. Though at times crude and more reflective of the writers than of their purported subject, these stereotypes were overwhelmingly positive and had become increasingly fixed in the mindset of the educated public. The legacy of pioneering figures, such as Gil'ferding, had fired the romantic imagination of a new generation of writers, who turned to the Balkans in a search for romantic heroes. Using literary devices, such as the novel, common to Western Europe as much as to Russia, certain writers utilised these stereotypes to further their message.

One of the first such writers was Ivan Turgenev, whose 1860 novel *On the Eve*, had as its protagonist, a stalwart Bulgarian patriot named Insarov, the antithesis of the superfluous hero. Although portrayed in a rather one-dimensional and wooden fashion, with little character development, he served

as the vehicle for Turgenev's romantic notion of Bulgarianness.[533] A single-minded man of action, totally dedicated to the liberation of his homeland, he is characterised as "direct with calm firmness and everyday simplicity."[534] At the same time, there is "something dangerous" in his face[535] and he is adept at such tasks as obtaining false passports.[536] Ever the patriotic hero, he always puts the needs of the people ahead of his own desires. Other characters in the novel note that "in talking about his country, Insarov manifests a sense of force and intense outward striving."[537] This selfless worthy utters such stirring phrases as, "our time belongs to all those who need us, not to us."[538] When Elena, the Russian heroine who falls in love with him, takes him to task for not avenging the murder of his father, at the hands of an 'evil Turk,' Insarov counsels her that "now is not the time for personal revenge, but for general national revenge."[539] This would take the form of destroying the mighty but infidel Ottoman Empire. Insarov is not only a representative of his country, as literary critic N.A. Dobrolyubov noted, "he cannot conceive of himself separately from his country"[540]

Turgenev's novel did not remain confined to the realm of literature: its message and imagery were debated by the author's contemporaries. In his essay on the novel Dobrolyubov asked his readers, "Why a Bulgarian and not a Russian? Are there no such characters among Russians, are Russians incapable of loving passionately and persistently, incapable of recklessly

---

[533] Ivan Turgenev, *On the Eve* (London: William Heinemann, 1903), Russian original published Moscow, 1860, p.ix. Although the book was published after the reign of Nicholas I, it still very much reflects the world of the last years of his rule. It must also be noted that publishing such a work prior to the liberalisation of Alexander II would have been impossible due to censorship laws.
[534] Turgenev, p. 94.
[535] Turgenev, p. 127.
[536] Turgenev, p. 195.
[537] Turgenev, p. 86.
[538] Turgenev, 108.
[539] Turgenev, p. 109.
[540] N. A. Dobrolyubov, "When will the Day Come?" in *N.A. Dobrolyubov: Selected Philosophical Essays* (Moscow, 1948), pp. 388- 438 (originally published in 1860, in the journal *Sovremennik* [Contemporary]). Dobrolyubov also notes the caricature-like heroic qualities: "he never tells lies, he never breaks a promise, he does not borrow money, he is not fond of talking about his achievements, he never puts off the execution of a decision once adopted, his deeds never contradict his words and so forth… But in addition to this, he is a Bulgarian whose soul is filled with a passionate desire to liberate his country, and to this idea he devotes himself entirely, openly and confidently, it represents the ultimate goal of his life." Insarov is thus, the ultimate man of action, to the point that he is more an embodiment of his nation than an actual human being. For more see p. 410.

marrying for love?"[541] Interestingly, Turgenev juxtaposed Insarov's sterling qualities against the shortcomings of his Russian counterparts whom he upbraids for their lack of comprehension of his native language: "it is a disgrace to a Russian NOT to know Bulgarian, he should know all Slav languages."[542] Turgenev's Balkan hero is thus the prototype of the simple but spirited and determined man of action, single-mindedly devoted to the liberation of his homeland and willing to lay down his life for the cause. Appropriately, the book ends with Insarov's death on his way to fight the Turks, whereupon Elena, now widowed, goes on to fight in his place, despite the entreaties of her family. Meanwhile, the couple's friends remaining in Russia are left to ask themselves "when will our time come? When will [such] men be born among us?"[543] Turgenev did not present Insarov as an oppositional Other. He was rather meant to provide an example of a sympathetic quasi-foreigner (who is Orthodox and speaks accentless Russian), as a model of "real" manhood (he gets the girl, Elena, rather than one of the Russian characters who is in love with her, but who is too childlike and weak to win her attention), and as a model of inner strength (he sacrifices himself for his cause). Like the superman described by several of the travellers in Montenegro, he is a model of the heroic Balkan male, but more importantly, he is an example of what the Russian male reader should aspire to. Like so many travelogues of the period, one suspects Turgenev has chosen a Balkan hero not only to advocate this region, but as a positive example which allows him to criticize his own nation, by creating an embellished and idealized alter ego. However, this image was only possible as the caricaturized model of the Balkan 'hero' was already part of Russian imagery. The Balkans were rapidly turning into a symbol: a model Slav nation exemplifying all the characteristics that Russia too should uphold. The necessity of maintaining dedication to a cause was all the more essential in

[541] Dobrolyubov, p. 414. Dobrolyubov concluded that it was indeed necessary for Insarov to be Bulgarian, writing: "a contemporary Russian Insarov will always remain timid and dual-natured, he will lie low, express himself with various reservations and equivocations…and it is this that reduces confidence in him…what sympathy can one feel towards a covetous man and a coward, especially when one's soul longs for action and seeks a great mind and a strong hand to lead it?" See pp. 421-422.
[542] Turgenev, p. 110.
[543] Turgenev, p. 245.

the aftermath of Russia's crushing defeat in the Crimean War

Although there were very few civilian Russian travellers in the region at this time, the Crimean War marked a turning point in Russian travel writing on the Balkans. Nicholas had advanced a myth of a powerful military state by coming in 1849 to the assistance of the Habsburg monarchy in crushing the Hungarian Revolution. Nicholas might have seen this as an affirmation of military prowess and proof of Russia's role as the saviour of Europe, yet for many in Europe the Tsar's actions only reinforced the view of Russia as a backward absolutist state, seemingly allergic to any form of change.[544] Nicholas grossly miscalculated the support he could count on in Western Europe, and thus launched his country disastrously into the Crimean War.[545] The effect of Russia's humiliation and sense of betrayal was profound. Nicholas's myth of Russian military might was shown to be an illusion, and Russia appeared an isolated and friendless empire.

Furthermore, the Crimean War called into question Russia's ability to fulfil its self-appointed role as defender of the Orthodox Christians in the Balkans. As Napoleon III asserted his influence in the Ottoman Empire, allegedly seeking greater access to Holy Land sites, Nicholas felt provoked. The Treaty of Kuchuk Kainardji had allotted Russia influence over the Orthodox peoples of the Ottoman Empire, and France's behaviour called this into question. At stake was more Russian pride than the well-being of Christians in the Balkans. The Balkan Orthodox clergy supported only limited Russian intervention. In Russia, the church was subordinated to the state, whereas under the Ottoman millet system, the clergy enjoyed far more freedom from authority and control over their populations. Within their millets, they were the ultimate secular and religious authority, and this gave them more power than they would have were they to come under more direct Russian influence.[546] The real provocation behind the Crimean War was that it posed a challenge to Russian pride, and to Nicholas's method of rule. As Tsar, Nicholas had repeatedly emphasised his role as a Christian monarch

[544] Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), p.186.
[545] Barbara Jelavich. *Russia's Balkan Entanglements, 1806-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 115.
[546] Jelavich, p. 124.

and defender of Orthodoxy, as seen in Uvarov's triad of Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationality. This Christian empire was supported by its people, who loved and served the Tsar unquestionably. It was also supported by numerous shows of supposed superior military prowess. Under Nicholas, military parades of well-disciplined and immaculately dressed troops had been common.[547]

Yet the Crimean War revealed that the parade grounds had not prepared Russian troops to match their better-equipped Western counterparts, and challenged Russia's ability to defend Orthodoxy. Coming to power as Russia was losing the war, Alexander II was faced with the unenviable task of repudiating his father's failed vision, while simultaneously fostering the illusion of continuity. He had been raised to believe in the tenets of Official Nationality, and genuinely believed both in the necessity of autocracy and in the people's devotion to the monarchy. Yet, the war had revealed Russia's backwardness and ineptitude, and its need for urgent reform. Reconciling his beliefs in the exigency of autocracy with the need for change was the major challenge of Alexander II's reign.[548]

Soon after assuming the throne, Alexander II eased censorship and resumed the tradition of sending students and scholars abroad for study. Both internally and internationally, he pursued a policy of reconciliation and concord.[549] Yet, at a time when writers such as Ivan Aksakov were pursuing a very different line of argument, this was not enough to win over segments of educated society, especially in Moscow. Many appeared to prefer strong and heroic leadership over cosmetic political change. Conservative intellectuals found Alexander II's Western ways repugnant and yearned for a more "Russian" monarch who would better represent their image of the nation. These conservative circles had different visions of what Russia should represent. Some, such as Ivan Aksakov, saw the national spirit represented by Orthodoxy and called for a strong, Orthodox Tsar who would return to the supposedly more "pure Russian" traditions of the pre-Petrine era, rejecting artificially imported Western institutions. Others, such as the publicist Mikhail

[547] Wortman, p.146.
[548] Wortman, pp. 189-190.
[549] Wortman, p. 194.

Katkov envisioned a strong state able to control the empire's diverse peoples. These groups had little in common ideologically, but they shared a common disenchantment with Alexander II. Despite such differences in viewpoints, these various sectors of Russian society were able to unite in opinion for a time, especially when it came to the Balkans.[550]

Turgenev was not the only writer to use the Balkans as a platform for attacking what he saw was wrong in Russia. Another example of the solidification of a Russian position towards the south Slavs can be seen in Aleksei Khomiakov's famous *Letter to the Serbs*, published in 1860 like Turgenev's work, and shortly before Khomiakov's death. The letter was Khomiakov's last great political testament to the Slav cause, and although it was addressed specifically to the Serbs, it too appears to have been written more for its Russian audience. Purporting to offer advice to the Serbs while simultaneously providing Russians with an example of a model Slav nation, the letter illuminates how Khomiakov envisioned the relationship between Russia and the abroad Slavs, and the role he thought his country should play. The connection between Russia and Serbia is laid out clearly on the first page:

> No foreigner (no matter how good or well-inclined he may be), could compare in this way with us, for to him you are still foreign, but to us, you, Serbs, are our blood brothers from birth, and our spiritual brothers in Christ. Your physical appearance is precious to us, as it testifies to our blood relationship; and your language is precious to us for it sounds the same as our native tongue; your traditions are precious to us for they come from the same source as ours.[551]

Khomiakov cited Orthodoxy as one of the uniting features between the two nations. Orthodoxy, according to Khomiakov, represented "the highest knowledge and the highest truth." Such was the Serbs' reputation for upholding their faith that "for the Turk, the words 'Serbian' and 'Orthodoxy' seem synonymous" just as Gil'ferding had claimed that 'Moscovy' and 'infidel' were one and the same in the Turkish mind. Serbs were stereotyped as Orthodox, just as Russians would like to be similarly identified with their faith. However, the letter was quick to emphasize that not all Orthodox peoples were

---

[550] Wortman, p. 246.
[551] Aleksei Khomiakov, "*Poslanie k Serbam iz Moskvy*" (*A letter to the Serbs from Moscow*), in *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii* (*Complete collected works*) (Moscow, 1900-1907). Third edition, volume I, p. 377.

included in this idyllic vision. It accused the Greeks of being overly proud and turning on the Slavs, their co-religionists. Khomiakov blamed this on excessive Western influence, which had made the Greeks blinded by pride so that "they consider themselves the only sons of the Church, and think that the others were mere slaves and adopted children…they are ready to consider themselves as alone the chosen ones of God." While Khomiakov attacked the Greeks for turning on the Slavs, he also criticized certain Slavs for abandoning what he felt should be their faith, claiming "a Slav cannot be a complete Slav outside of Orthodoxy. Our own brothers led astray into the Western lie, whether they are papists or believers in the Reformation, themselves recognize this with sorrow." Again, excessive pride had been the downfall of these unfortunates.

No nation was exempt from this disease, and Khomiakov encouraged the Serbs to avoid it, by learning from Russia's mistakes: "we are older than you in active (independent) history, we have experienced more, albeit not heavier, trials, and we pray to God that our experience, which has been bought at a very high price, can benefit our brothers, and that our numerous errors will forewarn you of the dangers which are often imperceptible and deceptive in the beginning but extremely ruinous in their consequences."[552] Yet the faults he cites as examples of Russian failings suggest he was aiming his text as much at Russians as at Serbs. His letter traced what he saw as the systematic mistakes made by the Russian elite, who he felt led the country astray for too long:

> Let our mistakes serve as a warning and a lesson to you. We also possessed many of these advantages which you now possess, certain of them in smaller measure than you….We also, like you, came in contact with Europe and its enlightenment as a result of historical events. We looked at our ignorance with sorrow, and at foreign knowledge with consternation. We fell in love with this knowledge, we endeavored to make its treasures our own…but in our blind veneration of foreign treasures we were not able to recognize the evil admixtures in them; at the same time we forgot our own greatest treasure.

Khomiakov then described in detail all the mistakes Russia made in its attempt to mimic blindly the West:

> We took over the law court from the Germans, with its secrecy and formality, discarding the rights of human conscience… the beautiful and comfortable dress of our forefathers was replaced with the ugly

[552] Khomiakov, p. 378.

> dress of the Western nations about which in time we could not be reminded without ridicule. We changed our customs to accept foreign ones… finally (it is shameful to recall), we despised our own language, a great Slavic tongue, the most ancient and the best of all human tongues; we despised it and stopped writing it. In public and even in friendly conversations we substituted for it the most pitiful prattle of the most barren of all European languages.

Yet, Khomiakov stressed that not the entire Russian population was afflicted by this desire to imitate, claiming, "this self-humiliation actually existed, not among the people, only in the upper class of society, which had lost contact with the people. It wished to imitate everything foreign, it wished to appear foreign, and to the people it became foreign."

Khomiakov's criticism of the Russian elite echoes many of the points raised in previous chapters by Russian travelers in the Balkans: Gil'ferding had attacked Serbs for dressing up as Europeans during his travels, and Makushev had fiercely reproached the Montenegrin royal family for speaking in French at the dinner table. Yet, Khomiakov was the first to lay out clearly in one document a synthesis of the points raised by earlier travelers. His writing also shows the degree to which the travelers observations abroad mirrored debates that were occurring inside Russia. Even though Khomiakov's text was addressed to the Serbs, a large percentage of the text detailed Russia's faults and failings, supposedly so as to encourage the Serbs not to repeat the same errors. Yet his text was written in Russian and circulated mainly in Russia, suggesting that Khomiakov was targeting the Westernised Russian elite for criticism as much as he was giving advice to his supposed brothers. In this way the *Letter to the Serbs* represents an assertion of a worldview more than a simple letter. The letter was signed by ten of Khomiakov's closest intellectual companions.[553] Of the eleven signatories, only one, Ivan Aksakov, is among the travelers considered here.[554] Many of the travelers from this period shared their views, statements, and, probably, beliefs. It is impossible to establish "who copied whom." Rather it seems Khomiakov's letter represents the culmination of ideas

[553] In the order that the names appear in: Michael Pogodin, Aleksandr Koshaliov, Ivan Beliaev, Nikolai Elagin, Iurii Samarin, Piotr Bezsonov, Konstantin Aksakov, Piotr Bartenev, Fedor Chizhov, and Ivan Aksakov. See Khomiakov, p. 379.

[554] Ivan Aksakov was not, however, the only one of the signatories to have travelled. Pogodin had travelled extensively in the West Slav lands, and Samarin travelled in Europe as well. Yet Ivan Aksakov was the only one to keep a written account of his trip to the South Slav lands.

that had been developing and growing in popularity among certain circles over several decades. As the travelers in previous chapters had attempted to classify the populations of the South Slav lands, they had in many ways simultaneously highlighted certain aspects of their own identity: Orthodoxy and Slavdom came to the forefront while other themes such as that of a multi-national empire receded. This identity was not universal: many in Russia would not have subscribed to it, preferring instead to look to the West for cultural inspiration and innovation. Many more people living within the Russian empire would have been excluded from it: as Muslims, Jews, Buddhists, Catholics or Protestants they would not have fit into Khomiakov's vision of the centrality of Orthodoxy. As speakers of Sami, Chechen, Tatar or any of the myriad other languages spoken in the empire, more would have been excluded for not speaking the Slavic tongue. Yet, it was the worldview exclaimed in Khomiakov's letter that, as we shall see, for a brief moment in the 1870s came to enforce itself on the public sphere to the degree that some used it to speak "for the people" and even to drive Russia's foreign policy.

Many of the ideas expressed by Khomiakov had been expressed prior to the Crimean War, but it was only in the aftermath of Russia's humiliation in this conflict that these ideas came together in a semi-coherent fashion. The war provoked much national self-reflection among educated circles, where once again, a stereotype of Serbia was presented as a superior example. Khomiakov was quick to cast the war as a sign of Russia's past sins, Western betrayal, and the need to return to the country's Orthodox past. Imitation of the West had led to excessive pride and the exploitation of peasants through the institution of serfdom. Russia, Khomiakov argued, had strayed from its intended path, and thus "war, the just war we undertook against Turkey for the amelioration of the fate of our Eastern brothers, served as our punishment, for God did not allow us to perform such a clean deed with unclean hands." Russia's stunning defeat in the war represented for Khomiakov not only the punishment of God, but also a demonstration of Western duplicity, as "the alliance of the two most powerful states in Europe, England and France, the perfidy of Austria which we saved, and the hostile attitude of almost all the rest of the nations forced us to conclude a degrading peace." For Khomiakov, the experience of defeat was an enlightening one for "the disastrous war made us

wise." As a result "we now know the futility of our self delusion…God grant us that our repentance and correction shall not cease, that the good beginning may bring forth good results in our spiritual purification." This purification necessitated the rejection of the West and its corruption of Russian culture. Khomiakov was calling for a more Orthodox, more pure country, cut off from the influences that had led it astray, just as many travelers had made similar claims about the Balkans, praising places like Montenegro for having avoided contamination.

As Travel Continues

As Khomiakov was writing polemics from home, the number of Russian travellers to the Balkans continued to grow. Russian travelogues of the 1860s and early 1870s likewise testify to efforts to negotiate Russia's place in post- Crimea Europe. Travellers responded to this challenge in a myriad of ways, as witnessed by conflicting representations of conditions in the Balkans, which some represented as a stereotypical Slavic ideal, and others as a state of suffering and horror. These travellers of the 1860s and 1870s had a clear idea of where they were going and what people they expected to encounter when they got there. Many were students of earlier travellers, such as Osip Bodianskii and Ismail Sreznevskii who had gone on to have successful careers in Russian universities after returning from their travels in the 1830s and 1840s.

Many of this younger generation of travellers were from Moscow, but there were exceptions. Vladimir Ivanovich Lamanskii (1833-1914) was very much a product of the capital's elite: born into a noble family, his father was the director of a branch of the ministry of finance. Young Lamanskii attended the prestigious First Petersburg Gymnasium before reading history at St. Petersburg University, where he successfully defended his masters' in Slavic history in 1859.[555] Before going on to pursue a doctorate, however, Lamanskii accepted a two-year government stipend to travel in the South Slav lands, with the goal of improving his language skills and general knowledge of the

[555] His masters' thesis was titled "On the History of the Slavs in Asia, Africa and Spain," a topic which was being investigated in various academic circles at this time in Russia.

region. Over the course of these travels (1862-1864), his interest shifted progressively away from the style of history he had studied in St Petersburg and moved increasingly towards ethnography.[556] In this respect, he was not alone: Pavel Apollonovich Rovinskii shared this passion writing extensively on his ethnographic findings in Montenegro (as we have seen) as well as on Serbia. "Scientific ethnography" was emerging as a distinct and influential genre throughout mid-nineteenth century Europe. Whilst the circumstances in which Russians travelled to the Balkans were not the same as, for example, British travellers in India, the basic parameters of the genre can nonetheless be found in Russian writing after the mid-nineteenth century. Furthermore, Russian travelogues written about travels to the eastern and southern parts of the Russian empire often contain substantial overlap with their Western colonialist counterparts.

As the genre diversified, so did the type of Russian travelling to the Balkans. Rovinskii, unlike most of the other travellers mentioned here, was not Moscow educated- he had graduated instead from the University of Kazan. Rovinskii was an avid traveller, who journeyed extensively in Asia as well as in the Balkans. Yet it was Serbia, and particularly Montenegro that captivated him: he moved to Montenegro in 1879, and remained there for nearly thirty years. Ivan Aksakov, meanwhile, did come from Moscow's landed gentry, and attended Moscow University where he was active in the Slavophile circle of Khomiakov, and a signatory of the afore mentioned Letter, as was his brother Konstantin. Other travellers, such as Ivan Liprandi and Solomon Chudnovskii had less academic backgrounds, although they were no less shrewd in their observations on the ground. Liprandi was a Lieutenenat Colonel in the Russian infantry who had distinguished himself in the Crimean War, and was considered by the Minister of the Interior to be a "most clever and trusted agent."[557]

---

[556] Ludmila Pavlovna Lapteva, *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke* (The History of Slavic Studies in Russia in the Nineteenth Century) (Moscow: Indrik, 2005), pp. 358-359. After his travels, Lamanskii returned to Russia and eventually took up a position at St Petersburg University, where he taught and published extensively for several decades. He was also an active member of the St Petersburg Slavic Benevolent Society, and a frequent contributor to the journal *Slavianskie izvestiia*.

[557] Bruce Lincoln, *Nicholas I, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), p. 308.

While the travellers studied up to this point have been predominantly scholars, by the 1860s, travel was changing and quickly becoming open to different members of Russian society. Generational changes also played a key role, and the last traveller we will look at in this chapter, Chudnovskii, had studied at the Medical-Surgical Institute of St. Petersburg, but had been expelled in 1870 due to his revolutionary activities. At that point, he travelled to Western Europe, where he became interested in the study of ethnography and statistics, and later on to Serbia, where he was interested in Balkan revolutionary activity. His writing demonstrates the social changes that were taking place within Russian society at the time, and represents the start of overtly political travel to the region.

We Are Not the West

For many travellers, Russia's humiliating loss in the Crimean War resulted in both a defensive anti-Western hysteria and a bloated image of the Self. Liprandi was one of the shrillest advocates of the need for a new order in South Eastern Europe, blaming the West, and its behaviour in the Balkans, on anti-Russianness. He repeatedly used the Balkans as a platform on which to promote an enhanced position of authority for Russia within Europe, based on what he saw as his country's superior knowledge on the region. In his travels in the Balkans, Liprandi called for complete expulsion of the Turks from Europe and the freeing of the Slavs. The fact that Russia had very recently been defeated militarily does not appear to have tempered his insular and defensive views. In his opinion, it was only the West that stood in the way of this vision being realised. He claimed that many of Russia's critics in Western Europe would never allow the nations of the Balkans to free themselves of the Ottoman Empire, as the West was "scared of Russia" and, in a misguided belief that Russia had expansionist motives in the Balkans, saw "Russia as the main enemy of the West." According to Liprandi, distrust of Russia was common in the West, where many regarded the Eastern

Question as synonymous with the "Russian Question."[558] Liprandi was at pains to counter this notion of an expansionist Russia. He argued that Russia's interest in the region was humanitarian, and that although the common religion did make the Balkans especially important to many in Russia, it was not for this reason alone that he advocated intervention. He then claimed, rather pompously, that "Russians in their magnanimity always extend a helping hand to all nations in need, regardless of their religion" and he claimed his fellow countrymen would feel the same "if those suffering were Muslims or Jews."[559]

In Liprandi's eyes, the West failed to understand the Balkans in the same way they could not comprehend Russia. He saw this as being motivated by Western fear of Russia. On the one hand, this seems a defensive line given Russia's overwhelming military defeat in Crimea, yet the fear Liprandi was citing appeared to be the fear of the unknown, which was a common theme in many of the Russian travelogues. Several of the travellers expressed frustration, although often mixed with smug superiority, at their supposedly advanced level of knowledge of the Balkans. In the Balkans, the Russians presented themselves as the knowing and understanding brother Slav, an advantage they held over Western travellers. Thus, several travelogues began with the explanation that they felt a duty to educate people about the Balkans. These travelogues also reinforced the perception among some that Russia had a superior level of knowledge about the region. Liprandi claimed that "all" the books being published on Bulgaria were based on first-hand experience with the region by people who had travelled there and witnessed directly the conditions in the region. Liprandi felt this made them more qualified to discuss the region, than Westerners who were susceptible to misconceptions.[560]

Knowing about the Balkans was thus presented as a duty to Russians, even a necessary aspect of their national being. Yet some of the travellers felt

---

[558] Ivan Liprandi, "Bolgariia," in *Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh*. No. 1 (1877), p.i.
[559] Liprandi, p. iii.
[560] Liprandi, p.22. It can be presumed that by "all" books written on Bulgaria, Liprandi means all books written in Russian. All the books to which he refers are Russian publications, and he does not seem aware that Westerners were publishing works, including travelogues, on Bulgaria at this time.

that not enough Russians had yet awakened to this duty. In his writing, Petrovskii attacked what he called the "unpardonable indifference of the educated elite" arguing that it is their moral responsibility to take an interest in the south Slavs.[561] Liprandi explained that his purpose in writing about the Balkans was that he wanted his readers to understand who really lived there, and that the region contained related peoples.[562] While some travellers sought to rouse the feelings of their fellow countrymen, others simultaneously felt the need to correct Westerners and their uninformed misconceptions about the region. In his travelogue, Lamanskii ridicules "the mistakes of French publicists" who knew so little about Serbia that they have gullibly reprinted various mistakes told to them (deliberately) by Serbian brochures.[563] Lamanskii clearly felt his superior level of understanding prevented him from such duping, and attempted to convey an "accurate" depiction of the region to his audience. While Lamanskii focussed on the cultural and economic aspects of what he saw of Serbian life, Petrovskii was worried by the consequences that Western ignorance would have on the political situation, and lamented the inability of Austria and Russia to devise a common policy for dealing with the Balkans.[564]

Yet, while Petrovskii might have wanted a better-coordinated multinational plan for dealing with the Balkans, many Russian writers felt that foreign influence in the region was negative, and attacked all foreigners, except themselves, who had been involved in the area. This was portrayed as an "ancient" problem, dating back centuries. Besides the colonising Turks, several other "foreigners" had tried to interfere. Once again, several travellers blamed the Greeks for having played what they saw as a sinister role in the region's past. Historically, Liprandi argued, the Balkan Christians had been persecuted and held back by what he called "Greek enmity." This "ancient, historical" hatred was due to endless Greek intrigue and interference in Balkan

---

[561] M . Petrovskii, *Otchet o puteshestvii po slavianskim zemliam (Report on travels around the Slavic lands)* (Kazan, 1862), p. 5.
[562] Liprandi, p. iii.
[563] Vladimir Ivanovich Lamanskii, "Serbiia i iuzhno-slavianskie provintsii Avstrii," in A.L. Shemiakin, *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh* (Russians on Serbia and the Serbs) (Moscow: Aletiia, 2006), p. 27. The original excerpts were published in St. Petersburg, 1864.
[564] Petrovskii, p. 3.

Slav affairs.[565] Greeks, according to Liprandi, had always tried to impose their religious leaders over the Bulgarians, despite the fact that most of the Greek clergy appeared incapable of or disinclined to learn Bulgarian. Liprandi cited numerous examples of historical slights, such as Greek refusal to recognise medieval Bulgarian Tsar Simion, and the belief of Tsar Svetozar that the Greeks should be expelled from Europe, due to their negative influence.[566]

In recent times however, it was the West, either out of an inability to understand what was happening in the Balkans, or fear of Russian expansionism, or sheer cruelty, that was playing a harmful and obstructive role in the region. Many of the Russians blamed Western interference for the conditions of the Balkan Christians. Aksakov was extremely critical of the West, blaming various countries, in particular Austria for the Serbs' miserable conditions. He accused the Austrians of reinforcing Turkish domination over Serbia and wrote that the Serbs "would have freed themselves of their guardianship long ago, were it not for the foreign powers." While "Catholic propaganda" was infiltrating the region with great success, Aksakov was left feeling upset and powerless, claiming "Russia is limited to being only sympathetic" and was unable to counter the Austrian efforts. Part of the reason for the success of "Catholic propaganda" in the region was the Austrian-imposed censorship imposed on Serbia: no printed matter could enter Serbia if it had been banned in Austria, as there was no other postal route to the country. As a result, Serbs were cut off from Europe, as even trivial items, such as newspapers from Belgium, could not get through the Austrian control.[567] For this reason, Aksakov claimed in his letters home that he was writing only about the basic facts of his trips, and omitting the most interesting details, as he was sure that they would be censored. Another letter consisted of little more than an endless attack on the Austrian postal system, and almost no information on Serbia, suggesting that Aksakov fully expected his letters to be read and was attempting to send a heavy handed message to the nearby Austrian postal authorities!

Aksakov felt that this constant surveillance and intervention had

[565] Liprandi, p. 21 and p. 25.
[566] Liprandi, p. 20.
[567] Aksakov, p. 465.

created an atmosphere of 'too much intrigue and too many spies" combined with harmful Western interference. Aksakov tried to illustrate his argument by citing the case of a "Turkified Bosnian" who had converted from Islam, and as a result was beaten almost to death by the Ottoman authorities. In the aftermath of the ensuing scandal, according to Aksakov "all the foreign embassies conspired to incriminate the Serbs." Aksakov attacked in particular the English consulate for what he saw as its ridiculous behaviour, claiming it had announced that it would not recognise local Serbian laws as holding any meaning. Only the Russian embassy, and the Prussian after considerable Russian persuasion, took the side of the Serbs in this matter.[568] While Aksakov attacked the negative role played by Western embassies in the region, he never doubted that Russia should and must be involved.

Aksakov clearly argued that consular sympathy was not sufficient, and insisted Russia had a moral duty to help the South Slavs "who have always put their belief in Russia, their love and sympathy."[569] The next paragraphs provide an insight into how Aksakov perceived his country's role in the Balkans. This duty was explained in grandiose terms: "Russia's historical calling, moral right, and duty to free the Slav peoples from their material and spiritual yoke and give them the gift of independent spiritual and political life under the shade of the powerful wings of the Russian eagle." This statement could easily be interpreted as imperialist, attempting to justify Russian expansionism, though Aksakov no doubt genuinely believed what he wrote for moral and ideological reasons. Why did he think Russia had such a duty to a people in a foreign empire? The reasons are numerous, but religion, "blood" and a common imagined past predominate. Orthodoxy, and its defence, was central to the Russian self image that men like Aksakov had been constructing. The nineteenth century saw a resurgence of faith in Russia, despite the fact that the church remained in many ways at odds with certain elements of Russia's educated classes. In their revolt against the perceived immorality of the Enlightenment, some in the educated classes sought a return to ancestral traditions, real or imagined.

[568] Aksakov, pp. 471-472.
[569] Aksakov, p. 466.

Yet, this conservative turn was inherently contradictory.[570] Orthodoxy was certainly part of Russia's "ancestral" traditions, yet since the time of Peter the Great, it had been subjugated to the authority of the state; others in educated circles found the church lacking in spiritual and intellectual stimulation.[571] Yet, despite a certain degree of alienation from the church, particularly among elements of the intelligentsia, religion moved to the forefront of the debate on national identity, coming to be seen as a defining aspect of Russianness, as well as a key part of the basis for Russian-Balkan brotherhood. Aksakov himself equated the terms "Russian," "Orthodox," and "Slav," seeing Orthodoxy as central to being Russian, and, as the leaders of the Orthodox world, the defence of Orthodoxy abroad was described as a requirement of maintaining Russian honour on the international stage, as well as before the Empire's own citizens.

The Byzantine Past

The centrality of the Balkans to Russians was also reaffirmed by the idea that the Balkans represented the origins of Russian culture, as some members of the educated class had imagined it. Liprandi, following Venelin, called Bulgaria a "classical country" for Russia in a way that the West does not share and cannot understand.[572] This argument served not only to explain the necessity of Russia's involvement in the region, but also to separate Russia and Russian civilisation from that of the West. What made Bulgaria a "classical country" in the eyes of some Russians? In c ontrast to earlier romantic Slavophile visions, conservatives of the 1860s onwards were more pragmatic in their approach and interested themselves more with tangible contemporary politics than with vague dreams.[573] Many Russian conservative intellectuals at this time, in their efforts to create an image of themselves and their homeland, were deliberately rejecting the image of Russia created by Peter the Great and continued by his successors. That influence was visible

[570] Alexander Martin, *Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997), pp. 4-5.
[571] Martin, p. 145.
[572] Liprandi, p. 22.
[573] Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p.460.

everywhere and affected every aspect of modern Russian life, as Mikhail Pogodin noted in his famous essay on the late Tsar.[574] Conservatives such as the Aksakov brothers revolted against this influence and idealised pre-Petrine Russia, as they imagined it to have been. As noted above, this pre-Petrine state was an Orthodox one. Since Russia had received its religion and church language in many ways from Bulgaria, where Cyril and Methodius had first succeeded in converting large numbers by translating the Bible into Slavonic, Bulgaria could be imagined as the birthplace of the Cyrillic alphabet and the shared religious past. After the fall of Constantinople and the South Slav lands to the Turks, Russia maintained this heritage as an independent state, the Third Rome after the fall of the Second. During his reign, Nicholas I had done much to encourage this imagery and heritage, constructing buildings in a nouveau-Byzantine style and thus steering his country away architecturally from Western Europe. Alexander II presided over the official celebrations of the thousandth anniversary of Rus', a much publicized observance that also resulted in the construction of monuments emphasising Russia's Byzantine origins.[575] A nostalgia for this inheritance emerged, and many in the educated classes of the nineteenth century, in their nostalgic efforts to retrace their ancestral roots, chose to look at Bulgaria as the home of many aspects of their culture which they valued.

It was from this sense of inheritance of the position of the Third Rome that interest in the Balkans was encouraged. Furthermore, the notion of the Third Rome implied certain duties that accompany roles of leadership, and it was from this sense of responsibility that part of the notion of duty towards the Balkans sprang. Understanding Balkan history was seen not only as understanding a common shared past, it was also part of the duty of a concerned Orthodox Christian. Central to the interpretation of this supposedly shared past was the Battle of Kosovo. As did Gil'ferding in Bosnia, many of the Russians in Serbia appear to have been deeply fascinated and moved by the myth of the Battle of Kosovo. While Russia might have inherited the title of Third Rome and thus defender of the

[574] For more on Pogodin's essay, see Walicki, p.52.
[575] Wortman, p. 214.

Orthodox, it did so in part because of the loss of the ancient (and Orthodox) Serbian kingdom. According to Rovinskii, Kosovo Polje marked the beginning of an ongoing battle between Christianity and Islam, which he (and other travellers, such as Aksakov) saw as continuing into their lifetime. United by their shared religion and Byzantine past, this battle of civilisations was central to Serbian, and by extension Russian, identity. The impact of the battle on Serbs could be clearly observed by the travellers several centuries after the event, and the way in which Serbs 'remembered' the battle shed light on their identity for the Russians. On one occasion, Rovinskii witnesses a father testing his small son's knowledge:

> "The father asked the son 'who are you?' He responded 'a Serb.'
> 'Where did the Serbian kingdom fall?'
> 'On Kosovo Polje.'
> 'Who was killed at Kosovo Polje?'
> 'King Lazar, nine Yugovićes, and all Serbian heroes'
> 'And who else?'
> 'Tsar Murat'
> 'How did he die?'
> 'He was knifed by Miloš Obilić.'
> 'How do we commemorate Tsar Lazar, Miloš Obilić and all the Serbian heroes?'
> 'By preserving everlasting memory.'
> 'And Murat?'
> 'Curse him!'
>
> 'Who is the enemy of the Serbs?'
> 'The Turks.' And
> who else?'
> 'The Shvabs' [the Austrians]
> 'What would you wish to do to them?'
> 'Take a sabre and cut off their heads."[576]

[576] Pavel Rovinskii, in A.L. Shemiakin, *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh* (Moscow: Aletiia, 2006), pp. 38-118. See p.74. Excerpts originally published in *Vestnik Evropy* between 1868 and 1875.

Rovinskii found this lesson enlightening, referring to the questions and answers as being a Serbian catechism, to be learned by heart by all children. Seemingly following the argument proposed by Gil'ferding a decade earlier, Rovinskii claimed Serbia had defended Orthodoxy at Kosovo Polje, and it was thus the duty of Russians to defend Serbia and their common Byzantine-inspired culture, against its perpetual enemies.

The shared religion and the belief that the Balkans represented the cradle of a common and unique civilisation form much of the basis for arguments in support of Russian intervention. The same arguments were also used by the Russians in their attempts to explain the attitudes of the Balkan Christians towards them. Aksakov and Liprandi felt the Serbs and Bulgarians loved Russia and had placed all their belief in the country. Lamanskii, however, tempered this view. He concurred with the afore-mentioned writers that Serbs were the people outside the Russian Empire who were closest to Russians, and they were thus in a position to understand "Russia and its mission and vocation in the Slavic World." Yet he suspected certain members of the Serbian elite of betraying Russia and its mission by failing to commit themselves to this nouveau-Byzantine culture. He was horrified to find that Russian was not widely taught outside the seminaries, though "all educated Serbs should speak it." He was even more appalled by the impression that some in the elite "put on a show of Westernness" in a deliberate attempt to prove that they were not actually related to Russians. Lamanskii even accused some Serbian diplomats of obsequiousness to Western Europe during the Crimean War, which he saw as a direct betrayal of Russia.[577]

Yet, as in Russia where the elite were frequently accused of similar examples of cultural betrayal whilst the peasants were portrayed by many Slavophiles as representing the "true spirit" of Russia, in Serbia too travellers argued, this betrayal was not found among "simple Orthodox Serbs." These "simple Serbs" loved Russia immeasurably and "respect and love the Russian Tsar and the Tsar of Orthodoxy" who was obliged "to defend the interests of

[577] Lamanskii, p. 33.

Orthodox Christians."[578] During his travels, Rovinskii claimed to have made efforts to speak with such "simple" people. One peasant told him that he was Serbian. Rovinskii tried to explain that he was actually from Russia, and that "Russians and Serbo-Slavs are peoples related by language and the same Orthodox faith" but they live in separate empires. The peasant rejected this, announcing, "no, you are a Serb, you just don't know it." The peasant then showed him an old book where it was "proven" that "all Russians are Serbs."[579] Lamanskii had a similar experience while conversing with Serbian peasants, who repeatedly assured him *"rusi tako su srbi"* (Russians are the same as Serbs) which Lamanskii explained by claiming that in Serbia "the people love Russians, not only as being the same as Serbs (that is, Orthodox) but as the people who are helping them to freedom from the Turkish yoke and who, consequently, do not fail to live up to their expectations."[580] In his travels, Rovinskii was moved by the warm response he received, finding that everyone he met seemed to be interested in Russia and bombarded him with questions about his homeland, such as: is it really cold in the winter?[581] Rovinskii also found that the Serbs he talked with were well aware of Russian efforts in the region, and were familiar with the names of the Russian politicians central to their interests, such as Ignatiev and Gorchakov. Several asked Rovinskii if Russia would "attack the Turks." They were also equally curious to know what Russians thought about them, and what people in Russia knew about Serbia.[582]

The text suggests that Rovinskii found it quite normal that Serbs were particularly interested in what Russians thought of them, and that they apparently thought Russians were Serbs, rather than the other way around. As he noted on several occasions, Serbs thought of themselves in grandiose terms. He conceded however that although "Serbs are very self-confident, they have a right to be." Rovinskii identified this confident spirit as the factor which had made it possible for the Serbs to continually rise up against their enemies.[583]

---

[578] Lamanskii, p. 34.
[579] Rovinskii, p. 82.
[580] Lamanskii, p. 34.
[581] Rovinskii, p. 70.
[582] Rovinskii, p. 71.
[583] Rovinskii, p. 39.

Lamanskii saw Serbia as a nation in which "the spirit of equality and freedom" flourished, and he described the Serbs as "more proud and warlike than hard-working or industrial."[584]

Rovinskii and the "Serbian Character"

Rovinskii in particular had a romanticised view of Serbia as a land morally and spiritually superior to anything he had seen in Western Europe. Upon arrival in Belgrade, he observed that "few cities in Europe could, from the first glance, carry such pleasant impression as Belgrade." Although Serbia was undeniably economically impoverished, he wondered at "how unpoor the life is here, it is very far from the dirt and horror that is many cities of Europe." He claimed there was no pauperism, and that the air was fresh, unlike in Western Europe. Furthermore, unlike poor regions of unequal Western Europe, all Serbs had good food and were able to dress well.[585] The Serbs' moral superiority was additionally manifested through their figures. Although there was supposedly an abundance of food in the country, Rovinskii wrote that "fat and fleshy people, like we have, do not exist in Serbia." The Serbs thus had plenty, but had not succumbed to the excess and decadence prevalent in Western Europe, and due to exposure, in Russia as well.[586]

In his attempt to create an image of the "Serbian character," Rovinskii described them as a very practical people. He claimed Serbs were alien to idealism and that they simply "don't understand the concept." Their utilitarian nature could be seen in the great popularity of "practical subjects" at the local gymnasium, where Rovinskii claimed "all students" want to study areas such as law, despite the lack of teachers qualified to instruct them.[587] The Serbs were additionally a tough race who "feared all soft feelings." The men kept their weapons always ready and were prepared at "a moment's notice" to abandon all close emotional ties if necessary.[588] Nevertheless despite this, Serbs were generally a sociable people who valued their families and friends. Thus although Belgrade proved completely lacking in the kind of literary and

[584] Lamanskii, p. 28.
[585] Rovinskii, p. 46.
[586] Rovinskii, p. 59.
[587] Rovinskii, p. 54.
[588] Rovinskii, p. 97.

trade- based societies to which Rovinskii was accustomed and initially sought out in Serbia, he soon found it very easy to meet local people. He wrote that it seemed that "everyone in Belgrade knows each other" and the legendary "Slavic hospitality" was certainly present. In Belgrade and throughout his travels in the region, Rovinskii found himself constantly being invited to dinners, lunches and Slavas with local Serbs.[589] He was thus able to observe closely their domestic relations and culture.

Rovinskii was warmed by the "incredible love within families" he witnessed, especially the love of sisters for their brothers, whom they often love more than their husbands.[590] As in Montenegro, however, Rovinskii was astounded by the state of marital relations in Serbia, where "Serbian women still live under the despotism of their husbands" and it was difficult for youths to meet those of the opposite sex, since girls rarely strayed from the supervision of their relatives and were raised "as if inside prisons."[591] The gulf between educational levels was wide, clearly more so than in Rovinskii's Russia. Thus, the traveller marvelled that it was still common for a man who had been educated abroad and who was comfortable discussing politics and science, to have an illiterate wife who "knows nothing beyond the kitchen and sewing" (although Rovinskii noted with approval that all Serbian housewives cook very well). Rovinskii claimed such relationships were sustained by the fact that husbands and wives almost never saw each other- the husbands were rarely ever home and the wives were practically forbidden from leaving home.[592]

Rovinskii's opinions on Serbian marital relations suggest that he was more a product of post-Petrine European culture than he might have wanted to believe. Gender relations in pre-Petrine Russia had similarities to those witnessed in nineteenth century Serbia. Peter, inspired by his European travels, had decreed that women socialise publicly with men. In Rovinskii's writings on the Balkans, Russia oddly, and no doubt unintentionally, takes on the role of the civilising Western force. Rovinskii claimed that "men, even

[589] Rovinskii, p. 51.
[590] Rovinskii, p. 108.
[591] Rovinskii, p. 58.
[592] Rovinskii, p. 57.

those educated abroad-except in Russia- do not have the slightest need for female company, and look at women in a material and one-sided way."[593] Those who had studied in Russia, however, had apparently learned how to appreciate the opposite sex, making Russia ironically the filter through which Westernisation might be achieved in the Balkans.

If the state of gender relations puzzled Rovinskii, he was quite pleased by what he saw as the separation of different nationalities in Serbia. He observed that people of many different nationalities were resident in Belgrade, citing in particular Jews, whom he was pleased to note did not monopolise commerce as he believed they did everywhere else, and Czechs, who he claimed occupied mainly professional roles, such as doctors.[594] Yet despite this presence of these "foreigners," Rovinskii noted that there had been little intermarriage between Serbs and non-Serbs. Although he did not write of this specifically using the terms of "race" or even "tribe," he did claim that this had allowed the Serbs to "preserve their Serbian physiognomy" and morally superior style of life. Rovinskii was satisfied to note that "the Serbian character" had been preserved over the centuries, and wondered if this was sufficient to represent a rebuff to progress and civilisation.[595]

Yet despite this presence of these "foreigners," Rovinskii noted that there had been little intermarriage between Serbs and non-Serbs. Although he did not write of this specifically using the terms of "race" or even "tribe," he did claim that this had allowed the Serbs to "preserve their Serbian physiognomy" and morally superior style of life. Rovinskii was satisfied to note that "the Serbian character" had been preserved over the centuries, and wondered if this was sufficient to represent a rebuff to progress and civilisation.[596] Yet, such a description directly contradicts that of Aksakov, who described Belgrade, as a lovely town, "especially when seen from the water" and one that had been "physically built in the European style."[597] This European influence offended Aksakov less than the traces of Turkish influence

[593] Rovinskii, p. 59.
[594] Rovinskii, p. 49.
[595] Rovinskii, p. 47.
[596] Rovinskii, p. 45.
[597] Aksakov, p. 453.

still visible in the town: it was with a heavy heart that he saw Kalemegdan,[598] and he claimed to hear Turkish music and to see Turkish soldiers frequently around the city.[599] In the case of Rovinskii, however, it seemed more likely that he was referring to more than mere cosmetic design when describing Serbia as a rebuff to the West. Serbia's potential to permanently ignore the model of the West was central to the hopes that some conservative intellectuals, such as Rovinskii and Aksakov, had invested in the country.

While he saw Serbia as having the potential to remain in its pure state, Rovinskii worried that this ideal would not last, as there have "unfortunately" been several recent attempts at centralisation and increased organisation of the country.[600] He also noted the appearance of certain institutions designed to mimic Western ones. For example, while staying in one of Belgrade's few hotels, run by Austrian Serbs, he noted that his room was clean and light, complete with an iron bed and soft pillows. Yet Rovinskii saw this as the illusion of European civilisation, copied from Austria, and not genuinely either "civilised" in the Western sense, or properly Serbian.[601] It was, thus, a sign of what he feared most: the encroaching of artificial imitation of the West.

Questioning Voices

Not all Russian travellers were of the same opinion as Rovinskii. Lamanskii took a less idealized view finding that the economic backwardness, poverty, and lack of adequate infrastructure (he claimed there were no canals or proper bridges) were all detrimental to the country. Furthermore, the lack of educated people was holding the country back, economically as well as politically. Although Lamanskii found that attempts had been made to create more schools, there were not yet enough literate people, with the result that those who were educated were employed by the government. As a result, Lamanskii wrote, "very harmful for the current development of Serbia is the lack of educated people who are independent of

[598] The Turkish fortress in the centre of Belgrade, it overlooks the water where the Sava river meets the Danube, which in the nineteenth century was the border between Serbia/ the Ottoman Empire and Austria.
[599] Aksakov, p. 16.
[600] Rovinskii, p. 48.
[601] Rovinskii, p. 43.

the government."[602] Lamanskii felt that this was stifling the development of an independent intelligentsia, the very class that could create a dynamic cultural life for the country. He also complained that not even all those in the government were particularly well- educated: many civil servants were apparently only semi-literate.

Other Russian travellers expressed views of the Serbs that were not wholly positive. Even Aksakov, great Slavophile that he was, grew weary of what he saw as endless squabbling amongst the Serbs, writing that infighting "lies in the blood of the Serbs: disputes, enmity, slander, and libel are everyday occurrences here."[603] Lamanskii found Serbia to be, among other things, the land of intrigue and half-baked ambitions where every half-educated person is a civil servant, and where "every Serb wants to be a minister and every minister *knjaz*."[604] Rovinskii was surprised to find that no matter how serious a Serb seems to be, they were nonetheless prone to dreams and fantasy, often imagining themselves in grandiose terms.[605] There was also the creeping approach of materialism: as Rovinskii noted, all Serbs complain they were poor, even if they are not, and all want to be richer, even if they already live in relative comfort.[606] Thus, while some, particularly Aksaksov, invested high hopes in the morality of the Serbian nation, others were already aware of the approach of change: the country might still be a rebuff to Western civilisation, yet elements of the elite were clearly being influenced by it. While several of the Russians disliked Serbian efforts to adopt the superficial appearance of the West, they also missed the conveniences of Western comfort they themselves had grown up accustomed to.

Several of the travellers' writings and letters home suggest their frequent denunciations of the West represented a more complex attitude than they might seem. Aksakov might have devoted his literary career to proclaiming the glories of his homeland, but his letters home to his family

---

[602] Lamanskii, p. 28. Rovinskii took a different view, citing bureaucrats, along with journalists, as being the key pillars of the local intelligentsia. See Rovinskii, p. 65.
[603] Aksakov, p. 463.
[604] Lamanskii, pp. 28-29.
[605] Rovinskii, p. 73.
[606] Rovinskii, p. 53.

reveal certain contradictions. Receiving a letter from his mother informing him that his brother Konstantin had fallen ill, he immediately responded by telling his mother that his brother must be sent abroad as soon as possible, and he recommended Vienna "where there are excellent doctors."[607] Russia might have represented moral superiority to Aksakov, but when it came to getting the best care for his own family, he clearly recognised his homeland's limitations. In doing so, he brought himself closer to those Russians he frequently attacked for constantly turning to the West. His letters also show a certain amount of impatience with the inefficiencies of everyday life in Serbia for which even brotherly Slavic love could not compensate. His letters arrived sporadically, and many for his family appeared to have gone missing. Feeling cut off from his relatives and worried about his brother's health, Aksakov complained that he cannot wait to be back in a proper "European city" with a functioning postal system. Rovinskii suffered a similar moment of frustration with the inconvenience of "Slavic simplicity." Upon crossing the border into Serbia, he waited for the onslaught of the horde of "cabbies and porters that form part of the fixture of civilised Europe, but that did not happen here."[608] Being forced to carry his own luggage while hunting for a porter seems to have a challenged to his belief in the need to reject Western artificiality and decadence and adhere to pure Slavic ways.

Revolutionary Solidarity

While the majority of those Russians who ventured to Serbia were heavily influenced by, or even active in, the Slavophile or pan-Slav movements in Russia, there were exceptions to this trend. By 1870, the type of Russian travelling to the Balkans was diversifying, with a new generation expressing interest in their brother Slavs, often for very different reasons. In the years after Nicholas I's death, a series of reforms profoundly changed the country's social and educational system with wide-reaching consequences.

---

[607] Aksakov, p.460. This letter home calls reveals not only Aksakov's apparent questions about the availability of quality medical care in Russia, but also his disgust with Poles, who clearly fall outside his notions of Slavic brotherhood. While encouraging his brother to travel West for medical care, he also warns him "not to travel through Warsaw on any conditions" as it was filled with treacherous Poles, p. 462.
[608] Rovinskii, p. 39.

In 1853, there were fewer than 3,000 university students in the Russian Empire, due in part to restrictions which made it nearly impossible for sons of peasants, soldiers, Jews, foreigners, clergymen and artisans to gain acceptance. However, between 1855 and 1858, a series of reforms revolutionised the Russian university system: uniforms were abolished, restrictions eased, military training for students was ended, and the libraries were remodelled on more Western lines. In this environment of greater freedom, student organisations began to develop and flourish, and some began to question the values of their society's authority figures.[609]

Revolutionary groups formed, albeit with often confused and ambiguous ideologies. This situation was not exclusive to Russia: similar movements were emerging in other Slav lands at the same time. Contacts between Serbian and Russian radicals began intensifying in the mid- 1860s, with many taking an interest in "the Slav problem." While the Slavophiles always remained centred around Moscow, these younger revolutionaries had greater connections with St. Petersburg. Furthermore, while many had specific revolutionary goals for their homeland, several were part of larger pan-European networks and as comfortable in Zurich or Vienna as in their own country. Their texts suggest they were intellectually closer to their Italian counterparts than to the Russian Slavophiles whose works have been studied in this thesis. The young revolutionaries had a very different view of the world and of the way in which they wished to see their country evolve and define itself. One such early leader of this movement was Ivan Ivanovich Bochkarev who had been born in the Tver district in 1842 and had learned the basics of publishing from his father, who had owned a printing press. While a student in St Petersburg, Bochkarev became deeply concerned by the "Slav problem" and decided to form *Obshchina*, an organisation of South Slav students studying in Russia who were already aligned with *Omladina*, a radical South Slav organisation. Bochkarev went abroad in 1866-67 to rally support in Russian exile communities. He travelled to Belgrade in 1867 to

[609]Franco Venturi, *The Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1960), pp. 121-122.

attend a meeting of *Omladina,* and prepare future cooperation.[610] Upon his eventual return to Russia, he spent several decades being hounded by the police. Among his crimes was his consistent refusal to write "Orthodox" next to his name on census forms, suggesting a very different feeling towards the Church than Aksakov or Gil'ferding would have displayed.[611]

While I found no travel notes of Bochkarev's South Slav adventures, his friend and fellow Petersburger, Solomon Lazerevich Chudnovskii (1849-1912), was a diligent note taker. From a relatively well-to-do Petersburg family, he became active in revolutionary politics while a student at the Medical-Surgical Academy of St Petersburg, from which he was expelled in 1869.[612] Already as a student, Chudnovskii's views were largely formed, to the extent that he even felt guilty about his student status, asking "should we not rather, we students, give up our privileged position, give up scholarship and devote ourselves to learning a craft, so as to take part as simple artisans or labourers in the life of the people, and merge with it?"[613]

His expulsion from university perhaps resolved this dilemma, and Chudnovskii left Russia for Zurich, where he was actively involved with Russian revolutionary circles, especially with the journal *Vpered*.[614] Interested in the rumours of emerging revolutionary politics in Serbia, Chudnovskii set off for Belgrade to investigate the scene for himself. Belgrade was not entirely unknown territory for him: although he had never been there before, his older brother Mikhail had been living and working in Serbia since the late 1850s and already had a flat and social network established. Mikhail helped introduce Solomon to Serbian political activists, with the aim of finding a

---

[610] Venturi, p. 352.
[611] Venturi, p. 353. Bochkarev spent many years in internal exile, first in his home town of Tver, then in Astrakhan, and in Archangel. Towards the end of his life, he found himself living near Yasnaya Polyana, where he became a close friend of Tolstoy, who heartily sympathised with Bochkarev's earlier stance on Orthodoxy and census forms.
[612] Chudnovskii was one of many students expelled at this time, after an incident between a student and a professor turned into a large protest which resulted in the police being forced to intervene and the school briefly being closed on 15 March 1869. For more on the incident, see Chudnovskii, pp. 358-359.
[613] Quoted in Chudnovskii, p. 359.
[614] Solomon Lazerevich Chunovskii, "Iz davnikh let: vospominaniia." (From Distant Years: Memories), in A.L. Shemiaki,. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh* (Russians on Serbia and the Serbs), (Moscow: Aletiia, 2006), p. 119.

Belgrade correspondent for *Vpered*.

As a young revolutionary, and ultimately a young member of Petersburg's urban intelligentsia, Chudnovskii shared little of the romantic idealisation of a supposed common Byzantine past which men like Aksakov focused on. Perhaps as a result of his different interests, Belgrade failed to impress Chudnovskii as it had some of the other Russians noted in this chapter. With a population he estimated at 40,000, Belgrade struck Chudnovskii as a resembling a provincial Russian village more than a "capital" (he routinely put the word capital in quotation marks when referring to Belgrade, apparently to underline his scorn). He described the city as being of "scanty size, with humble edifices." He noted the buildings were mainly one-storey, and generally built from wood. Very few, he noted, had "a European look" claiming that he had noticed many huts with "straw roofs and wattle and daub floors." Except for two or three, he complained the streets were "narrow and unpaved." He found one or two "very small hotels and a couple of cafes." He wrote that he was "stunned by the patriarchal habits of the 'capital'" and appeared generally unimpressed with the city, finding one of the few signs of a civilisation with which he could identify the recently constructed "very small theatre where they shown a really not bad drama troupe."[615] No mention was made at any point in Chudnovskii's writing of Orthodoxy; thus we cannot know his exact views on the subject, other than it clearly did not occupy the central importance it did for men like Aksakov or Gil'ferding. Rather, Chudnovskii quickly had his brother put him in touch with Serbian students and aspiring politicians. He claimed to have found those young Serbian radicals to be a mixed bunch. He was initially introduced to a young "engineer Pašić" who he complained "speaks badly in Russian, and no better in German, his adversaries claim he even speaks bad Serbian." Yet, while he found many of the local students to be crude and semi-literate, some of the higher up figures in the radical and socialist parties did impress him, particularly those who had studied abroad. He was delighted by Pera Velimirović, whom he found to speak Russian "fluently, even

[615] Chudnovskii, p. 121.

eloquently" and who agreed to write for *Vpered*.[616] Velimirović introduced Chudnovskii to many other figures in Serbia, in particular Svetozar Marković, whom Chudnovskii described as "the father of Serbian socialism."[617] Marković, like Velimirović, impressed Chudnovskii with his excellent command of Russian, and even announced he "considered Russia to be his second fatherland, which he really loved and highly valued its young generation."[618]

Chudnovskii's writing differed in many dramatic ways from the texts mentioned earlier in this study: Orthodoxy and "race" are of no or little importance to him. Like the other travellers, Churnovskii expressed sympathy for the Serbs and their plight at the hands of the Ottomans, but this empathy was based on political, reasoning rather than emotion, following the argument that all peoples have the right to self-determination. He did not refer to race at all, nor did he attempt to justify his connection with the Serbs on the grounds of "blood" and "tribe" as many others did, although he was clearly aware of the great linguistic similarities between the two nations. He also did not identify with folk traditions, nor did he seek them out as other travellers did: Churnovskii was a modern man, pursuing a modern political programme, and thus not the least interested in what he no doubt would have seen as superstitions. Finally, at no point in his writing on Serbia did Chudnovskii feel the need to denounce the West, nor did he appear to hide or feel ashamed of the fact that he was at this time based, for political reasons, in Zurich. Rather than cling to a romantic notion of Slavic purity and primitiveness, Chudnovskii valued international education- the Serbs who impress him the most are those, like Marković and Velimirović, who have studied abroad and been exposed to different cultures and ideas. Thus, while the writings examined previously in this chapter appear at times contradictory, as the writers praised the primitive but upon occasion yearned

---

[616] Ibid, p. 120. Pera Velimirović (1848-1921) was a Zurich educated Serbian politician who continued to rise in the Serbian government after Chudnoskii's visit, becoming a senator in 1901, and then Prime Minister in 1902 and again in 1908-1909.
[617] Svetozar Marković (1846-1875) was a Serbian publicist who had studied in St Petersburg between 1866-1869 and then in Zurich (1869-1870). It is interesting that the two men had apparently not met before, as Marković was active in revolutionary circles already in St Petersburg.
[618] Chudnovskii, p. 123.

for the comforts they were used to, Chudnovskii's work is more internally consistent in this regard. He was not impressed by the primitive, nor did he pretend to be.

Yet, despite all these differences, there are some common features to be found between Chudnovskii's writing and that of the Slavophiles. Chudnovskii shared the view that Russia had a central role and duty towards the South Slavs, and he saw his country as being a leader in the region. His reaction to individuals was often highly Russo-centric: he expected the Serbian students with whom he came in contact to speak Russian. He judged poorly those, like Pašić, who did not possess a good command of the language, and saw Velimirović and Marković's fluent Russian as an indication of their sophistication. Like the other travellers, he claimed that those he met all praised Russia and looked to it for leadership, yet in Chudnovskii's writing, it was not the figure of the Tsar that the Serbs are looking to, but rather to young revolutionary intellectuals like himself. Furthermore, it is also interesting that Chudnovskii did not claim to be the only Russian active in Serbia at the time. In his writings he noted that his brother was one of many Russians living permanently in the Serbian capital, and he refers to a "community" (of unspecified size) of fellow countrymen in the city.[619]

Changing Times

The years after Nicholas I's death were a time of great social change. Restrictive laws were relaxed, providing for an explosion in intellectual activity in the public sphere. In travel literature, as in everything else, a new generation of younger writers challenged some of the beliefs held by the older generation. Thus the writings of a young revolutionary could appear alongside those of an older Slavophile such as Rovinskii or Aksakov, as the two ideologies overlapped in the Balkans. Although the two styles of text may appear to be contradicting each other in their representations of Serbia, each reflects currents within Russian thought at the time. The literary manifestations of this struggle for national self-definition were clearly not limited to travel writing, and were perhaps captured best of all by Turgenev

[619] Chudnovskii, p. 120.

in his best known work *Fathers and Children*. Yet, it is important to note that, with regard to the South Slavs, this apparent clash of worldviews and values did not result in a generational conflict or struggle. Rather, for one very brief period, the two groups successfully joined forces against what they came to see as the criminal inaction of their own government in the face of Balkan suffering, as we shall see in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: The Eastern Crisis

A survey of the Russian press from the 1870s presents a clear and largely undifferentiated message: Russia's brethren were suffering unspeakable abuse at the hands of the Turks in the Balkans, and Russian intervention was needed instantly to prevent large-scale atrocities from occurring. Though this message was crafted in part by dedicated Slavophile believers, economic interests also played a significant role in the selection of the material published. There are very few wars in which "truth" is indisputable and the Eastern Crisis proved no exception.

Based on the tragic stories they read in their national media, thousands of young Russians abandoned their homes and livelihoods to travel to Serbia to fight, seduced by images of Slavic Orthodox peasants suffering at the hands of the Turks. However, not all found the reality of the Balkans to be what they had anticipated. In many cases, their letters and unpublished travelogues reveal a sense of confusion and anger as some Russians found living standards in Serbia to be higher than at home. This gap between the press and the experiences of the volunteers forced some to reflect seriously on their country, what it stood for, and what their role was as Russians in the Balkans. While the volunteers reacted to this challenge in various ways, their texts generally share a collective sense of bewilderment: How did such a large chasm occur? What target audience were they courting? This chapter focuses on this gap, and what it represented.

The chasm between the two views raises questions about the basic tenets of Russian identity- in particular, the use of Orthodoxy as one of the inherent foundations of Russianness and the role of Russia within the Orthodox and European worlds. The gap also reveals a diverging set of assumptions and attitudes towards Russia's peasantry, as various elements in Russia's literate society sought to appropriate peasants to further their own construct of the national character. Finally, the divergence of views raises basic questions about Russia's place within − and supposed superiority to − Europe and the role it should play in the Balkans.

Economic Interests, the Media, and the Exertion of Influence

Thus far, this thesis has concentrated almost exclusively on Russian travel writing as its primary source base. However, by the 1870s, the political situation in both the Balkans and in Russia led to a shift in the style and nature of publications. The war was the first − and one of the very few − to be covered by a relatively free Russian press. In fact, the media played an important role in pushing the country towards active military involvement in the Balkans, contrary to the wishes of many within the government, including the Tsar. Why did the media take such an active role in agitating for action? Many publicists, such as St. Petersburg-based editor Aleksei Suvorin, held strong personal beliefs, especially with regards to Orthodoxy. Others, Mikhail Katkov among them, believed in a strong Russia with an international role to play in the Balkans. Many of the writers of the numerous daily articles on the Balkans, such as Ivan Aksakov, believed that Russia had a moral duty in the Balkans. Others, however, had economic interests in the war, which had become a vehicle of commercial success. By 1875, the Balkans had become a regular feature in the Russian press, and no newspaper could afford to overlook such a hot topic. While this work does not attempt an in-depth analysis of the media's impact during the Eastern Crisis, a certain amount of overview is necessary in order to understand the reaction that it aroused.

Newspaper editors desperately sought Russians with knowledge of the region to increase their coverage of the subject. As Russia had few professional journalists, many of these experts were recruited from the ranks of scholars who had previously travelled in the region and could provide details on the conditions in the region. Travelogues became regular features in both daily newspapers and journals, such as *Vestnik Evropy*, which serialised Rovinskii's travelogues on Serbia. The lines between travel writing, journalism, ethnography, and political texts blurred as borrowing between genres became commonplace. While newspapers were using travellers as sources, many of the same travellers were drawing their facts from newspapers. This resulted, not

surprisingly, in considerable circularity. [620] Furthermore, an intense degree of commercially driven competition emerged as editors struggled to upstage their rivals. One result was the emergence of a rich and diverse variety of sources of information. Such a plethora of competing sources would have been impossible a generation before; in this way, the media and their representation of the Balkans are very much the product of Alexander II's reign.

To appreciate the unique role played by the media at this moment in Russian and Balkan history, it is necessary to consider the situation from which it emerged. Nicholas I had regarded all journalists with extreme suspicion, and Russian journalists had been forbidden from reporting on the Crimean War. The only news that reached the Russian public was the officially approved military dispatches that were reprinted in government newspapers.[621]

The Great Reforms provided the conditions in which modern Russian journalism could emerge. Censorship was greatly eased after Alexander II came to the throne, and censorship laws were completely revised in 1865.[622] He also allowed newspapers to accept funding from private individuals, which encouraged the use of advertisements and allowed for the creation of a commercial press. Consequently, a newspaper's survival depended on its ability to attract advertisers, and a large readership was necessary to solicit investment. Hence, a newspaper's success was defined by the size of its readership. The efforts of newspapers to attract more readers meant that readers gained increased access to the press. Prior to 1865, most newspapers were delivered by post to annual subscribers at their home addresses. However, after Alexander II's reforms, newspapers began to be sold openly on the street.[623] This had a

---

[620] For example, Liprandi's writing footnotes many of the major newspapers and journals of the time. Ivan Aksakov in his *Dnevnik* (Diary) made extensive references to Gil'ferding's work on Bosnia. The work so greatly influenced him that he claimed, "It is impossible to judge its contemporary importance for the Slavic world." See Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov, *Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov v ego pis'makh: dnevnik 1838−1886 gg* (Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov in His Letters: Diary 1838−1886) (Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 2004), p. 464. Gil'ferding is cited again on p. 469.
[621] Louise McReynolds, *The News Under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass-Circulation Press* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 80.
[622] McReynolds, p. 18.
[623] Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (London: Polity Press, 1989), pp. 168−169. As Habermas has noted, the nineteenth century "mass press was based on the commercialization of the participation in the public sphere on the broad strata designed predominantly to give the masses in general access to the public sphere." Actually, Habermas thought that ultimately, due to the nature of mass culture and the interests of private individuals, the public sphere would lose its political nature. This was due to the fact that the "culture

tremendous effect on sales, making news, and newspapers more visible, as their presence expanded into the public realm of streets and kiosks. Furthermore, the selling of individual issues meant that people who could not afford a yearly subscription could still occasionally purchase a newspaper. It also encouraged competition, since people could choose from among multiple newspapers on any given day. Thus, newspapers had to make efforts to encourage people to buy *their* paper. Due to this commercialization, there was an explosion in newspapers and an increase in the so-called "thick journals" between 1865 and 1875.[624] Between 1855 and 1875, the total number of periodicals published in the Russian Empire increased dramatically, even though many of the new publications were short lived. Leading this expansion were newspaper editors, some of whom became powerful figures in Russian society and politics.

By 1876, the most prominent Russian newspapers in St. Petersburg included the dailies *Golos*, edited by Andrei Kraevskii, and *Novoe vremia*, edited by Aleksei Suvorin.[625] The ideological positions of *Golos* and *Novoe vremia* were different, and they appealed to different sorts of readers. *Novoe vremia* was by far the more reactionary of the two, although its views found a loyal and receptive audience. *Golos* had long been regarded as the mouthpiece of the St. Petersburg elite. However, not wanting to lose its audience to *Novoe vremia*, during the Eastern Crisis, it was forced to adopt *Novoe vremia*'s more extremist positions to remain competitive. The Moscow market, meanwhile, was dominated by the so-called "professor's paper," Nikolai Skvortsov's *Russkie vedomosti*, which was read by the liberal intelligentsia,[626] and Mikhail Katkov's more nationalistic *Moskovskie vedomosti*.[627] These four dailies

---

consuming public whose inheritance derived from the public sphere in the world of letters more than from that in the political realm attained a remarkable dominance."

[624] "Thick journals" were influential, limited circulation journals that explored at length philosophical, social, historical, and literary questions, while, when necessary, engaging in Aesopian language in an effort to circumvent censorship.

[625] McReynolds, p. 294. McReynolds claims that in 1875, *Golos* had a circulation of 22,000. *Novoe vremia* had a circulation of 20,000 in 1880, the first year for which figures are given (since the newspaper was not published in 1875).

[626] V. A. Giliarovskii, *Moskva gazetnaia/ druzia i vstrechi* (Newspaper Moscow/friends and encounters) (Minsk: Nauka i Tekhnika, 1989), p. 9.

[627] Katkov was one of Moscow's most powerful men. He attracted a great deal of attention both personally and professionally. He even became the subject of numerous poems, some of which were not flattering. For more, see Giliarovskii pp. 4−5. His views evolved over time, from those of a 'conservative Westerner' to someone more nationalistic. This nationalism and its evolution are particularly interesting as it "represents the development from an aesthetic individualism (a

dominated the daily press throughout the Eastern Crisis, bitterly competing with one another for readers.[628] Especially in the case of the two St. Petersburg-based papers, the outbreak of hostilities in the Balkans provided the motivation for what amounted to Russia's first war for public opinion, as the two papers constantly sought to surpass each other. In the competition for the St. Petersburg market, Suvorin managed to turn what appeared to be a fatal disadvantage into a major asset. Suvorin's newspaper was a newcomer to the market. Its first issue appeared on 29 February 1876, with an initial print run of 3,000 copies. Most of Suvorin's friends thought the paper would survive only a few months at best, as was the case with many other papers that appeared and quickly folded in the 1870s. *Novoe vremia*, however, proved an exception − in large part due to Suvorin's clever manipulation of the Eastern Crisis. Public awareness and interest in the Balkans had been growing steadily since the early 1870s, with interest spreading from the small circle of Panslavic believers to the larger sphere of educated society. Watching from the sidelines, Suvorin understood that this issue could be exploited most effectively by his new publication. In February 1876, the efforts of the St. Petersburg Slavic Benevolent Committee and the Red Cross meant that public awareness of the conflict was already quite high. From the first issue, Suvorin concentrated on exploiting public awareness, with the unfolding events in the Balkans the feature article of nearly every edition.

Suvorin was also fortunate in his timing. In mid-March, *Golos* argued that the rebels should trust the sultan and Great Powers and lay down their arms. Suvorin lost no time in attacking *Golos* in his three-week-old *Novoe vremia*. Accusing *Golos* of "cold blooded objectivity," he argued precisely the opposite. Not only should the rebels continue their struggle, but Serbia and Montenegro

---

self-identity) to an integral nationalism (a Volk identity)." Yet even when advocating the incorporation of certain technical aspects of Western culture, Katkov always maintained that "Russia too had a recognized Eigenart which must be preserved." For an extensive look at Katkov's background, see: Martin Katz, *Mikhail Katkov: A Political Biography, 1818−1887* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966), pp. 14−20.

[628] Mary Zirin, "Meeting the Challenge: Russian Women Reporters and the Balkan Crises of the Late 1870s", in Barbara T. Norton and Jeanne Gheith, eds., *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender, and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001), p. 141.

should be encouraged to join them.[629] Ultimately, Suvorin's opinions prevailed among the public. As a result, *Novoe vremia*'s stance towards the conflict grew stronger. Whereas the paper's approach in February and March had been relatively mild, by April the paper claimed that Russia should not be a member of the *dreikaiserbünd* [630] but should take its rightful place as the head of all Slavic nations (presumably excepting the Poles).[631] The appearance of *Novoe vremia* and its subsequent competition with *Golos* forced the Eastern Crisis even more to the forefront.[632] Suvorin achieved his goal: Within a few months of *Novoe vremia*'s initial appearance, the paper averaged print runs of 15,000, thus making it *Golos*'s most serious competitor.[633] Suvorin had judged his audience correctly. Yet, by anticipating public interest, he also simultaneously spurred it on, as public demand for news from the Balkans soared in Russia. Consequently, the more readers read about the Eastern Crisis, the more they wanted to read about it.

Editors sought to expand their readership to unprecedented scales, targeting audiences that had been ignored previously. While the situation in the Balkans was an issue of importance to educated society throughout 1875, by late spring 1876, it spread to the Russian public more broadly. This happened in many ways. At the time there was an increase in seasonal migrant workers, often young men who would travel from their home villages to the cities in search of work in the factories. This constant movement brought the village into closer contact with the city. The profound social effects of this are too numerous to fit within the scope of this thesis, but one important result was that the young men would sometimes bring newspapers, often single issues bought from street vendors, back with them on a trip home. This meant that more newspapers were reaching the villages than had previously been possible. The migrant workers did not even need to buy the papers to come in contact with the news. Such

---

[629] Effie Ambler, *Russian Journalism and Politics, 1861-1881* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972), p. 135.
[630] The *dreikaiserbünd*, or the League of Three Emperors, was formed in 1872 between Alexander II of Russia, William I of Germany, and Franz Joseph of Austro-Hungary. It was a conservative alliance aimed at maintaining the status quo by forming a protective opposition against the liberal governments in Western Europe, in particular England and France.
[631] Ambler, p. 140.
[632] Ambler, p. 133.
[633] Ambler, p. 116.

papers were also available for reading in many factory cafeterias and taverns frequented by workers. Again, the news the workers read could be retold to relatives on trips back to the villages.[634]

Furthermore, resources such as newspapers and woodblock prints (*lubki)* were physically reaching the countryside as a result of the expansion of the train network. In addition to making it easier for workers to commute between the cities and the countryside, goods and ideas were able to move faster against the liberal governments in Western Europe − in particular, England and France − and more freely as well. The decrease in time of dissemination of news from the cities to the province further helped to promote provincial newspapers.[635] In the countryside, the increase in availability encouraged demand, forcing editors to adapt to the growing new readership and resulting in a shift to the popular in many publications. As Daniel Brower has noted, "What to Russian intellectuals at the time constituted blatant vulgarity represented commercial survival to the publishers of the penny press, who had to sustain the daily interest of their readers."[636] While many in the intelligentsia were horrified, the press shifted in the late nineteenth century to being more representative of the diverse populations in Russia, becoming a mirror through which the values of diverse sectors of the Russian population were voiced. Human-interest stories became extremely popular, in part, as Brower argues, because they "gave new publicity to a moral language by which to judge personas and events . . . these stories relied on a set of moral values, never clearly defined and constantly revised."[637] Many of the articles published during the Eastern Crisis reveal some of those moral values with which many identified − in particular, religion.

Not surprisingly, another way in which news reached the non-urban population was through the church. The latter naturally took keen interest in the suffering of co-religionists in the Balkans and was one of the first to vocally advocate intervention on behalf of the South Slavs. Clergymen did not hesitate

---

[634] Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 28.
[635] Irving Fang, *The History of Mass Communication: Six Information Revolutions* (Oxford: Focal Press, 1997), p. 80.
[636] Daniel Brower, "The Penny Press and its Readers", in Stephen Frank and Mark Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 150.
[637] Brower, p. 167.

to articulate their views to their congregations. This phenomenon did not go unnoticed. In May, the Moscow correspondent for the St. Petersburg newspaper *Nedelia* published an article entitled "Our Peasants and the Herzegovina Uprising" in which the author observed that the Balkan conflict was unprecedented in its popularity with the "simple and uneducated people." The writer claimed that churches were collecting many donations from "pure peasants" to aid the South Slavs.[638] In areas with high levels of illiteracy, those who were literate were often called upon to read aloud in public places such as taverns. Daniel Brower has argued this means of diffusion "turned newspaper articles into subjects of discussion and debate."[639] As the *Nedelia* writer observed in one village, priests read the news from the Balkans out loud to their congregations. Observing the session, the author noticed that "during the reading, many cried." The writer of the article saw much of the feelings on the part of the peasants as being religiously oriented, and he attributed their actions to what he labelled "the self-consciousness of our people."[640] Yet, what was the self-consciousness of the people? Did peasants truly think in the patriotic manner the *Nedelia* journalist described? Did an urban journalist have the right to speak for the vast majority of the population that the peasantry represented? As Cathy Frierson has noted, the peasants in the post-Emancipation era presented the Russian elite (which she defines as 'non-peasants'[641]) with an unsettling quandary: What was the role of peasants in Russian society? Over the course of the late nineteenth century, this question haunted the elite as they "set out to conquer that unknown territory through description, through language, through texts that would facilitate understanding."[642] Frierson has argued that

---

[638] "Nashi krest'iane i gertsegovinskoe vosstanie" (Our Peasants and the Herzegovine Uprising), *Nedelia*, 11, 16 May 1876, pp. 377−378.
[639] Brower, p. 148.
[640] *Nedelia*, 11, p. 377−378.
[641] Cathy Frierson, *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Nineteenth Century Russia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 15.
[642] Frierson p. 6. As Frierson notes, the process of 'understanding' the peasant grew increasingly professionalized and standardized in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In the period under study here, there was still a considerable amount of flexibility, as "during the 1860s, the 1870s, and the first half of the 1880s, one did not have to bear the imprimatur of a profession to be an authority on the peasantry. One had simply publicly to avow loyalty to the principles of science and to have personal knowledge of the village based on residence in the countryside." However, this soon changed, and "by the end of the 1880s, specialists in ethnography, statistics, jurisprudence, and economics would be more stringent in their requirements, and their

the elite used the peasantry as a means of "seeking alternative moral definitions of Russian culture … they were seeking not distinction from the peasants but some kind of identification with them."[643] Richard Wortman concurs, noting that for the elite, "The peasants bolstered their feelings of self-esteem and made possible a meaningful role for them in Russian life."[644] It also allowed the elite to finally break with notions of inferiority towards the West as "the peasants became their guardians of virtue and kindness against the evils of the alien civilisation they dreaded. The peasants showed that not all mankind had been corrupted."[645] Yet, how did this process take place? Who pinpointed the values that defined the peasantry and, by wishful extension, the elite? The example of travel literature suggests the process was a complex and incomplete one.

Wortman argues that the "bond with the peasantry" emerged in the years directly preceding Emancipation, as radical youths "felt the need for something to idealize and embrace."[646] Yet many of the characteristics rightly or wrongly ascribed by some in the elite to the peasantry were remarkably similar to those traits travellers already in the 1840s, admired in the South Slavs: strong religious convictions, moral purity, and heroic endurance in the face of harsh conditions. The travellers had portrayed these traits as being uniquely Slavic and Orthodox, and they strongly identified with them − in contrast to the decadence and excess of the West. Thus, it is not surprising, particularly as many travel writers went on to publish in newspapers, that these same themes reappeared in the Russian press and were used to link the South Slav cause not only with the Russian elites but also with the imagined heart of the homeland − the peasantry. This linkage tied "Russian values" (embodied by the peasant) with the South Slavs and made Russia emerge as having not only the authority over Western Europe to act on behalf of the South Slavs but the duty as well.

While providing a complete analysis of the media during the Eastern Crisis is impossible here, the presence of the above-listed themes and the

---

professionalization would in turn redefine the subjects of inquiry on the peasantry." For more on this process, see Frierson, pp. 10−11

[643] Frierson, p. 9.

[644] Richard Wortman, *The Crisis of Russian Populism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, p. 7.

[645] Wortman, p. 9.

[646] Wortman, pp. 7−8.

frequency with which publicists cited them as a means to arouse readers' emotions must be noted. Yet, as Suvorin's success suggests, the more the papers excited and engaged their readers' sensibilities by appealing to certain symbols, the greater was the demand, as people increasingly identified with those symbols. In their appeals, the editors, like travellers a few decades earlier, emphasized the ties of religion, blood, and common cultural heritage. One of the first war correspondents in the region, for example, was the opinionated columnist G. K. Gradovskii, who in late summer 1875 published an article in *Golos* in which he passionately defended "our brother Slavs" in the Balkans, the place "from which came the civilisation we are so proud of." The writer was deliberately referring to the Byzantine heritage that is common to both Russia and the Orthodox nations of the Balkans, reminding his readership of the bonds between the two regions. These similarities were contrasted with the Turks, the enemies of Slavdom. Gradovskii scathingly dismissed the Ottoman Empire as "that debased 'subject' dangerous to the political health of Europe."[647]

Messages were not always conveyed by means of the written word. *Lubok* peddlers also helped to distribute the news cheaply around the villages in visual form, especially after the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War.[648] As Stephen Norris has noted, "The visual aspects of European nationhood represented just one part of the development of national identities that dominated the early nineteenth century." *Lubki* played an essential part in this process, providing a visual conceptualization of Russia and its enemies.[649] The suffering of the South Slavs and Russia's subsequent military involvement in the Balkans was a popular subject for *lubki*. The central visual motif was religion: The struggle against the Turks was frequently represented as a holy

---

[647] In the original: '*predmet*,' the word appears in quotation marks in the original text. Grigorii Konstantinovich Gradovskii, *Golos*, No. 233, 24 August 1875, p. 2. Grigorii Konstantinovich Gradovskii (1842−unknown) was a well-known columnist for a variety of Russian journals, including *Golos* and *Itogi*.

[648] *Lubki* were defined by a law in 1851 as "all kinds of rough engravings, images, and lithographs." It is unknown exactly from where the term stemmed, with some suggesting that it came from *lub*, the Russian word for bark, or from the name of Lubianka Square in Moscow, which was a popular place for *Lubki* to be sold. Regardless, the represented a popular and difficult to regulate means of distributing both images and information. While the government sought to regulate their distribution and content, at times they were also used as a means of distributing the government's own messages. For more, see Stephen Norris, *A War on Images*, (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006), pp. 46−47.

[649] Norris, p. 7.

war in which the allegedly superior Orthodox warriors would inevitably triumph over the inferior Ottomans. *Lubki* imagery was rarely subtle: Turks were often depicted as physically ugly, with distorted bodies and savage, animalistic expressions. Meanwhile, Balkan peasants were shown poorly nourished and often bound in chains, while strong Russian soldiers were engaging in acts of selfless heroism.[650]

As was the case with the newspapers, *lubki* began to depict such images before Russia officially entered into the conflict, thus playing a crucial role in stirring up public emotions.[651] After the arrival of Russian volunteers in Serbia, *lubki* were frequently produced featuring Serbian peasants fighting under the leadership of Russian General Cherniaev, or representatives of both nations were shown standing together to be blessed by an Orthodox priest. As Norris argues, such as image "clearly asserts that the Slavic cause in the Balkans is one that Russians, symbolised by the Panslavist General Cherniaev, should take up. The religion shared by the Serbian troops and the Russian leader, and the blessing given by the Orthodox clergy provide a powerful visual theme." The number of such "holy war" images being produced increased sharply in 1876 and 1877, as reports of atrocities in the Balkans grew. *Lubki* began to be published with stirring titles such as "Holy Rus'," "For Fatherland and for Christ," or "Russia for Faith and for the Slavs." As was the case in the increasingly shrill newspaper editorials, the images reiterated three major themes: Slavdom, Orthodoxy, and heroic peasants.[652] Slavdom underlined the brotherhood that supposedly existed with the South Slavs; Orthodoxy highlighted the notion of Russian moral superiority and the concept of a holy war; and the image of the peasantry helped to reinforce spiritual purity, to draw Russian peasants into the mainstream of Russian national identity.[653] These were three powerful concepts with which many Russians were readily identifying and for which some were willing to risk their lives to defend.

While Gradovskii might have been worried about the "political health of Europe," he and many other Russians felt it was the role of their country to take

---

[650] Norris, pp. 80−81.
[651] Norris, p. 83.
[652] Norris, p. 84.
[653] Norris, p. 100.

the leading role in the Balkans, citing the "common faith" and "one tribe" images. The Russian government, however, was of a very different opinion, and the press did not restrain from viciously attacking their leaders. Part of the reason for the government's resistance was strategic: The Tsar was well aware that his army was in need of modernization and that his country was plagued by serious economic problems and domestic instability. He was anxious to prevent a war that would surely prove disastrous for Russian development and relations with other European powers. Therefore, prior to 1877, he tried desperately to avoid involvement, encouraging the leaders of both Serbia and Montenegro to pursue a path of neutrality as well. More importantly, Alexander was distrustful of anything that resembled a popular movement: In an autocracy, where power was wielded by the monarch, there was little room for public opinion.

Yet the problem was ultimately one of identity and generation. A significant role in shaping Russia's initial foreign policy stance in the region at the start of the Eastern Crisis was occupied by diplomats. Such diplomats, many of whom were quite advanced in years − Gorchakov, for example, was born in 1798 − were practitioners of an "old style" diplomacy that had functioned adequately at the Congress of Vienna but would meet its demise in World War I. The problems with this style of diplomacy were already appearing during the Eastern Crisis. The diplomats in 1875 still saw wars as abstract events fought over borders and land, with little thought to its social, political, and economic consequences; they saw diplomacy as something conducted from the top down, and "public opinion" was something they referred to only when trying to manipulate foreign cabinets.[654] They did not ask the opinions of their own citizens and certainly gave little thought to the opinions of the populations that would be affected by their decisions.

As was the case in the vast majority of European countries, Russian diplomats were almost exclusively drawn from the upper classes; consequently, they practically constituted an international class of their own, frequently remaining aloof and ignorant of their fellow countrymen's customs, beliefs, and even language. The problem with such a manner of diplomacy was that it was

[654] Andrei Lobanov-Rostovsky, *Russia and Europe 1789-1825* (New York: Greenwood Press, revised edition, 1968), p. 343.

utterly incapable of responding to mass movements. As supposed manifestations of "popular" will − such as nationalism − grew stronger, "old style" diplomacy was less and less effective. This problem was highlighted by the Eastern Crisis. With certain exceptions (such as Ignatiev), most of the diplomats advising the Tsar had little sense of identification with issues such as Slavic or Orthodox brotherhood.[655] Such old-fashioned diplomats were ruthlessly accused by the press of sitting on their hands and then attempting to "place borders around the spreading fire." Russians were not part of some pan-European club for whom the Balkans did not matter; rather, Russia had a specific moral duty in the region. Gradovskii reminded the Russians of the role that France had played in the formation of modern Italy. He called upon his co-citizens − and in particular, the Moscow and St. Petersburg Slavic Benevolent Committees − to fulfil their self-proclaimed role as "older brother Slavs" and organize aid for the South Slavs. He ended by asking his audience, "Are you not ashamed? The heart of Russia should bleed in light of the news of the calamitous position of its younger brothers . . . it is time to respond!"[656] This plea was well phrased. By citing Russia and Serbia's common heritage, it appealed to Panslav Orthodox believers. It also appealed to the imperialistically minded by calling on Russia to take the lead role in uniting the South Slavs, citing the example of Italy. Other publications were more interested in the suffering of local populations. A few weeks after the publication of Gradovskii's article, the newspaper *Nikolaevski vestnik* lamented that the diplomats' efforts were accomplishing nothing and called for immediate action to be taken to prevent civilians from "dying of hunger in horrid numbers."[657] In this article, intervention was justified on humanitarian grounds.

The correspondents in the Balkans launched a passionate plea for aid in the pages of the Russian press. They reminded their readers that the country

---

[655] The government remained divided. On the one hand, the Tsar, Gorchakov, War Minister Miliutin, and Finance Minister Reutern were strongly opposed to involvement. Yet, other figures such as Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador to Constantinople, felt that Russia must take a strong position in the Balkans or see its influence usurped by Austria-Hungary. Meanwhile, both the Tsar's wife and son were influenced by the Panslav movement, in particular by the views of Ivan Aksakov. This internal division within the government created a vacuum of clarity that the press exploited. While the government dithered, the press enjoyed unprecedented freedom.
[656] Gradovskii, p. 2.
[657] *Nikolaevskii vestnik*, No. 37, 27 September 1875, p. 415. Incidentally, *Nikolaevskii vestnik* was owned by Kraevskii, the same publishing magnate who owned *Golos*.

"alone carried on her shoulders the pressure of the whole Muslim world." Furthermore, several correspondents claimed that Serbian civilians were starving and unprepared for the upcoming winter.[658] There were variations, however, in the initial editorials of the newspapers: *Moskovskii vedomosti* and *Russkii vedomosti*'s writers felt that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be given autonomy. *Golos* thought that if Serbia could be restrained, the whole affair would die out. The militant Panslav *Russkii mir* was quick to proclaim Serbia the Balkan Piedmont, noting, "To breech this chain and, linking hands with their brethren in Herzegovina and Bosnia, to smash the poorly disciplined Turkish horde . . . will not be very difficult for the considerable Serbian army."[659] While the newspapers were not yet calling for Russian soldiers to participate directly in the conflict, they did express dissatisfaction with the way that diplomats were handling the affair. They were also convinced that Western powers were failing to understand the situation, not taking it seriously enough. Analyzing the situation, an editorial writer for the *St. Peterburgskaia gazeta* accused Austria and Count Andrássy, in particular, of "washing their hands" of the situation instead of trying to halt the flow of "Christian blood" of the writer's "co-religionists."[660] Austrian diplomats were not the only ones to be vilified in the Russian press: Soon, the Russians began questioning the overall role that the Great Powers were playing in the region. As the journal *Delo* observed:

> Free Serbia and Montenegro would willingly give their insurgent ethnic kin a hand, if it were not forbidden [to them] by the sponsoring powers. But, it is without doubt that if the struggle is prolonged, neither the Serbian nor the Montenegrin government will have the strength to go against the general desire of the Serbians and Montenegrins to interfere in the struggle.[661]

It seems that the writer sensed that the Great Powers were attempting to prevent the inevitable. The Russians also specifically questioned their own government's policies. By September 1875, Moscow's *Russkie vedomosti* noted, "In Austria, the insurgents see their greatest obstacle, and help they expect only from Russia. This expectation, we hope, will not be in vain." The writer then predicts that "Russia, despite its desire not to destroy European

---

[658] *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 320, 13 December 1876, p. 3.
[659] *Russkii mir*, quoted in David MacKenzie, *The Serbs and Russian Pan-Slavism 1875−1878* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 42.
[660] M. Trigo, *St. Peterburgskaia gazeta*, No. 188, 19 July 1875, p. 1.
[661] *Delo*, No. 188, December 1875, p. 1.

peace, little by little must take an opposite course from that, it seems, which corresponds to the goals of our government."[662] Such a statement poses a direct challenge to the government, as well as a reaffirmation of the notion that Russia had a responsibility in the region. The writer's opposing view was published, uncensored, and unconfiscated. In Russia, such an outcome was unprecedented.

While newspapers indirectly confronted the government, they were also aware of the need to challenge the people, to encourage them to take individual and collective action. As *Golos* noted:

> It is necessary to stir our society into action. In any case, the strongest possible excitation of public feeling and thought in Russia on such a question as the Eastern is desirable and in favour of the insurgents' struggle, the only struggle outside our borders to which we cannot be inactive spectators as we must not lose our most reliable and close allies: the Slav peoples. . . . Who is interested in a diplomat's words unless the country stands behind him?[663]

The situation temporarily seemed to alter somewhat when Andrássy issued the five points of his so-called "Andrássy Note." This support for official policies did not last long, however, especially as it was viciously attacked by Suvorin's *Novoe vremia*.[664] From spring 1876 onwards, Russian editorials, many written by former travellers such as Ivan Aksakov, advocated with increasing passion the need for intervention on behalf of the South Slavs. The papers agreed that by late April 1876, diplomatic attempts to reach a solution had failed. Furthermore, reports that the uprisings had spread to Bulgaria spurred further interest in the region.

Reports in late May that these were being crushed with unprecedented viciousness outraged Russian readers. The Bulgarian atrocities were thoroughly denounced and the ideological position of the Russian public solidified, although variations of exactly what the public position was may be observed among the major papers. On 14 June, *Golos* published an editorial stating the opinion that "Russia doesn't want, and cannot want, any personal acquisitions on the Balkan Peninsula. . . . We have only one interest on the Balkan Peninsula: the freeing of the Christian subjects of Turkey from the Muslim

---

[662] *Russkie vedomosti*, No. 197, 13 September 1875, p. 1.
[663] *Golos*, No. 15, October 1876, quoted in MacKenzie, p. 76.
[664] Ambler, p. 135.

yoke."[665] In addition to publishing stirring editorials, the paper published letters by Serbian and Montenegrin leaders, appealing to the Russian public to send aid "to our poor people who are suffering under Turkish fanaticism."[666] The other paper to take such a firm imperialist line was, not surprisingly, Suvorin's *Novoe vremia*. In April 1876, on the eve of the Serbian declaration of war, Suvorin himself published one of his politically charged feuilletons in which he called for "a holy war, which would elevate our spirits and would cleanse the atmosphere." A few days latter, he asked his readers, "Why shouldn't we seize Constantinople?"[667] He soon went further still, concluding that Russia's future depended on a "free Constantinople in the hands of free Slavs, our allies, brothers."[668] Suvorin made no pretence at maintaining objectivity. Rather, he announced:

> Whatever the government is like, I am ready to sacrifice my soul to . . . liberate the Slavs and drive the Turks from Europe. . . . That is why I seek to arouse the public: I am seeking to separate its aspirations from official ones; I want it to demonstrate its independence.[669]

Yet, many recognized that Serbia might need Russian help, a help that was portrayed as a duty. As *Novoe vremia* stated:

> Upon Russian society there lies a sacred obligation to assist with all its means, principally with money, these heroic fighters. The Serbian loan must be subscribed by our resources so that in the history of this struggle the Russian name will play the proper part. . . . Nothing can prevent noble sacrifice on the part of society itself if only it can be profoundly inspired to help the fighters for freedom. . . . Can we not help the Slavs to free themselves from slavery?[670]

This article appeals to Russians on many levels. It portrays Russians as having a "sacred" or religious duty towards the Serbs. It also presents a challenge to Russian national pride by suggesting that Russia must attach its name to the Serbian cause. Finally, it presents an appeal to society to act on its own volition, without the assistance of the government, by reminding people that nothing can stop society from sacrificing itself for a cause.

---

[665] *Golos*, No. 151, 2 July 1876, p. 1.
[666] *Russki mir*, No. 209, 1 November 1875, 2.
[667] Ambler, p. 136.
[668] Ambler, p. 137.
[669] Aleksei Suvorin, *Dnevnik A.S. Suvorina* (The Diary of A. S. Suvorin) (London: Garnett Press, 1999), p. 125.
[670] Suvorin, p. 111.

All of these factors profoundly touched many of the newspapers' readers. This effect was observed at the time. In the early days of the Serbian war against the Ottomans, a writer for *Delo* commented:

> Never before in Russia have newspapers been read so much as now . . . . Never has sympathy for our own Slavic tribes[671] burned in Russia so strongly, as now. Donations are flowing from all sides, peasants, workers, cabbies are donating. . . . *Republique française* and *The Daily News* justly claim that never − not at any other point of her historical life − has Russia been so profoundly and unanimously excited, as now. The business of the Serbs has been made Russian national business.[672]

Here, the writer goes as far as to cite the Serbs as being "our own tribe." Thus, he is clearly calling for aid on the grounds of ethnicity. The last sentence, however, betrays hints of imperialism: The conflict in the Balkans is Russia's business.

The writer continued his article, announcing that all that Russians have given up to that moment was really only a "droplet in the sea compared with what we must and can do for the Slavs. . . . The Russian people must render one hundred times stronger than it has rendered." The author outlines what help should be given, calling for "thousands" of volunteers, especially officers, to go to the Balkans.[673] Similar articles followed in numerous other publications, outlining the aid that had already been sent and at the same time calling for more.[674]

Politicians were allocated little respect in such articles, since as *Golos* noted, "Until now, all Slavic action and the Serbian war have been the business purely of the people."[675] Meanwhile, in the northern capital *Golos* announced that Russia had a duty to fight, not only in the name of the Slavs but "in the name of Western civilisation, in the name of European freedom, we hope to move the Turkish border."[676] *Nedelia* called for "freedom from the Black Sea to the Adriatic."[677] Not to be outdone by the competition, Suvorin's *Novoe vremia*

---

[671] In the original, "*k rodnim slavianskim plemenam*".
[672] *Delo*, 8 August 1876, pp. 96−192.
[673] *Delo*, 8 August 1876, pp. 96−192.
[674] For example, *Golos*, No. 242, 2 August 1876, p. 3 and *Delo*, 9 September 1876, pp. 126−128.
[675] *Nedelia*, No. 37, 10 October 1876, p. 1188.
[676] *Golos*, No. 91, 3 April 1877, pp. 1−2.
[677] *Nedelia*, No. 16, 17 April 1877, pp. 539−542.

identified the freeing of the Slavs from the Turkish yoke as the most important task facing Russia.[678]

While newspapers used their reporting and editorials to express their views from an allegedly factual perspective, their efforts did not stop there. In January 1875, Katkov began to publish in regular instalments Tolstoy's epic *Anna Karenina*. While on the surface a love story, the serialized novel also served as a vehicle for debating Russia's role in the Balkans. *Anna Karenina* features young men running off to Serbia to place themselves "in the service of faith, humanity, and our brothers."[679] Meanwhile, some newspapers began to publish, or republish, travelogues about the Balkans. *Novoe vremia* published articles by ethnographer-historian Pavel Rovinskii as well as by Lamanskii. Katkov published Tchaikovskii's *Turetskie Anekdoti* to great commercial success, while Grigorovich's travelogue of his time in Bulgaria was also republished, with a new introduction seemingly designed to raise patriotic Russians' blood pressure. The press presented a virtually united front on the Eastern question in a manner that discouraged all dissent.

---

[678] Ambler, p. 245.

[679] Leo Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina* (Moscow, 1878), p. 839. The eighth chapter of the novel is largely dedicated to the Eastern Question, as one of the characters notes, "In the circle to which he belonged nothing else was written or talked about at the time except the Slavic question and the Serbian War . . . everything the idle crowd usually does to kill time, it now does for the benefit of the Slavs". Ibid., p. 839. The chapter features characters who describe the Montenegrins as "splendid fellows", and claims that "the massacre of Slavs who were co-religionists and brothers excited sympathy for the sufferers and indignation against their oppressors." Ibid., p. 840. This translated into Russian action since "the heroism of the Serbians and the Montenegrins, fighting for a good cause, begot the whole nation a longing to help brothers not only in word but in deed". Ibid., p. 838. Thus Anna's lover Vronsky agrees to go off to fight in Serbia "taking a whole squadron with him at his own expense". Ibid., p. 873. Yet, the novel stops short of pro-war propaganda through the voice of Levin, who confesses in a lengthy argument with Koznyshev that he does not understand what the cause is about. Koznyshev tries to persuade Levin by telling him. "Our brothers, men of the same blood, the same faith, are being massacred!" Ibid., p. 875. Despite publishing such a work, Tolstoy himself was ambivalent about the role Russia played in the region, and his doubts are at times expressed through the voice of Levin. This hesitation was attacked by Dostoevsky, who had no hesitation about the role Russia should play.

[683] There was little alternative representation of such views at the time. However, that does not imply these writers were unknowns. Far from it, Gleb Uspenskii's works in particular were published regularly throughout the 1860s and '70s, particularly in the journal *Notes of the Fatherland.* For more on Uspenskii's work, see the chapter dedicated to him in Wortman's *The Crisis of Russian Populism*.

Voices of Dissent

Newspapers presented a largely clear and united opinion on the situation, often driven by a variety of agendas, including economic survival. Lesser-known travelogues and personal letters written home by Russians, especially volunteers from Serbia, at the time provide an interesting counter picture albeit one that often did not make it into the press.[680] These dissenting voices demonstrate that the views generally being put forth by the press did not represent a uniform public opinion. More importantly, the writers examined here were challenging their national press as well as interrogating a set of cultural values. Such voices of dissent came from a variety of backgrounds: Konstantin Apollonovich Skal'kovkii (1843−1906) had been born in Odessa, but moved as a young man to St. Petersburg, where he began to write for several local newspapers. After his adventures in Serbia, he returned to Russia and went on to work for the government. Gleb Ivanovich Uspenskii (1840−1902) was already an established writer and publicist by the 1870s; his fictionalised works on the peasantry were frequently published in *Notes of the Fatherland*.[681]

Nikolai Vassilievich Maksimov (1843−1890) was a journalist who signed up as a Russian volunteer in the Serbian army. After fighting in the Balkans, he continued his travels and lived for many years in the United States. Prince Vladimir Petrovich Meshcherskii (1839−1914) was another publicist and, at times, a close collaborator of Katkov. An active contributor to the ultra-conservative publication *Grazhdanin*, Meshcherskii was a staunch conservative who opposed the reforms of Alexander II.[682] Little is known of A. N. Khvostov, other than that he was a volunteer, for personal reasons, in the Serbian army. All, it would appear, travelled to Serbia with good intentions towards the Serbs, and, in some cases, a sense of duty. Yet, upon their arrival, they found a reality very different from what they had anticipated, and this clash can be observed in their writings, which express cynicism, anger, frustration and, at times, a sense of betrayal.

---

[681] Frierson, p. 13.

[682] For a miniature biography of Meshcherskii, see A. L. Shemiakin, *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh* (Russians on Serbia and the Serbs) (Moscow: Aletiia, 2006), p. 137.

The letters and travelogues of these men challenge many of the views propagated by the press. The young authors were forced by the reality of what they saw to question some of the core assumptions both they and the press had made − not only about the Balkans but about their own country as well. Through what was clearly a painful process, some of the writers began to question the basic foundations upon which their conception of their homeland had been built. Specifically, many called into question the three key images highlighted above: the bonds of Slavdom, the moral superiority of Orthodoxy, and the spiritual purity of the peasantry. Were the South Slavs really so closely related to Russia? Were linguistic and religious ties sufficient to underwrite a special 'brotherly' relationship between the two? Was Russia indeed the undisputed leader of the Orthodox world, and did it therefore have the duty to act on behalf of other Orthodox nations? Whence was this duty derived? Did Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality provide an adequate base upon which to construct a culture? Was Russia really more pure than and superior culturally to the West? Or were elements of Russian society not also subject to the decadence and excesses normally blamed on the West?

The first myth to be attacked was that all Serbs loved Russians unconditionally, seeing them as their brotherly Orthodox saviours. Many travellers were surprised to find that the Russian volunteers were not always welcome in Serbia, nor did all the locals hold them in high esteem. Early in his travels, Meshcherskii was shocked to find a sign claiming, in Russian, "Russians rob unmercifully."[683] Throughout his travels, he found it to be a widely held view that Russians were thieves.[684] During his travels, De Vollan also seemed confused by the conflicting reception he received. Some Serbs thanked him, saying "Without you Russians, the Turks would already be in Belgrade," while others appeared indifferent or even annoyed by the Russians' presence, apparently feeling that it was a sign something was lacking in Russia. As one Serb asked De Vollan, "What devoured them at home, so that they all

[683] Vladimir Petrovich Meshcherskii, "Pravda o Serbii: Pis'ma" (The Truth about Serbia: Letters). Excerpts taken from *Grazhdanin* and *Golos*, reprinted in Shemiakin, *Russkie*, pp. 137−167. Quoted above, p. 138.
[684] Meshcherskii, p. 139.

came over here?"[685] De Vollan was surprised to discover that many Serbs were upset by the arrival of the volunteers, believing it would have been better if they had stayed home and left the Serbs to decide matters on their own. Some even claimed, "Better the Turks than the Russians."[686] Unlike many other volunteers, De Vollan remained firm in his Slavophile and pro-Serbian views; however, he conceded that many Serbs did not like Russians and seemed startled by this realization.[687]

The sense of being unwanted was found in many of the personal letters and travelogues of the time. However, several of the travellers concede that the Russians themselves were partly to blame, describing behaviour that was not always exemplary. A. N. Khvostov claimed that the first Russians who travelled to the region at the start of the troubles in 1875 were genuine Slavophiles who were "champions of the idea" and acted out of desire to help the Serbs. However, those who followed were "a mass of a different sort, who were not interested in the idea, but just of a loose and reckless lifestyle." Many of these were "idle people, without a place in society or occupation." Khvostov sharply attacked the Slavic Benevolent Committee in Russia for the appearance of such characters in Serbia. There was no selection of those who claimed they wanted to go to the Balkans and fight. In Khvostov's view, the committees blindly "gave money to go to Belgrade, many took the money, and didn't even go to fight, disappearing on the way." Khvostov himself was appalled and disgusted by many of his fellow countrymen in Serbia, many of whom presented the worst possible image of Russia and several of whom appeared to have no idea where they even were: "Many thought they were going to Persia, or the Caucasus. On route to Belgrade, many got very drunk and created great scandals. . . . They didn't understand the country in which they found themselves."[688] This view was shared by Gleb Uspenskii, who also complained of the Russian volunteers' ignorance, saying, "Of all the Russians in Serbia, there was not one who could

---

[685] Grigorii Aleksandrovich De Vollan, "V Serbii: nedavniaia starina," Reprinted in Shemiakin, *Russkie*, pp. 168−175. Quoted above, p. 172.
[686] De Vollan, p. 171.
[687] De Vollan, p. 172.
[688] N. Khvostov, "Russkie i Serby v voinu 1876: Pis'ma." (Russians and Serbs in the War of 1876: Letters). Reprinted Shemiakin, *Russkie*, pp. 232−241. Quoted above, pp. 232−233.

say anything except the odd kind word."[689] After interviewing large numbers of soldiers and questioning them about their reasons for coming to Serbia, Uspenskii noted, "The majority had absolutely no understanding: not about Serbia, not about the Serbs, their character, their goals, their possibilities."[690] Furthermore, Uspenskii found that travel did not help enlighten the Russians significantly. Reading through the letters of many of the volunteers, Uspenskii was amazed to discover that virtually none of the soldiers made any mention of Serbia or the Serbs at all, nor did they make references to Slavdom, the supposed symbol for which many were fighting. Instead, Uspenskii found descriptions of mundane details, which could have been written from anywhere.[691]

The encounters of the men being analysed here with their fellow countrymen in Serbia appears to have been an eye-opening experience for many. Although these writers were not exclusively aristocrats − some, such as Prince Meshcherskii, certainly were − they did represent the upper levels of Russian society: They were all urban educated, literate, and well read. Many had worked in publishing, often as publishers. In the Balkans, they came across types of Russians they almost certainly would have never met in Russia and were forced to confront the reality that was many of their fellow countrymen's everyday existence back home: grinding poverty, alcoholism, illiteracy, and suffering. For many of the travellers, these encounters with their fellow Russians proved more traumatic and exotic than their encounters with the Serbs. Several ended up studying the Russian volunteers as a foreign and slightly wild 'other,' sometimes writing more about their fellow countrymen in Serbia than about the Serbs. In the process, many also questioned the notion − popular among certain circles at the time − of the supposed moral purity of the peasantry.

This reaction of curiosity was not atypical for Russians of their class. In the Post-Emancipation era, tales of encountering peasants in rural areas entered

---

[689] Gleb Ivanovich Uspenskii, "Iz Belgrada: Pis'ma nevoennogo cheloveka" (From Belgrade: Letters of a Non-Military Man). *Otechestvennye Zapiski* (Notes of the Fatherland) No. 12. pp. 171−185. Reprinted in Shemiakin, *Russkie,* pp. 206−231. Quoted above, p. 207.
[690] Uspenskii, p. 215.
[691] Uspenskii, p. 215.

into the mainstream of Russian literature, both in fiction and travel writing. This experience of "entering the mysterious and unknown village thus became a national experience through the public repetition of the encounter and broad participation in assessing its significance."[692] Russians travelling within their own country were faced at times with similar shocks when forced to confront the realities of peasant life, as opposed to the utopian representations found in urban publications about the peasantry. The travellers studied these exotic specimens, categorised them, and described them to their readers − they had gone abroad only to find the exotic was really at home. Maksimov became very interested in categorising the volunteers and claimed that Russian volunteers in the Balkans could be divided into several categories: The first consisted of the true believers, who had profound knowledge of Serbia and felt they had a duty to participate in "the struggle for freedom and independence of a brethren people." However, Maksimov noted that such volunteers were extremely rare and unfortunately proved to be the worst soldiers, as they had no practical experience in such matters. The next group were "honest, but beaten down by life," and they travelled to Serbia, prepared to "look death in the face." Yet Maksimov acknowledged that the majority of the Russians fell into a final group. This lot were only in Serbia because they had nowhere else to go: mercenaries, alcoholics, homeless people, debtors, peasants who did not have enough at home to feed their families, and escapists running away from unhappy lives.[693]

Uspenskii reached similar conclusions, noting that many of the volunteers were in extremely poor health, the result of lifetimes spent in extreme poverty and malnourishment. Like Khvostov, he cited the Slavic Benevolent Committees as the reason such men had ended up in Serbia: The Benevolent committees paid 100 rubles to each volunteer, supposedly to help them with their journey; in reality, many poor men left most of the money with their families in Russia, travelling to the Balkans with nothing to support them. Although, like Maksimov, Uspenskii notes that not all Russians were simply

---

[692] Frierson, p. 12.
[693] Nikolai Vasil'evich Maksimov, *Dve voiny 1876−1878: vospominaniia i rasskazy iz sobytii poslednikh voin* (Two Wars 1876−1878: Memories and Tales from the Events of the Last War), St. Petersburg, 1879, pp. 3−177. Reprinted in Shemiakin, *Russkie*, pp. 176−205. Quoted above, pp. 201−202.

motivated by the pressure of feeding families − others were debtors or petty criminals trying to escape commitments or strings attached to them in their homeland.[694] When Uspenskii interviewed volunteers about their reasons for being in the Balkans, one man bluntly explained that he had wanted to leave his wife, while another was eager to escape an endless family drama unravelling at home.[695] Slavic solidarity, the subject of so many intellectual arguments over the previous half century, hardly appeared to have touched these men at all; they were in the Balkans as if by accident and struggling to understand what their purpose was there − other than their immediate goal of survival. As Uspenskii complained, the volunteer always seemed to "think first of himself, not of Slavdom."[696]

Such encounters must have been a severe shock for Uspenskii, who had for some time been well known for his defence of the peasantry. The "intelligentsia's chronicler of despair," he had railed against the social order of his homeland.[697] After some encounters with Russian émigrés in Paris in 1875, he began to turn to the peasantry as a source of true and unsullied Russianness. He thought that the peasantry could lead the country out of its rut and provide moral salvation: "It seems that everything is sleeping or has died [in every peasant village]. But meanwhile, in this silence, this apparent muteness, grain by grain of sand, drop by drop of blood, slowly, inaudibly, the broken and forgotten Russian soul is reconstituting itself along new lines, and most important, is reconstituting itself in the name of the strictest truth."[698] In these early texts, he praised what he saw as the idyllic peasant way of life and beseeched peasants "to protect their children's purity and innocence, to safeguard them from the hypocrisy of education and mental work."[699]

For Uspenskii, his trip to Serbia in 1876 must surely have represented a shattering time in his perceptions of self. The Russians he encountered in Serbia directly contradicted his well-published descriptions of the unsullied Russian

---

[694] Uspenskii, pp. 210−211.
[695] Uspenskii, p. 115.
[696] Uspenskii, p. 114.
[697] Richard Wortman, *The Crisis of Russian Populism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 61.
[698] Wortman, pp. 67−68.
[699] Wortman, p. 68.

peasants. In 1877, having returned to Russia, Uspenskii set out for the Russian countryside, hoping to find there a reaffirmation of the existence of his ideal. Yet Uspenskii's vision was not clouded by rose-tinted lenses, and he reported with honesty of the bleak circumstances he found in such a way that "would make it impossible for the members of the intelligentsia ever again to look upon the peasantry with their former innocence."[700] In the villages he visited, he found peasants embezzling the meagre funds of the commune and was horrified that money seemed to occupy all their thoughts and dictate all their actions. Worse, the farther away Uspenskii moved from the cities, the more depravity he witnessed. In Samara, he observed that when peasants were not actively being exploited by others and could dictate their own lives, they tended to be selfish, violent, and utterly immoral, thinking mainly of self-enrichment and drink.[701] Yet these encounters should not have been wholly unfamiliar to him: His encounters in the Russian village only support his observations made a year earlier in Serbia. The Russian peasants he had encountered abroad were not anomalies, and it was not necessary to go abroad to witness their seemingly uncouth behaviour. Yet, it was only in Serbia that Uspenskii had made this discovery. In this case, Serbia had served not as an idealized model of a Slavic state but an unfortunate mirror in which he saw the worst excesses of his own culture reflected. His travels in Serbia shattered his image of his homeland, and his subsequent travels in Russia could only have reaffirmed his sense of loss.

While the Russians were upset that the Serbs did not seemed happy with their presence, Uspenskii notes that the lack of love was mutual, as the Russian volunteers spent a significant part of their time speaking ill of the Serbs.[702]

Even while their own behaviour was apparently less than exemplary, some of the Russian volunteers felt themselves superior to the local people and clearly had no qualms about expressing this view. Many of the travelogues attempted to understand why the Serbs took such a dislike to their Russian "brothers." Many ultimately do admit that the Russian volunteers' behaviour was part of the problem. However, Meshcherskii provides an interesting alternative perspective on the treatment of Russians in Serbia, arguing that if

[700] Wortman, pp. 71−72.
[701] Wortman, pp. 73−74.
[702] Wortman, p. 208.

some Serbs were feeling cold towards the Russians and Russia, it was not so much due to the Russian volunteers' behaviour but rather because the Russian government had not taken more steps earlier to ensure that the Serbs were firmly and consistently Russian-oriented. Meshcherskii suggests it was perfectly within Russia's ability, right, and even duty to ensure the pro-Russian feelings of the Serbs, as Russia is a "colossal Slavic government" while Serbia was tiny and focused on its own internal problems.[703] Thus, he appears to feel that Russia had a duty to increase involvement, lest the Serbs be driven away from Russia and towards the West. However, the problems of Serbo-Russian relations on the battlefield were deeper and more complicated than simply ignorance and bad behaviour.

It was not only the sense of not being wanted that irritated some of the travellers. Some also felt they had been consistently lied to in Russia, by both the media and earlier travellers, who had described an often uniform perspective of Serbia as a poor and oppressed country. Upon their arrival in Serbia, many travellers were surprised to find that the Serbs did not live as badly as they had anticipated and did not, in fact, appear to be severely oppressed. To some of the Russian travellers, they appeared to be better off than many of the Russians who had come to help them. Several of the travellers of this period were keen observers of Serbia's economic situation, and many were clearly confused by what they witnessed. Meshcherskii noted, "Most Serbs are wealthy, in that they all have enough to get by, although few of them are very rich."[704] Maksimov also found Serbs to be far from starving. On a trip to the countryside, he found that many Serbian peasants appeared wealthy and demanded, "What are they lacking?" He found the land to be very rich, with the result that everything grew. There was ample livestock, and poverty was unheard of. Furthermore, he claimed all Serbs were ploughmen as well as sellers and, thus, could even make money from their produce. Like Meshcherskii, he noted the wealth was relatively evenly distributed, writing with some frustration, "In this country, which for some reason we are accustomed to referring to as 'a poor country of oppressed brothers,' it is good to see that the riches and capital are evenly

[703] Meshcherskii, p. 154.
[704] Meshcherskii, p. 159.

distributed, riches are as unheard of as poverty."[705] Yet, this generous view of the situation soon soured as Maksimov saw more of Serbia and the Serbs. He was amazed to discover that when he asked Serbs if they were rich or poor, they unanimously claimed to be impoverished, despite the apparent advantages they enjoyed. Maksimov began to feel that "Russia has been too generous in its relationship with the Serbs." He argued that the Serbs are in reality "more sanctimonious than victimized" and was not pleased about the large amount of aid his country was supplying, although he conceded that the Turks were indeed barbarians and must be pushed back.[706] Yet the more Maksimov travelled, the more frustrated he became with the sharp contrast between living standards in Serbia and in his own country:

> Lo and behold their content faces, thanks to full stomachs, in a moment of quiet evening conversation by the warm fire, and say to a Serb: 'How happy you truly are, you have an abundance: fresh bread, ox meat, veal, ham, and various sorts of poultry. You eat meat every day in wartime: how on earth do you eat in peacetime?' 'We eat well' the Serb answered. 'In Russia it is completely different! If only you could see our peasants, and what they eat. . . . Our peasant lives very poorly! His *izba* stoops sideways, just barely clinging on, he has just one horse, his cow perishes, he cannot get milk for his children, he gnaws on crusts of stale bread, he lunches on onions, and on the last Friday, he buys just a drop of vodka, and he buys it with his last half-kopeck, because his stomach is empty, that of a sick man.' The Serb listened . . . and didn't believe me.[707]

Prior to travelling, Maksimov had read sentimental descriptions of the Serbs, depicting them as pure peasants and comparing them to those in Russia, yet he found this image shallow and deceptive. The purity he found resided only within his own country, and he was indignant that Russian peasants had been sent to liberate those living better than they. He became increasingly frustrated, not only with the Serbs but also with the images in his mind of his homeland: Serbs are as naïve, full hearted and soft in character as our peasants. Yet our peasants are poor, and Serbs are rich; poor people are generally kind people and hospitable. Rich people more likely to be greedy; Serbs are this kind of greedy people. The Russian is without a voice, beaten, and used to kowtowing

[705] Maksimov, p. 182.
[706] Maksimov, p. 183.
[707] Maksimov, p. 193.

practically to anyone; the Serb on the other hand, is a man with a voice and an understanding which is foreign to us.[708]

The more Maksimov saw of Serbia, the more he became upset with the conditions back home − in a tone reminiscent of some Russian soldiers' reactions in the Napoleonic Wars, yet surely an unusual reaction for a "liberating" soldier to have. He became annoyed that while he and many of his fellow countrymen had gone to Serbia to fight, many Serbs of fighting age had not yet enlisted and were still "sitting about in cafes."[709] At one point, he lost his temper as he witnessed a Serb returning from a successful hunt with his catch. "His country is flowing in blood, and he went on a hunt," exclaimed the astonished Russian.[710] His anger can be seen in his increasingly dismissive comments about the Serbs he encounters, which appear to be reactions more out of envy than any tangible offence. He called the Serbs "egoists," implying they are mercenaries by nature who would do anything to improve slightly their own well-being. They are petty traders in a way that "recalls the Jews."[711] Many argued that the Serbs lacked the moral purity of the Russian peasantry, who were self-sacrificing and did not seek to better themselves at the expense of others, although they were in need. Yet, while the image of the Serbs and their supposed purity was tarnished, some − such as Uspenskii − began to question the myth of the purity of Russian peasants as well.

Perhaps the biggest shock for some of the Russians was the discovery that, in fact, they did not have much in common with their supposed "Serbian brothers." Several felt acute disappointment upon their arrival in the Serbian capital. Skal'kovskii noted immediately that parts of Belgrade were "quite ugly" and complained, "The carelessness of Slavic nature makes its appearance quite noticeably, with the exceptions of a few sights, nothing in Belgrade presents itself as striking, and the tourist will invariably be disappointed."[712] He was also

---

[708] Maksimov, p. 198.
[709] Meshcherskii, p. 176.
[710] Maksimov, p. 176.
[711] Maksimov, p. 200−201.
[712] Konstantin Apollonovich Skal'kovskii, *V strane iga i svobody: putevye vpechatleniia po Kavkazu, Maloi Azii, Evropeiskoi Turtsii, Chernogorii, Serbii, Avstro-Vengrii i Soedinennym Shtatam* (On the Side of the Yoke and of Freedom: Travel Notes from the Caucasus, Asia, European Turkey, Montenegro, Serbia, Austro-Hungary, and the United States) (St. Petersburg, 1878). Reprinted in Shemiakin, *Russkie,* pp. 126−137. Quote above, p. 127.

quickly frustrated by the inconveniences of life in Belgrade, wondering, "Why in this capital of 30,000 are there only 30 cab drivers?"[713] He complained that the entire region was extremely underdeveloped, citing as an example the fact that there was only one factory in the entire *pashlik*, and that it was paid for by the Austrian consul.[714] Initially, this reminded him of provincial towns in Russia, as it did many earlier travellers. Yet, Skal'kovskii did not romanticize this "primitiveness"; instead, it simply exasperated him. He wrote, "At first glance, Belgrade reminds one of a minor Russian provincial town: Everything is crooked, askew, the streets are not regulated and not swept, the squares are not paved and frightfully dirty."[715] Rather than seeing simplicity and purity in such a scene, however, he became irritated and reminded of the things he did not like about his own country: It was dirty, disorganized, and unplanned.

Meshcherskii reacted similarly to his experiences, claiming Serbs, though wealthier, were far less advanced than Ukrainians.[716] He described the local population in general as being "quite coarse, ignorant, and uneducated to the utmost." Furthermore, the population as a whole, both urban and rural, lacked discipline.[717] The Serbs' constitution and political institutions he dismissed as "a sad comedy"[718] and concluded that the people did not participate in political life in Serbia, as they were, politically, still "in the period of earliest childhood."[719] This political immaturity was also to be observed in the confusion of those who felt themselves to be politically active in Serbia. As the Minister of the Interior confirmed to Meshcherskii, most of the young men active in the *Omladina* movement, in fact, had little or no clue what the movement stood for or what it sought to achieve. Behind all their slogans and manifestations were frighteningly little theoretical understanding or

---

[713] Skal'kovskii, p. 128.
[714] Skal'kovskii, p. 128−129.
[715] Skal'kovskii, p. 127.
[716] The comparison between Serbs and Ukrainians appears in several travel documents, and not always in terms as unflattering as Meshcherskii's. Khvostov, for example, compares the Serbs to Ukrainians while describing them as "a healthy nation by sight". Khvostov, p. 243.
[717] Meshcherskii, p. 158.
[718] Meshcherskii, p. 161.
[719] Meshcherskii, p. 163.

foundation.[720] Several travellers had difficulty comprehending the Serbs' way of relating themselves to their nation's political scene. Skal'kovskii found some interactions with the local population exasperating, complaining, "All inhabitants, it is said, can be divided into ministers, former ministers, future ministers, and those wanting to be ministers."[721] Skal'kovskii and several other travellers complained of what they saw as endless political intrigue in the *Pashlik*.[722] While others simply reacted negatively to the Serbs they met in general, Meshchevskii noted that although the Serbs were good-looking and hospitable, they were ultimately "lazy and obstinate,"[723] while both Maksimov and Uspenskii accuse the Serbs of being "egoists."[724] Maksimov seemed anxious to differentiate himself geographically from the Serbs, calling them "Eastern people," apparently suggesting that he came from a European civilisation, and they did not. To this tag of Easternness, Maksimov attached those values that he did not like and saw as opposite to his, writing; for example, "Serbs, like all Eastern peoples, are great fans of wasting empty time."[725] In using the term "Eastern" to describe the negative characteristics, Maksimov was using a line of discourse Russian travellers normally reserved exclusively for Turks. Again, the implication was that such "Eastern" people were lazy, unlikely to ever achieve much, and very dissimilar to the Russians who had come to save them.

Overall, Meshcherskii found the Serbs to be "an unhappy people," as witnessed by their "woeful songs." Unlike previous Russian travellers to the Balkans who had taken acute interest in South Slav songs and had seen them as representing and preserving local history, Meshcherskii dismissed them simply

---

[720] Meshcherskii, pp. 154−155. Meshcherskii was interested in the *Omladina* movement and questioned the Minister of the Interior about it at length. Although it was clear the minister was not comfortable with this topic, he defined *Omladina* as a "clear absurdity," claiming its leaders defined it as an Austro-Hungarian movement aimed at uniting all Slavs. However, the minister felt that much of this meaning had been lost in Serbia, as too few understood the movement's actual goals. Yet the impression Meshcherskii got was not the only view on the matter. After several conversations with local inhabitants, Skal'kovskii described *Omladina* in very different terms, calling it a "learned society" and claimed it was quite influential in Serbia. Skal'kovskii, p. 129.

[721] Skal'kovskii, p. 127.

[722] Skal'kovskii, p. 130. Meshcherskii also complained that "there is no town with more highly developed political intrigue than Belgrade." Meshcherskii, p. 155.

[723] Meshchevskii, p. 158.

[724] Uspenskii, p. 208, Maksimov, p. 200.

[725] Maksimov, p. 180.

as being "boring."[726] Meshcherskii also failed to find examples of the Serbs' supposed moral purity and instead described quite the opposite, noting, "Married women are not required to be faithful to their husbands, and marital scandals are so common that no one pays any attention."[727] In his view, the Serbs compared unfavourably to Russian peasants in their moral standards. Such a quotation not only calls into question the reports of earlier Russian travellers on the supposed virtuousness of Serbs but also their lengthy descriptions of South Slav gender relations. Meshcherskii's tales of blatant infidelity directly contradict the works of earlier travellers such as Rovinskii and Kovalevskii, who presented the South Slav lands as a patriarchal society where women and children obeyed blindly the commands given to them by the men in their lives. Was Meshcherskii simply bitter and looking for any evidence of immorality so as to make himself feel better about the state of his own country? Or were earlier travellers trying to envision an ideal universe along patriarchal lines? The truth most likely lies somewhere in between. The comments of earlier travellers, as noted in previous chapters, suggest that at times they were uncomfortable with the extreme division of gender relations in the South Slav lands, and it is clear that this was one of the few aspects of South Slav life they found exotic. While they did not condemn the way South Slav women were treated, nor did they seem envious of the situation or desirous of importing such standards in Russia. Thus, it seems plausible that although earlier travellers might have exaggerated the power of Serbian men over their womenfolk, Meshcherskii was also exaggerating, perhaps in his desperation to find something positive in his homeland's culture. If this is so, Meshcherskii shared certain common traits with earlier Russian writings about Western Europe. Although he admitted his countrymen lived in worse economic and material conditions, he tried to salvage their reputation in his own mind by claiming they were somehow more moral than those − the Serbs, the West − who possessed more and lived better. Several of the travellers also noted that, despite the considerable amount of attention being given to Serbia in their homeland's press, this appeared to be of little interest in Serbia. As Khvostov noted,"Despite

[726] Meshcherskii, p. 160.
[727] Meshcherskii, p. 158.

the many foreign journals, you with difficulty would find a Russian newspaper, even the best hotels don't have them. Russian language and literature no one studies; furthermore, Serbs from urban, more or less prosperous families often know German. Church connections between us and Serbia never existed. They [Serbs] only know us as a political entity, but they know nothing about our lives and social structure."[728] Meshcherskii was also surprised to find that "no Serbs" appeared to read Russian at all, the exception being King Milan, who often read stories about his country emanating from the Russian press.[729] As Serbs did not seem to take an interest in either Russian literature or the Russian press, it is not surprising that they, as De Vollan argued, "know nothing about Russian society and do not know the pressing debates in Russia."[730] The false preconception that each nation apparently had of the other, led to constant confusion. Despite the claims of some earlier Russian travellers, many of the volunteers actually found it quite difficult to communicate with their Serbian brothers and often resorted to German as a *lingua franca*. Furthermore, despite the fact that earlier Russian travellers such as Gil'ferding were insistent on the use of the "Slavonic language" in their travels and criticised locals for speaking West European languages, the notes of several Russian volunteers betrayed an inherent contradiction in such a demand. De Vollan described the great confusion of the Serbian officers who discovered that their Russian counterparts were more comfortable conversing in French than in their own Slavonic tongue.[731]

In addition to culture and language, many previous travellers had also cited religious ties as one of the greatest links between Serbia and Russia. Again, in this regard, several of the volunteers were unconvinced that such a tie really existed in any concrete way. Meshcherskii was surprised in his visit to the Metropolitan of Serbia to discover that religious matters were very far from the church leader's mind. Instead, the Metropolitan spoke to the Russian at length about war, the need to acquire better firearms, and the political and economic

---

[728] Khvostov, p. 237.
[729] Meshcherskii, pp. 140−141. Meshcherskii claimed Milan read *Golos, Moskovskie vedomosti* and *Grazhdanin* regularly, and the Russian wondered if, based on his readings, Milan anticipated a large amount of Russian support in his struggle against the Turks. Meshcherskii was also able to speak in his native tongue with the Metropolitan, although with local political leaders, such as Ristić, he claimed he was obliged to converse in French. Meshcherskii, p. 148.
[730] De Vollan, p. 171.
[731] De Vollan, p. 173.

situation in Bulgaria.[732] He then demanded to know, "What can we expect from Russia?" Meshcherskii delicately explained that, although "the people" supported war, the Tsar did not, only to have the Metropolitan beg him for official protection from the Russian Army.[733] The passage in Meshcherskii's work reads more like a conversation between two state officials rather than between a traveller and a man of the church. The Russian appears to have been perplexed by the Metropolitan's earthly demands: Russia clearly represented little more than military might to the Serbian church leader, who at no point mentioned theology or Russia's role in the Orthodox world. His conversations with other Serbs hardened this belief, and Meshcherskii concluded that Serbs generally had "no concept" of religion, and almost no churches.[734] Meshcherskii was not alone in his observations. Other travellers also observed what they saw as a lack of spiritual conviction among the Serbs. Khvostov noted that very few Serbs ever bothered to attend church, "not even old people and women."[735] It is unlikely that all the Russian volunteers were strict churchgoers themselves, and the same lack of church attendance would no doubt have struck them as absolutely normal in Paris. It appears to shock them in Serbia, mainly because it contradicted what they had been led to expect and clashed with the stories they had been exposed to prior to departure. In some cases, the Serbs' supposed religiosity might even have been part of the very reason they had gone to the Balkans in the first place. For such people, the realisation that the truth was far more ambiguous than its representation in the Moscow media and earlier travel accounts must have been a brutal shock.

So strong had the discourse of brotherhood been in earlier travelogues that even small differences seem to surprise the dissenting volunteers. Whereas some earlier travellers had gone out of their way to ignore the differences between Serbs and Russians, many later travellers sought these differences out

---

[732] Meshcherskii, p. 144.
[733] Meshcherskii, p. 147.
[734] Meshcherskii, p. 158. The very earthly interests of the Serbian Metropolitan might have surprised Meshcherskii, but such political activism was advocated by some, such as Ivan Aksakov, who felt that the political participation of the Orthodox clergy was an essential element in the fight to preserve the faith, not only in the Balkans, but also in regions such as Poland. For more on Aksakov's views on the matter see his *Sobranie sochenеniia* (The Works of I. S. Aksakov) (Moscow: Tipografiia M.G. Volchaninova, 1836−1887), vol. II, p. 42.
[735] Khvostov, p. 135.

and highlighted them. Skal'kovskii commented on the different ways Serbs interacted with each other, claiming, "What actually distinguished Belgrade from Russian towns is the development of its street life." His prime illustration of this was the omnipresence of coffee houses in Serbian "urban" life. To Skal'kovskii's astonishment, soldiers, ministers, simple citizens and shepherds "all go to drink coffee, read the papers, and discuss how good it would be to fight the Turks."[736] This use of public space for personal interaction clearly surprised Skal'kovskii, as did the free way in which people of various professions and social classes interacted. At the time, Russia had no similar sphere of interaction, and the Russian appears to have been curious about such institutions in Serbia. Yet, curiosity and "brotherhood" are different things, and it seems that for many of the Russians who travelled at this period, the expression of the one did not always lead to the expression of the other. As Maksimov wrote in a moment of reflective frustration, "We just didn't understand each other."[737]

To What End?

The concerns and objectives of the early volunteers proved to be little more than drops in the ocean; their voices and opinions were quickly drowned out, as many public figures actively called for intervention and war. One of the most compelling arguments in favour of action in the Balkans was that presented by Ivan Aksakov in October 1876. In a speech before the Slavic Benevolent Committee, Aksakov laid out his views on events in the Balkans, called for action, and presented a clear argument as to why Russian involvement in the region was essential, drawing on several of the notions that doubtful travellers − such as Uspenskii − were already questioning. The speech carried such intellectual resonance that it was quickly published, not only in Russian but also in English.

In his speech, Aksakov justified the war on moral grounds, claiming it "is carried on not stealthily or secretly, but openly, in sight of all, with full conviction of the lawfulness, right, and holiness of the cause."[738] So just and

[736] Skal'kovskii, p. 128.
[737] Maksimov, p. 199.
[738] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie*, vol. I, p. 219.

correct was this cause in Aksakov's mind that it promoted the Slavophile ideal of unanimous decision- making, so that:

> All the literary parties and factions intermingled, and found themselves, to their mutual surprise, in agreement and unity on this question. The opponents of yesterday found themselves friends, as if they had broken their stilts, come down to the ground, thrown off the disguise of harlequins, and shown themselves what they are in truth: Russians, and nothing else.[739]

Such a quote overrides the doubts of the afore-mentioned volunteers, allotting no possibility for disagreement or dissent from Aksakov's view. It also reiterates several ideas and points Aksakov had been making for some time: Not only that the South Slav cause was a just and righteous one but also the means by which this opinion had been reached. Aksakov and other Slavophiles had long argued that consensus was an inherently Russian process and, with this example, they appeared to have found an illustration of their view. To unite in solidarity on behalf of fellow Slavs was to be a true Russian.

Just as much as the South Slavs needed Russian military protection, Russia also needed the Balkans to help solidify and unite its fluid sense of self-identity.

Serbia was sacrificing itself for the common Orthodox faith, and thus uniting Russia in suffering with it:

> With breathless anxiety Russia followed the uneven struggle of the little Orthodox country, smaller than the province of Tambov, with the vast army, gathered together from Asiatic hordes dispersed over three quarters of the globe. But when the Serbian army suffered the first defeat, when on the soil of the awakened popular feeling fell, so to speak, the first drop of Russian blood, when the first deed of love was completed, when the first pure victim was sacrificed for the faith, and on behalf of the brethren of Russia, in the person of one of her own sons, then the conscience of all Russia shuddered.[740]

Thus, the Serbian cause was transformed into a Russian one, with each death representing not that of a foreign soldier in another country's army but rather the death of "brethren" or a "son," all in the defence of the faith. Aksakov was particularly emphatic that this desire to defend the faith came from peasants as well as officers, claiming that he was surrounded by peasants begging him for the money to travel to Serbia to join the fight, telling him, "I have resolved

---

[739] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie,* vol. I, p. 220.
[740] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie.* vol. I. p. 222.

to die for my faith," "My heart burns," "I want to help our brethren," "Our people are being killed." The numbers professing such feeling soon turned into a torrent, which Aksakov explained in the following terms: "When a movement embraces tens of millions of people, scattered over an extent equal to nearly a quarter of the globe, it is impossible to arrange and regulate the expression of feeling." Unlike some of those on the ground mentioned above, Aksakov never doubted the noble intentions of such men, writing, "I repeat there was not and could not be any mercenary motive on the part of the volunteers."[741]

Yet it is not only Orthodoxy that Aksakov saw the Serbs as defending. On battlefields across the Balkans, they were defending an entire civilization, one in which Orthodoxy and Slavdom were inherently entwined and to which Russia firmly belonged. As the largest representative of this civilization, Aksakov argued that Russia had a duty to lead the fight, not just to allow Serbia to bear the burden of it. He concluded his speech, noting:

> We must not forget that the Serbians of the principality have fought not only for their country, but for the deliverance of all the Slavs who are suffering and dying under the yoke of the Turk, and whose fate is just as near to the heart of the Russian people. We are in debt to the Serbians! But we shall not long remain so. The Russian people will not allow the Russian name to be disgraced; and the blessed hour so much hoped for by all is near, when this work, which belongs properly to the state, will pass into the hands of our strong organized government. Being led and aided by the popular force, the government will take into its powerful hands the defence of the Slavs. So be it![742]

Yet the Serbs' supposed willingness to die for the faith and Slavdom was not the only reason Aksakov felt the Russians were in debt to their South Slav kin. Aksakov was keenly aware of Russia's internal struggle to define its sense of identity. Part of this struggle was due to Russia's multi-religious, multi-ethnic and multi-linguistic empire, but Aksakov also emphasized, in other speeches, the role social divisions had created within the country: Many members of the Russian elite had become heavily Europeanised, while the vast majority of the population had been excluded from this trend and remained "Russian." Thus, the country had become divided into two estranged groups, as

---

[741] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie*, vol. I, pp. 223−224. Later on in the same speech, Aksakov claimed that two-thirds of all donations received were from 'our poor peasants' but he does not indicate how he arrived at these figures or specify if he is referring to two-thirds of the total amount given or if he meant that two-thirds of those who gave were peasants.
[742] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie*, vol. I, p. 236.

the elite had lost touch with their "*narodnost'*" or national personality. Aksakov felt his country's elite risked becoming "just like a man who has reached the point of self-contempt, self-debasement, and who is incapable of developing his spirituality, thus are the people who have lost their *narodnost'* and who therefore stop existing historically."[743] In Aksakov's mind, going to war in the Balkans presented the opportunity to reverse this situation by bringing the elite and the masses together again, united by a just cause. Aksakov claimed:
The Russian national consciousness shall become stronger and more solidified as it achieves the spiritual unity with the Slav world and when it feels itself no longer alone in its war against internal enemies, those who are the common enemies of Slavdom, those renegades of Russian nationality.[744]

Thus, Aksakov acknowledged that there existed elements within the Russian Empire that he considered to be somehow less than Russian. Yet, it was his hope that a war for a cause he felt was indisputably just would serve as a rallying point, bringing together all Russians. Thus, the Balkans became a focal point, not only of Serbian nationalism but also of Russian. In fact, as Aksakov seems to suggest, it became the place where Russian national self-consciousness was to be created and defined.

[743] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie*, vol. II, p. 245.
[744] Aksakov, *sobranie sochenenie*, vol. I, p. 14.

Conclusion

This work has moved away from the existing body of historiography, which has traditionally concentrated on the formation of Russian identity through the country's relationship with Western Europe, and on travel writing through the paradigm of Self/Other opposition. I have demonstrated that these traditional patterns of analysis are too simplistic in the understanding of Russian identity. Rather than addressing the topic as a set of binarisms (Self/Other, Russia/The West), I have chosen a triangular pattern of analysis. Many of the travellers examined here did seek to define themselves in opposition to West European culture, and they did so by seeking to portray themselves as the leading representatives of a separate "Slavic" culture sphere. Yet the values of this sphere were only identified and understood as Russians travelled through the South Slav lands and interacted with the local population. In the Balkans, Russian travellers attributed a set of admirable and often highly idealized attributes to the local population, and argued that these characteristics were common to a Slavic world to which they not only belonged, but led as the only large independent Slavic state. It was the Balkans, not the salons of London or Paris, which provided the forum for debating many of the elements of Russian identity.

Through their travelogues, journal articles and letters written in the Balkans, it is possible to identify a set of values with which the travellers increasingly identified. Although these views were neither homogenous nor universally expressed, several themes, particularly those of religion, brotherhood, and "Slavdom" do emerge with remarkable consistency, and highlight issues perceived as being central to Russian identity. Yet these views are complex and diverse. Although both religion and ethnicity are key themes, they were seen by the travellers as almost inseparable. As the example of Poland proves, merely being Slavic was not sufficient to be included in this imagined "Slavic world," whilst the high degree of negativity addressed in the texts towards the Romanians and Greeks demonstrate that being Orthodox alone was equally insufficient. It is no coincidence that the South Slav lands proved the natural place to debate Russian identity, as no other area shared with Russia both a related language and the Orthodox faith, and thus fit the view of Slavdom that the Russians were creating. It is also possible that the Balkan Slavs were the

focus of Russian attention as they, living in the Ottoman Empire, had been the least influenced by Western Europe, which many of the travellers examined here were at pains to differentiate themselves from. It is additionally conceivable that, given their sense of being oppressed in a Muslim empire, the Balkan Slavs were more receptive to the Russians and deliberately cultivated their attention.

Several of the travel texts suggest a high level of awareness on the part of locals, including members of the Montenegrin royal family, that they were being observed for a purpose, and that they fed to the Russians a manipulated image of their culture, often for purely personal or national purposes. Makushev's encounter with a small child in Montenegro can be easily imagined on a larger national scale: the Russian slightly overpaid the boy, and then asked him what he thought about Russia, to which the boy dutifully responded "Russians are our brothers and the Russian Tsar is a great friend of our leader and without him our leader can do nothing".[745] Satisfied with this answer, Makushev gives the boy even more money. Such manipulation on the part of locals of Russia's still insecure identity should not be discounted. An interesting topic of further study would be to reverse the direction of analysis, examining Bulgarian, Montenegrin and Serbian identity through interactions of travellers from these lands to Russia. At the same time as Russian scholars were travelling to the Balkans, hundreds of promising young Slavs from the Balkans were also travelling to Russia, where many completed advanced studies. Like Russian scholars in the Balkans, these South Slavs often kept detailed accounts of their travels among the East Slavs, not all of which suggest the harmonious brotherhood that well-published Slavophiles such as Ivan Aksakov envisioned.

Yet, while identifying with the supposedly "traditional Slavic values" the travellers claimed they found amongst the South Slavs, many of the travellers actually revealed how integrated their own identity was with the larger European cultural sphere. For even in their attempts to define themselves separately from Europe, they effectively demonstrated their inherent Europeanness. In their travels in the South Slav lands, the influence of Western

[745] Makushev, p. 139.

Europe is ever present; it is the reference point against which the travellers seek to demonstrate their opposing values, and its influence proves inescapable. Their encounters with Turks also serve to underline the travellers' underlying Europeanness. Travellers such as Gil'ferding note that "Christianity" and "Muscovy" are used as synonyms, and that Russians are seen as the most fearsome of infidels, thus reiterating allegedly Russian superiority over Western Europe, without separating the two.

Furthermore, the travellers described their travels amongst the South Slavs by appropriating the travelogue, a genre which had long enjoyed popularity among Western audiences, and which had entered Russia via translated editions of popular works such as Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*. Although the genre came slightly later to Russia, by the nineteenth century Russian travel writing closely mirrored its Western counterpart, following and actively participating in the same stylistic and thematic trends. Furthermore, many of the Russian writers expressed implicitly a set of values that, contrary to what they wanted their readers to believe, revealed very European assumptions about a variety of issues ranging from the role of women in society to personal comfort.

Travel writing, specifically scholarly travel writing, has been examined here as a vehicle through which Russians expressed and debated their identity. As such, this approach is not unique, as the past three decades have seen an explosion of studies using travel literature as a means for examining identity discourse. Many studies on nineteenth century scholarly travel writing, which typically sought credibility by claiming to be reporting facts acquired through first-hand observation, have focussed on the major colonial powers, and have argued that travel writing produced from these regions formed part of a larger colonial project. The existing framework of analysis, following on from Edward Said's ground-breaking research, has noted that Western travel writers of this era typically aligned "Other" with "inferior," thus allowing scholarly travel literature at times to be harnessed in support of imperial domination of other peoples.

Such analysis has focussed heavily on a set of binarisms: Self/Other, West/East, Developed North/"Developing" South. However, here again, I have concluded that this approach is again not sufficient in this case. Whilst, stylistically, Russian travel writing adhered to many of the same conventions as, for example, French and English travel

literature, it is examined here as a means of gaining insight into Russian identity, not in order to further post-colonial debate. Although a study could possibly be made applying post-colonial theory to Russian travel writing on Central Asia, the Balkans does not fit this model. Russia had no viable colonial plans in the region, and the travellers do not classify the locals they encounter as "Others." In fact the opposite is true. The travellers often took pains to negate any significant differences between themselves and the locals, identifying the South Slavs as their "brothers" and part of a larger "Slavic" cultural space. When occasions did arise when the Russians were forced to confront cultural differences, such as gender relations, they were frequently left confused and uncomfortable.

With the help of travel writing, the notion that Russians and the Balkans Slavs were "brothers" grew rapidly in the mid-nineteenth century, and was influential enough that the some of the volunteers who travelled to the region after 1875 were astonished to discover that there were in fact significant differences between themselves and the locals. The sense that many of the Balkan Slavs actively disliked the Russian volunteers, rather than welcoming them as liberators, bewildered many of the writers examined in the last chapter. The shock was not only cultural – it was one of social class. In the Balkans, many of the volunteers from urban, educated backgrounds found themselves fighting alongside their fellow countrymen from the countryside, whose behaviour and motivations were dramatically different and with whom they had little in common. These discoveries, and the sense that many of the Balkan Slavs lived better than many Russians, led some later travellers to feel bitter and to question many of the images of national identity that had been presented in earlier texts.

Despite such variations, the texts examined here do present a series of themes that in the nineteenth century became central to the way in which many Russians imagined their homeland. Furthermore, whilst Russian travel writing does not adhere neatly to the "Self/Other" models of analysis typically used to examine travel writing, an "Other" against which Russian identity is defined does clearly emerge. This "Other" takes the form of Western Europe, although no travel was done to that region in any of the texts considered here. This nevertheless necessitates the use of a triangle pattern of analysis of Russia/ the West/ the Balkans. The cultural influence of Western Europe proved inescapable to the travellers, and the region remained the benchmark against which all they observed was ultimately compared. Despite the articulation of an anti-Western identity argued throughout many of the texts, the image that emerges is one of Russia as a unique civilisation, yet one firmly located within a larger European framework.

This original idea for this work stems from my time as an undergraduate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies at McGill University in Montréal, where issues of travel first grabbed my attention in the undergraduate research seminar *Encounters with the 'Other': Spain and the New World*. My Canadian visa having expired, I returned to Moscow to work, only to be drawn back to university to do a Master's a few years later. At Moscow University, friends helped steer me more towards Slavic history. The *kafedra* of South and West Slav Studies, in particular my supervisors Konstantin Nikiforov and Ludmila Kuzmichova, provided me with opportunities to learn about the Balkans, study Serbian, and gain a greater understanding of the nature of Balkan- Russian relations. Later, at the suggestion of Kuzmichova, I went on to study at the Central European University. In Budapest, under the leadership of then department chair Laszlo Kontler, I found myself in a rich and challenging intellectual environment in which to continue my investigations into the same topic, as well as the encouragement to pursue a PhD, ultimately in London. At UCL, supervisors Wendy Bracewell and Susan Morrissey helped me focus my research in a productive direction and without their guidance I doubtless never would have written anything coherent at all. I am infinitely grateful to them for their invaluable assistance.

Over the course of pursuing four degrees in four different countries, I have accumulated debts to a wide range of people. Since we met playing in a sandbox (age three), Cheryl Flango has been a lifelong friend and supporter, and the only person to have braved both Russian and Canadian winters to visit me. I have held a variety of random jobs over the years of writing this PhD, and generally received generous support from all my employers, in particular managers Fleur Woodward and Ian Hagger at Waterstones, Trafalgar Square. However, frequent lack of funds and housing meant that I have spent months on my academic life on other people's couches and floors. In Montréal and later in Paris, Solenne Chardigny, Yaelle Benaim and their families have been generous beyond belief, at times feeding and housing not only me, but my cat as well. Ian Murton in Cambridge and Tony Esler and Cam Walker in Paris fed and housed

me at times too, while simultaneously helping me through some rough theoretical patches in my work. In Budapest, I have a great intellectual debt to the CEU gang: Marko Zubak, Jelena Gluhak, Ferenc Laczo, Gabor Karman, Kati Straner, Lovro Kuncevic, Marton Zaczalinsky, Dogan Cetinkaya, Bilge Seckin and many others, without whom this work would have been very different. Other close friends and I have been chasing each other around countries: in Moscow and London, Caitlin Murphy and Yuri Babin have helped with a variety of issues, ranging from copyediting (Caitlin) to providing appropriate signs of future gratitude to state officials (Yuri). In Moscow, the Cho family kept me fed on Korean delicacies. In Moscow and Budapest, Masha Falina has also helped tremendously with my bibliography, as well as my creative (Russian) grammar. In various spots around the globe, Harry Mitsidis has forced me to continue forward academically, while simultaneously providing practical advice on any situation I might find myself in. In Moscow, London and Lisbon, Ana Sofia Guerra Pereira has helped with advice and library books on more occasions than I can remember. In London, Max Fras, Zbig Wojnowski, Conar McCarthy, Rob Gray, Uilleam Blacker, Nick Piercy and Naneh Ajar helped keep me sane in and out of the British Library. From London and Harare, the love and support of Michael Mutanda was invaluable, and I thank him profusely for his patience.

Furthermore, keeping up with my adventuresome family, as well as my responsibilities as a manager in a media firm meant that much of this work was written in odd places, on every continent, with support from odd quarters. In particular, I owe a huge debt to the crew of Holland America, who once sent some chapters back to my supervisors via satellite, somewhere between Antarctica and Ushuaia. Others deserving thanks would be the staff at Barajas and Ferihegy, and the ever pleasant crews on Aeroflot, LAN Chile, Iberia, Malaysian Airlines, and many others. All considered, it is hardly surprising travel writing is the topic of this thesis.

The greatest debt though is to my parents, in particular my father Gilbert McArthur, who encouraged me academically my entire life, and without whom none of this would have been possible. This work is dedicated to them.

Marrakech, August, 2009

Bibliography

Adams, Percy. *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983.

Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. *Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov v ego pis'makh: dnevnik 1838-1886 gg*. (Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov in his letters: diary 1838-1886). Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 2004.

Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. *Sochineniia I.S. Aksakova* (The works of I.S. Aksakov). Moscow: Tipografiia M.G. Volchaninova, 1836-1887.

Ambler, Effie. *Russian Journalism and Politics, 1861-1881*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, Revised Edition, 1991.

Andreeva, L.A.. *Religiia i vlast' v Rossii* (Religion and power in Russia). Moscow: Ladomir, 2001.

Archer, Christon, John R. Ferris, Holger H. Herwig, and Timothy Travers., eds., *World History of Warfare*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Baitsura, Tamara. "Mesto Iu. I. Venelin v razvitii slavianovedeniia pervoi poloviny XIX veka" ("The Place of Venelin in the development of Slavic Studies in the first half of the 19th century"). In Volodimir Zadorozhnil and Mikola Zimomria, eds. *Iurii Gutsa-Venelin do 200-richchia Vid Dnia Narodzhennia*(Iurii Gutsa Venelin, On the 200 year anniversary of his birth). Uzhgorod: Vidavnitsvo Karpati, 2002, pp. 13-21.

Ballaster, Rosalind. *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bantysh-Kamenskii, Dmitri. *Puteshestviia v Moldaviiu, Valakhiiu, i Serbiiu* (Travels in Moldavia, Wallachia and Serbia). Moscow, 1810.

Barrett, Thomas. *At the Edge of Empire: Terek Cossacks and the North Caucasus Frontier, 1700-1860*. Boulder, Westview, 1999.

Bessenov, P. *Nekotoriia cherty puteshestvii Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu* (Some notes on Y. I. Venelin's journey to Bulgaria). Moscow, 1857.

Bhabha, Homi. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Blanton, Casey. *Travel Writing: The Self and the World*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Bracewell, Wendy. "Travels through the Slav world." In Wendy Bracewell and Alex Drace-Francis, eds., *Under Eastern Eyes*. Budapest: CEU Press, 2008.

Bridges, Roy. "Exploration and Travel outside Europe 1720-1914." In Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, eds., *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 53-69.

Bronievskii, Vladimir. *Zapiski morskago ofitsira* (Notes of a naval officer). St. Petersburg, 1825.

Bronievskii, Vladimir. *Puteshestvie ot Triesta do S-Peterburga v 1810 godu* (A Journey from Trieste to St. Petersburg in 1810). Moscow, 1828.

Brooks, Jeffrey. *When Russia Learned to Read.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Brower, Daniel. "The Penny Press and its Readers." In Stephen Frank and Mark Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Buganov, A.V. *Russkaia istoriia v pamiati krest'ian XIX veka i natsional'noe samosoznanie* (Russian history in the memory of the peasant in the nineteenth century, and national self-identity). Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1992.

Burbank, Jane and Mark Von Hagen. "Coming into the Territory: Uncertainty and Empire." In Jane Burbank, Mark Von Hagen, and Anatolyi Remnev, eds., *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700-1930*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.

Buzard, James. *The Beaten Track*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Chaikovskii, Mikhail. *Turetskie anekdoty* (Turkish Anecdotes). Kiev, 1873.

Chaikovskii, Mikhail. *S ust'ev Dunaia* (From the mouth of the Danube). Kiev, 1873.

Chambers, William and Robert Chambers., eds. *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Arts*. Volume 21-22, 1864.

Campbell, Mary Baine. "Travel Writing and its Theory." In Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, eds., *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Cherniavsky, Michael. *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myth*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Chudnovskii, Solomon Lazerevich. "Iz davnikh let: vospominania" (Memories of by-gone years). In A.L. Shemiakin. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. (Russians on Serbia and the Serbs). Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp 119-123.

Chulos, Chris. *Converging Worlds: Religion and Community in Peasant*

Russia, 1861-1917. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003.

Clark, Steven. *Travel Writing and Empire: Post Colonial Theory in Transit.* London: Zed Books, 1999.

Clarke, James. *The Pen and the Sword: Studies in Bulgarian History*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1988.

Clements, Barbara, Barbara Engel, and Christine Worobec, eds. *Russia's Women: Accommodation, Resistance, Transformation*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1991.

Clowes, Edith, Samuel Kassov and James West, eds. *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Collinge, N.E. "The Main Strands of 19th century Linguistics: the History of Comparative Linguistics." In R.E. Asher and E.F.K. Koerner, eds., *The Concise History of the Language Sciences: From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Čolović, Ivan. *Politika simbola: Ogledi o političkoj antropologiji*. (Political Symbols: Essays in political anthropology) Belgrade: Radio B92, 1997.

Coquelle, P. *Histoire du Monténégro et de la Bosnie depuis les origines* (The History of Montenegro and of Bosnia from their Origins). Paris, 1895.

Courrière, Céleste. *Histoire de la literature contemporaine chez les Slaves* (History of the contemporary literature of the Slavs). Paris, 1879.

Crews, Roberts. *For Prophet and Tsar*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Dal', Vladimir. *Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka*. St. Petersburg: Volf Editorial, 1882.

Danilok, D.D. *Iu.I. Gutsa-Venelin.* Uzhgorod: Uzhgorodskii Derzhavnii Universitet, 1995.

Daniliuk, D.D. "Iu. I. Gutsa-Venelin," pp. 141-144. In G. Kamaeniash and V. Gisem, eds., *Iu. I. Gutsa-Venelin z naukovoi spadshchini viznachnoho slavista* (Iu. I. Venelin, from the Academic Legacy of an Outstanding Slavist). Uzhgorod: Vidavnitstvo Padiaka, 2002.

De Custine, Marquis. *Journey for our Time*. Chicago: Gateway, 1951.

Delo, No 188, December 1875, p.1.

Delo, No. 8, August 1876, pp. 96-192.

Delo No. 9, September 1876, pp. 126-128.

De Sommieres, Vialla. *Voyage historique et politique au Montenegro* (A Historic and Political Voyage to Montenegro). Paris, 1820.

De Vollan, Grigorii. "V Serbii: nedavniaia starina ," *Russkii Arkhiv*, 1879. Book 2, No. 7, pp. 352-76. Reprinted in A.L. Shemiakin. *Russkiie o Serbii i Serbakh* (Moscow: Aletiia, 2006). pp. 168-75.

Dickinson, Sara. *Breaking Ground: Travel and National Culture in Russia from Peter I to the Era of Pushkin*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Đorđević, Vladan. *Crna Gora i Rusija* (Montenegro and Russia). Belgrade, 1914.

Dobrolyubov, N. A. "When will the day come?" in *N.A. Dobrolyubov: Selected Philosophical Essays.* Moscow, 1948. Originally published in *Sovremennik* (The Contemporary), Moscow 1860.

Donia, Robert and John Fine. *Bosnia and Herzegovina: a Tradition Betrayed*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Dostian, I.S. *Rossiia i Balkanskii vopros* (Russia and the Balkan question). Moscow, 1972.

Duncan, James and Derek Gregory, Editors. *Writes of Passage*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Duncan, Peter. *Russian Messianism: Third Rome, Revolution, Communism and After*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Ely, Christopher. *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002.

Evans, Sir Arthur. *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot During the Insurrection*. London: Longmans, Green and co, 1877.

Fabianich, Donato. *Il presente e il passato de Bosnia, Erzegovina e Albania*. Florence, 1879.

Fadner, Frank. *Seventy years of Pan-Slavism in Russia : Karamzin to Danilevskii, 1800-1870.* Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1962.

Fang, Irving. *The History of Mass Communication: Six Information Revolutions.* Oxford: Focal Press, 1997.

Filley, G. *Le Monténégro contemporain* (Contemporary Montenegro). Paris, 1876.

Forectić, Vinko. "Rusko-crnogorski rat s Francuskom, 1806-1807 godine" (The Russian-Montenegrin war with the French, 1806-1807). In *Jugoslovenske zemlje i Rusija za vreme prvog srpskog ustanka, 1804-1813*

(The South Slav lands and Russia at the time of the First Serbian uprising, 1804-1813). Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Science and Art, 1983, pp. 327-337.

Frank, Stephen P. and Mark D. Steinberg, eds. *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Frierson, Cathy. *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Nineteenth Century Russia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Gatieux, A. *A.S. Khomiakov et le mouvement Slavophile: les hommes* (A. S. Khomiakov and the Slavophile Movement: The Men). 2 vols. Paris: Editions du cerf, 1939.

Gawrych, George. "Tolerant Dimensions of Cultural Pluralism in the Ottoman Empire." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Nov. 1983), pp. 519-36.

Geraci, Robert. *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Geraci, Robert and Michael Khodarkovsky, eds. *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Gilferding, Alexander. *Bosniia, Gertsegovina i staraia Serbiia* (Bosnia, Herzegovina and Old Serbia). St Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1859.

Gilferding, Alexander. *Bosniia, Putevye Zametki: Pis'ma k A. S. Khomiakov* (Bosnia, travel notes: Letters to A. S. Khomiakov). Moscow: Semena, 1858.

Giliarovskii, V. A. *Moskva gazetnaia/ druzia i vstrechi* (Newspaper Moscow/ Friends and Encounters). Minsk: Nauka i Tekhnika, 1989.Glenny, Misha. *The*

Balkans: Nationalism, War and the Great Powers. London: Penguin, 2001.

Golos, No. 151. 2 July 1876, p.1.

Golos, No. 242. 2 September 1876, p. 3.

Golos, No. 91. 3 April 1877, pp. 1-2.

Gorina, Ludmila Vassilievna. *Istoriografiia istorii iuzhnikh i zapadnikh slavian* (Historiography of the history of the south and west slavs). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1986.

Gradovskii, Grigorii Konstantinovich. *Golos*, No. 233, 24 August 1875, p. 2.

Grave, Sir George and David Masson, John Morley and Mowbray Morris, eds. "The Christian Subjects of Turkey." In *Macmillan's Magazine*. Edinburgh, 1860. Volume II, pp. 452-463.

Greenfeld, Leah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Hacking, Ian. *The Taming of Chance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hartley, J.M. *Alexander I*. London: Longman, 1994.

Herold, J. Christopher. *Bonaparte in Egypt*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword Books Limited, 1962.

Hosking, Geoffrey. *Russia and the Russians: A History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

Hulme, Peter and Tim Youngs. "Introduction." In Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, eds. *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony Smith, eds., *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University
Press, 1996.

Iggers, Georg. *New Directions in European Historiography*. New York: Taylor Francis, 1985.

Jelavich, Barbara. *Russia's Balkan Entanglements, 1806-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Jovanović, Novak. *Sport u Crnoj Gori do 1914. godine* (Sport in Montenegro until 1914). Cetinje: Jaspromet, 1992.

Judah, Tim. *The Serbs: History, Myth and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Katz, Martin. *Mikhail Katkov: a Political Biography 1818-1887*. The Hague: Mouton and Co, 1966.

Kireevskii, Ivan Vasil'evich. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I.V. Kireevskago*. Moscow, 1861.

Khitrova, N.I. *Chernogoriia v natsional'no-osvoboditel'nom dvizhenii na Balkanakh* (Montenegro in the national-liberation movement in the Balkans). Moscow: Izdatelstvo nauka, 1979.

Khitrova, N. I. *Rossiia i Chernogoriia* (Russia and Montenegro). Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1993.

Khitrova, N.I. “Iz istorii russo-chernogorskih otnoshenii v nachale XIX v.” (From the History of Russo-Montenegrin relations at the beginning of the 19th century). In *Jugoslovenske zemlje i Rusija za vreme prvog srpskog ustanka, 1804-1813*. (The South Slav lands and Russia at the time of the First Serbian uprising, 1804-1813). Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Science and Art, 1983, pp. 307-326.

Khomiakov, Aleksei Stepanovich. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Third edition, Moscow, 1900-1907.

Khvostov, A. N. “Russkie i Serby v voinu 1876: Pis’ma” (Russians and Serbs in the War of 1876: Letters). Reprinted in A.L. Shemiakin. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 232-241.

Koerner, E.F.K. “History of Linguistics: The Field.” In R.E. Asher and E.F.K. Koerner, eds. *The Concise History of the Language Sciences: From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp.3-7.

Kohn, Hans. *Panslavism: Its History and Ideology*. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Kovalevskii, Egor. *Chetyre mesiatsa v Chernogorii* (Four months in Montenegro). St. Petersburg, 1841.

Lamanskii, Vladimir Ivanovich. “Serbiia i iuzhno-slavianskie provintsii Avstrii” (Serbia and the South Slav Provinces of Austria). In A.L. Shemiakin, ed. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. (Russians on Serbia and the Serbs). Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 27-35.

Lapteva, Ludmila Pavlovna. *Slavianovedenie v Moskovskom universitete v XIX-nachale XX veka* (Slavic Studies at Moscow University from the Nineteenth to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1997.

Lapteva, Ludmila Pavlovna. *Istoriia slavianovedeniia v Rossii v XIX veke* (The History of Slavic Studies in Russia in the Nineteenth century). Moscow: Indrik, 2005.

Layton, Susan. *Russian Literature and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Leask, Nigel. *Curiosity and the Aesthetics of Travel Writing, 1770-1840*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Lincoln, W. Bruce. *Nicholas I, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russians*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Liprandi, Ivan Petrovich. "Bolgariia" (Bulgaria). In *Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh*. No. 1 (1877), pp. 1-60.

Liprandi, Ivan Petrovich. *Kratkii ocherk khristiianskikh oblastei turetskoi imperii* (Short outline of the Christian provinces of the Turkish empire). Moscow, 1977.

Lobanov-Rostovsky, Andrei. *Russia and Europe 1789-1825*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

Lotman, Iurii. "The Poetics of Everyday Behaviour in Eighteenth-Century Russian Culture." In Alexander D. Nakhimovsky and Alice Stone Nakhimovsky, eds., *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History: Essays by Iurii Lotman, Lidiia Ginsburg, Boris Uspenskii*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press,1985.

Lotman, Iurii. "Liudi 1812 goda" (The men of 1812). *Besedi o russkoi kulture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva XVIII-nachalo XIX*. (Discussions about Russian Culture: the way of life and the traditions of the Russian nobility in the late 18th- early19th centuries). St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo- SPB, 2006, pp. 314-330.

Lotman, Iurii. *Istoriia i tipologiia russkoi kul'tury* (The History and Typology of Russian Culture). St. Petersburg: Isskustvo, 2002.

Lubianovskii, F.P. *Puteshestvie po Saksonii, Avstrii, i Italii v 1800, 1801, i 1802 gg.* (Travels around Saxony, Austria, and Italy in 1800, 1801, and 1802). Moscow, 1805.

Lystra, Karen. *Searching the Heart: Women, Men, and Romantic Love in Nineteenth-Century America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

MacKenzie, David. *The Serbs and Russian Pan-Slavism 1875-1878*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Magaš, Branka. "Introduction." In Matija Mažuranić, *A Glance into Ottoman Bosnia, or a Short Journey into that Land by a Native in 1839-1840*. London: SAQI, 2007.

Maksimov, Nikolai. *Dve voiny 1876-1878: vospominaniia i rasskazy iz sobytii poslednikh voin* (Two Wars 1876-1878: Memories and tales from the events of the last war). (St. Petersburg, 1879). Reprinted in A.L. Shemiakin. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 176-205.

Makushev, Vikentii. *Zadunaiskie i adriaticheskie slaviane* (The Danubian and Adriatic Slavs). St. Petersburg, 1867.

Malcolm, Noel. *Bosnia: a Short History*. London: Macmillan, 1994.

Malia, Martin. *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Manchester, Laurie. *Holy Fathers, Secular Sons: Clergy, Intelligentsia and the Modern Self in Revolutionary Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Mandelstam Balzer, Marjorie. *Russian Traditional Culture: Religion, Gender and Customary Law*. Armonk, NY: Sherpe, 1992.

Marcotti, Giuseppe. *Il Montenegro e le sue donne* (Montenegro and its Women). Milan, 1896.

Martin, Alexander. *Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997.

Mažuranić, Matija. *A Glance into Ottoman Bosnia, or a Short Journey into that Land by a Native in 1839-1840*. London: SAQI, 2007.

McCarthy, Justin. "Ottoman Bosnia, 1800-1878." In Mark Pinson, ed., *The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

McReynolds, Louise. *The News Under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass Circulation Press.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Meshcherskii, Vladimir. "Pravda o Serbii: Pis'ma" (The Truth about Serbia: Letters). Reprinted in A.L. Shemiakin, ed. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 137-167.

Mills, Sara. *Discourses of Difference.* London: Routledge, 1991.

Monas, Sidney. *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Moskovskie vedomosti, No. 320,13 December 1876, p.3.

Müge Göçek, Fatma. *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Muir MacKenzie, Georgina and Adelina Paulina Irby. *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe*. London, 1866.

Mylonas, Christos. *Serbian Orthodox Fundamentals*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2003.

"Nashi krest'iane i gertsegovinskoe vosstanie" (Our peasants and the Herzegovina uprising). *Nedelia*, No. 11, 16 May 1876, pp. 377-378.

Nedelia, No. 16. 17 April 1877, pp. 539-542.

Nikćević, T. *Politićke struje u Crnoj Gori u procesu stvaranje države u XIX vijeku* (Political building in Montenegro in the process of state building in the nineteenth century). Cetinje, 1958.

Nikolaevski vestnik, No. 37. 27 September 1875, p. 415.

Nikulina, M.V. "Puteshestvie Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu i ego mesto v nachal'noi istorii bolgaristiki v Rossii" ("The Travels of Venelin in Bulgaria and their place in the early history of Bulgarian studies in Russia"). In G.K. Venediktov, ed. *Iu. I. Venelin v Bolgarskom vozrozhdenii*. Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, 1998.

Norris, Stephen. *A War on Images*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006.

Pavićević, B. *Stvaranje crnogorske države* (The creation of the Montenegrin state). Belgrade, 1955.

Pejović, Momčilo. *Školovanje crnogoraca u inostranstvu, 1848-1918* (The Education of Montenegrins Abroad). Podgorica: Istorijski Institut Crne Gore, 2000.

Petrovich, Michael Boro. *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism, 1856-1870***.** New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Petrovskii, M. *Otchet o puteshestvie po slavianskim zemliam* (Report on travels around the Slavic lands). Kazan, 1862.

Popov, Aleksander. *Puteshestvie v Chernogoriiu* (Travels in Montenegro). St. Petersburg, 1847.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Prymal, Thomas. "The Strange Life of Sadyk Pasha." *Forum: A Ukrainian Review*. No. 50 (1982), pp. 28-31.

Popović, Pavle. "Dobrovski i srpska književnost." In Jiří Horak, ed. *Sbornik Statik k stému výročí smrti Josefa Dobrovského*. Prague, 1929, pp. 277-287.

Popović, P. *Crna Gora u doba Petra I i Petra II* (Montenegro in the reign of Peter the First and Peter the Second). Belgrade, 1951.

Randolph, John. *A House in the Garden: The Bakunin Family and the Romance of Russian Idealism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Raeff, Marc. *The origins of the Russian Intelligentsia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Raeff, Marc. *Politique et Culture en Russie 18e-20e siècles* (Politics and Culture in Russia in the 18-20th centuries). Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1996.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas Valentine. *Nicholas I and Official Nationality*

University of California Press, Berkeley, 1959.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas Valentine. *Russia and the West in the Teachings of the Slavophiles*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas Valentine. *Russian Identities: a Historical Survey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Soi-même comme un autre*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1990.

Roberts, Elizabeth. *Realm of the Black Mountain: A History of Montenegro*. London: Hurst and Company, 2007.

Rogger, Hans. *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Rovinskii, Pavel. *Petar II (Rade) Petrovich Njegosh: Vladika Chernogoriia* (Petar II (Rade) Petrovich Njegosh: Prince-Bishop of Montenegro). St. Petersburg, 1889.

Rovinskii, Pavel. "Dva mesiatsa v Serbii" ("Two months in Serbia"). In A.L. Shemiakin. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 38-118.

Rovinskii, Pavel. "Mirovozzrenie chernogorskogo naroda" (The worldview of the Montenegrin people). Read as a lecture to the Ethnographic department, 31.01.1886. Printed version of the lecture in The Russian State Library, file 44829-44.

Rubiés, Joao-Pau. "Travel Writing and Ethnography." In Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, eds., *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 242-260.

Russell, Terrence. *The Discovery of Egypt*. Phoenix Mill, Sutton Press, 2005.

Russkie vedomosti, No. 197. 13 September 1875, p. 1.

Russkii mir, No. 209. 1/13 November 1875, p. 2.

Said, Edward. *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* London: Penguin, 1978.

Schlözer, August. *Weltgeschichte nach ihren Haupttheilen im Auszug und Zusammenhange* (*The Main elements of world history in excerpts and context).* Göttingen, 1772.

Schrader, Abby. *Languages of the Lash: Corporal Punishment and Identity in Imperial Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2003.

The Scottish Guardian: Volume the Second. Aberdeen, 1865.

Seker, Nasim. "Identity Formation and the Political Power in the Late Ottoman Empire and Early Turkish Republic." *HAOL*, No. 8. (Autumn, 2005), pp. 59-67.

Skal'kovskii, Konstantin. *V strane iga i svobody: putevye vpechatleniia po Kavkazu, Maloi Azii, Evropeiskoi Turtsii, Chernogorii, Serbii, Avstro-Vengrii i Soedinennym Shtatam* (In the land of the yoke and of freedom: travel notes from the Caucasus, Asia, European Turkey, Montenegro, Serbia, Austro- Hungary, and the United States). St. Petersburg, 1878. In A.L. Shemiaki., *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 126-137.

Skene, James Henry. *The Frontier Lands of the Christians and the Turks; Comprising travels in the regions of the Lower Danube in 1850 and 1851.* Vol II. London: Richard Bentley, 1853.

Smith, Douglas. *Working the Rough Stone: Freemasonry and Society in Eighteenth Century Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1999.

Smucker, Samuel Mosheim. *The Life and Reign of Nicholas the First, Emperor of Russia, with Descriptions of Russian Society and Government*. J.W. Bradley: Philadelphia, 1860.

Spencer, Edmund. *Travels in European Turkey in 1850: Through Bosnia, Servia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thrace, Albania and Epirus, with a visit to Greece and the Ionian Isle*. London: Colburn and co., 1851.

Spurr, David. *Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing and Imperial Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Sreznevskii, Ismail. *Puteviia pis'ma iz slavianskikh zemel 1839-1842* (Travel letters from the Slavic lands 1839-1842). St. Petersburg, 1895.

Stagl, Justin. *The History of Curiosity*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Stavrou, Theofanis George. *Russian Travellers to the Christian East from the Twelfth Century to the Twentieth Century*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1986.

Stevenson, Francis Seymour. *A History of Montenegro*. London: Jarrold and Sons, 1914.

Stojanović, Ljubomir. "Dobrovský chez les Serbs." In Jiří Horak, ed. *Sbornik Statik k stému výročí smrti Josefa Dobrovského*. Prague: Karlovy Universitet, 1929.

Strangford, Viscountess. *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic in 1863 with a Visit to Montenegro*. London: Richard Bentley, 1864.

Thaden, Edward. *The Rise of Historicism in Russia.* New York: Peter Lang, 1999.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *La Conquête de l'Amérique: la question de l'autre* (The Conquest of America: the Question of the Other). Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1982.

Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina*. Moscow, 1878.

Trigo, M. *St. Peterburgskaia gazeta*, No. 188, 19 July 1875, p. 1.

Turgenev, Ivan. *On the Eve*. Moscow, 1860; London: Heinemann, 1903.

Usacheva, V.V. "Iu. I. Venelin i pervye shagi Slavianskoi etnografii" (Venelin and the first steps towards Slavic Ethnography"). In Volodimir Zadorozhnil and Mikola Zimomria, eds., *Iurii Gutsa-Venelin do 200-richchia Vid Dnia Narodzhennia* (Iurii Gutsa Venelin, On the 200-year anniversary of his Birth). Uzhgorod: Vidavnitsvo Karpati, 2002, pp.185-191..

Uspenskii, Gleb. "Iz Belgrada: Pis'ma nevoennogo cheloveka" (From Belgrade: Letters of a non-military man). *Otechestvennye Zapiski* (Notes of the Fatherland). 1876. No 12. In A.L. Shemiakin. *Russkie o Serbii i Serbakh*. Moscow: Aletiia, 2006, pp. 206-231.

Val'skaia, V.A. *Puteshestviia Egora Petrovicha Kovalevskogo* (The Travels of Egor Petrovich Kovalevskii). Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo Geograficheskoi Literatury, 1956.

Venediktov, G. K. Introduction to Iuri Venelin. *Uchenoe puteshestvie Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu* (The scientific expedition of Y. I. Venelin to Bulgaria). Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, 2005.

Venelin, Iuri. *Uchenoe puteshestvie Iu. I. Venelina v Bolgariiu* (The scientific expedition of Y. I. Venelin to Bulgaria). Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, 2005.

Venturi, Franco. *The Roots of Revolution: a History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia*. New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1960.

Walicki, Andrzej. *The Controversy of Capitalism: Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Walicki, Andrzej. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Walicki, Andrzej. *The Slavophile Controversy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Walsh, Reverend Robert. *A Residence in Constantinople During a Period Including the Commencement, Progress and Termination of the Greek and Turkish Revolutions*. London: Frederick Westley and A.H. Davis, 1836.

Weeks, Theodore. *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996.

Werth, Paul. *At the Margins of Orthodoxy: Mission, Governance, and Confessional Politics in Russia's Volga-Kama Region, 1827-1905*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Werth, Paul. "Changing Conceptions of Difference, Assimilation, and Faith in the Volga-Kama Region, 1740-1870." In Jane Burbank, Mark Von Hagen, and Anatolii Remnev, eds., *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700-1930*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.

Wilkinson, Sir J, Gardner. *Dalmatia and Montenegro*. London: John Murray, 1848.

Wortman, Richard. *The Crisis of Russian Populism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Wortman, Richard. *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press,1995.

Youngs, Tim. *Travellers in Africa*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Zirin, Mary. "Meeting the Challenge: Russian Women Reporters and the Balkan Crisis of the late 1870s." In Barbara Norton and Jeanne Gheith, eds., *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender, and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.

Zlatar, Zdenko. *Njegoš's Montenegro*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 2005.