

UDC 94(477.7)“17/18”
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197177

Halyna MYKHAILENKO

PhD (History), Assistant Professor of History, Archeology and Teaching methodology Department of Kherson State University, 27 University Street, Kherson, Ukraine, postal code 73000 (irida55@ukr.net)

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1160-8754>

ResearcherID: <https://publons.com/researcher/3338089/galina-mykhailenko/>

Oleksandr CHEREMISIN

PhD hab. (History), Professor of Professional Education Department of Kherson State Agrarian University, 23 Stretenskaya Street, Kherson, Ukraine, postal code 73024 (al.cheremisin@gmail.com)

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0173-0489>

ResearcherID: <https://publons.com/researcher/3338109/>

Scopus Author ID: 209245196 (<https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57209245196>)

Галина МИХАЙЛЕНКО

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання Херсонського державного університету вул. Університетська, 27, м. Херсон, Україна, індекс 73000 (irida55@ukr.net)

Олександр ЧЕРЕМІСІН

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри професійної освіти Херсонського державного аграрного університету, вул. Стрітенська, 23, м. Херсон, Україна, індекс 73024 (al.cheremisin@gmail.com)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Mykhailenko, H., Cheremisin, O. (2020). New Ukraine vs Novorossia: myths and realities of geopolitical changes during the second half of the XVIIIth – at the end of the XIXth century. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 14, 36–45. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197177

NEW UKRAINE VS NOVORUSSIA: MYTHS AND REALITIES OF GEOPOLITICAL CHANGES DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE XVIIIITH – AT THE END OF THE XIXTH CENTURY

Abstract. *The aim of the research is to reconstruct the peculiarities of geopolitical changes, which took place on the territory of southern Ukraine during the second part of the XVIIIth – the end of the XIXth century. The research methodology is based on the principles of scientism, historical methods, verification, author's objectiveness, the frontier theory, a human dimension, regionalism, and also on the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special-historical (historical-genetic, historical-typological, historical-systemic) methods. The scientific novelty consists in the fact that the process of incorporation and colonization of the southern Ukrainian region has been specified on the basis of the documents unknown before. It has been emphasized that the southern*

Ukrainian region had a lot of peculiarities, which differed it from other regions of the Russian Empire. It was characteristic of the spirit of free enterprising; it nearly did not know any serfdom and, besides, through southern ports not only new goods but progressive ideas were spread out from modernized West Europe. The Empire had been striving to implement an artificial project "Novorussia" for a long time, but this policy became a failure. The region was populated by the Ukrainians; it was formed in close economical and socio-cultural relationships with the left and right banks Ukraine and became an integral part of Great Ukraine. In the research the south of Ukraine is characterized as "New Ukraine" to counterbalance Russia's failed "Novorussia" project. The memoirs by West European and Russian political and public figures as well as ordinary travellers round the region have been studied and the attention is focused on the fact that the southern Ukrainian region had nothing in common with backward Russia. The same time, modernization, colonization, cultural and other factors only proved it. **The Conclusions.** As a result of the present research, the conclusions have been made saying that the term "New Ukraine" has more rights to exist as a manifestation of the beginning of "a new life" in many aspects (political, economical, socio-cultural, etc.). The new Ukrainian region from the very beginning was given a strong impetus to development in the West-European direction and the residents of the region did not inherit Russia's values.

Key words: New Ukraine, the south of Ukraine, Steppes' Ukraine, geopolitics, administrative-territorial system.

НОВА УКРАЇНА VS НОВОРОСІЯ: МІФИ ТА РЕАЛЬНІСТЬ ГЕОПОЛІТИЧНИХ ЗМІН У ДРУГІЙ ПОЛОВИНІ XVIII – КІНЦІ XIX ст.

Анотація. Мета дослідження – розкрити й проаналізувати особливості геополітичних змін, які відбулись на території Півдня України в другій половині XVIII – кінці XIX ст. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на принципи науковості, історизму, верифікації, авторської об'єктивності, теорії фронтиру, людиновимірності, регіоналізму, а також на використання загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що на основі невідомих раніше документів уточнено процес інкорпорації та колонізації південноукраїнського регіону. Наголошується, що Південь України мав багато особливостей, що якісно вирізняли його серед інших регіонів Російської імперії. Для нього характерним був дух вільного підприємництва, він майже не знав кріпосного права, а через південні порти поширювалися не тільки товари, а й прогресивні ідеї модернізованої Західної Європи. Довгий час імперія намагалася реалізувати на Півдні України штучний проект "Новоросія", але ця політика зазнала краху. Регіон заселявся українцями, формувалася у тісному економічному та соціокультурному взаємозв'язку із Правобережжям і Лівобережжям, ставши органічною частиною Великої України. У дослідженні Південь України характеризується терміном "Нова Україна" як протизвага невдалому російському проекту "Новоросія". У статті розглянуті спогляди західноєвропейських та російських політичних, громадських діячів і простих відвідувачів регіону, які фокусували увагу на тому, що південноукраїнський регіон не мав нічого спільного із відсталою Росією. Водночас модернізаційні, колонізаційні, культурні та інші фактори це лише підтверджували. **Висновки.** У результаті проведеного дослідження були зроблені висновки про те що термін "Нова Україна" має більше прав на існування як вияв початку "нового життя" в багатьох аспектах (політичному, економічному, соціокультурному та інших). Новоросійський регіон із самого початку існування потужний західноєвропейський напрям розвитку, а мешканці регіону не отримали в спадок російські цінності.

Ключові слова: Нова Україна, Південь України, Степова Україна, геополітика, адміністративно-територіальний устрій.

The Problem Statement. Under present conditions of Ukrainian State's building it is safe to say that historical inheritance is an exceptionally significant integral element of contemporary processes, as the south of Ukraine is of a paramount importance. It includes the territories of the Crimea and the Donbas and the events, which are taking place these years,

without exaggeration, have drawn the attention of the whole world. The problems, which refer to history of this region, take not the least place in an informational war, which gave birth to the archaic “New Russia project”. Under these circumstances a set of problems became actualized, which are connected with history of the southern Ukrainian region of the studied period, as at the very end of the XVIIIth – the beginning of the XIXth century the Russian Empire commenced a historical destruction of the Ukrainian territory.

The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches. In the sphere of historiography some separate parts of the problem were raised. In the first place among historical research works, which were dedicated to the above-mentioned theme, it is worth mentioning the work of D. Bagaley (Bagaley, 1889). He was a Ukrainian researcher, who started to bring up the question of the southern Ukrainian region being formed in close relationships with right and left banks Ukraine. During the colonization processes in the south of Ukraine there started “a new life” for a plenty of nationalities. In the conclusions he stated that as a result of the three colonization waves there appeared an absolutely new Ukrainian region, which was quickly modernized, having a powerful agrarian, trading, industrial and intellectual potential.

Speaking about the historical studies of the southern Ukraine under conditions of the Soviet regime, it is worth mentioning, first of all, the works of O. Druzhinina, which are very informative in the aspect of trading and industrial development of the region. In the context of the above-mentioned theme of the present article the Soviet researcher’s conclusion is important for understanding that Russia, having united the northern Black Sea regions in the second half of the XVIIIth century and hoping for their fast integration into the Empire, received an equal standing part of Southern Ukraine in the XIXth century instead (Druzhinina, 1955).

N. Polonska-Wasylenko did not fail to pay attention to the history of the southern Ukraine region. In particular, the researcher thought that while the Russian Empire was colonizing these regions, it had already had numerous populations, whose lands were either taken away or residents were imposed with heavy taxes. Russian or foreign colonists had privileges instead. N. Polonska-Wasylenko also stated that the majority of people, who came to the south of Ukraine, were natives of Ukrainian territories, and that all the newcomers started an absolutely new life (“vita nova”) in this region (Polonska-Wasylenko, 1978).

At today’s stage of development and under circumstances of an independent Ukraine an interest in these problems has increased. For example, it is worth paying attention to the researches of southern-Ukrainian region’s history at the end of the XVIIIth – the beginning of the XXth century, presented by O. Danilchenko. In this research there is not only a factual material, dedicated to the ethnic composition of newly united territories of Russian Empire, but also a series of important conclusions: the southern-Ukrainian territories became a unifying link of economical development for all Ukraine; representatives of the majority of peoples, who settled in the south of Ukraine, were aware of being the part of precisely southern-Ukrainian population (Danilchenko, 2009). A substantial contribution to the development of the above-mentioned theme was made by F. Turchenko and H. Turchenko (Turchenko, Turchenko, 2015), who analyzed the circumstances under which an artificial project “Novo Russia” appeared in 1764 as well as the attempts by the Tsar’s regime to realize it, later on by the Provisional Government in 1917 and at present time by today’s Russia. In the context of the analysis of the project made by Ukrainian scientists the 250 years’ long evolution of Ukrainian-Russian relationships has been investigated. At the same time, the authors’

attention is paid mainly to the sources and peculiarities of the contemporary Russian-Ukrainian war, not to special conditions of the southern Ukrainian region.

The purpose of the publication is to prove that for the naming of the region, which the Russian Empire made an attempt to colonize in the XIXth c., the term “New Ukraine” is more appropriate in comparison with the forced by the Russian propaganda name “Novo Russia”. Apart from it, the purpose of the present historical research is also to prove the fact that under the influence of different civilization processes on the territories of the southern Ukraine a new socio-cultural reality was formed.

The Statement of the Basic Material. Traditionally the lands of the southern Ukrainian region constituted a properly Ukrainian territory and had different names: “wild field”, “Steppes’ Ukraine”, “the Territory of Army Zaporozhskiy”. In the course of significant geopolitical changes in the second half of the XVIIIth c. the south of Ukraine was forcefully joined into the Russian Empire. The Tsar’s government broke traditional borders of historical and geographic division of Ukraine’s districts while artificially turning Slobozhanschina and the territory of Army Zaporozhskiy into the whole Novorussia province. The name “Novorussia” itself, as F. Turchenko and H. Turchenko (Turchenko, Turchenko, 2015, pp. 5–14) noted, originated due to the Manifest by Katherine II from March 22, 1764. The Tsar’s government followed a model of West-European states, which formed analogies of their monarchies on the colonized territories: New England, New France, New Holland, etc. But the principal difference from the countries of the Western Europe lay in that the Empresses of Russia presented the joined from the Ottoman Empire region as her own and properly Russian territory, which supposedly belonged to Russia earlier and that later it was unjustly taken by enemies and at the end of the XVIIIth c. returned into native measures of the Russian Empire.

However, it was not specified when the south of Ukraine belonged to Russia and in what way it was taken away. At the same time, the southern Ukraine region was pictured by Russia’s government as a total desert where there was no life; therefore Russia had to bring light of civilization onto those lands. The Novorussia province itself existed until 1783 undergoing substantial territorial changes. It was renewed in 1796 and liquidated in 1802 by dividing it into Mykolaiv, Katherinoslav and Tavria provinces. In 1803 Mykolaiv province was renamed in Kherson one. In 1822 these three provinces were united into one general-gubernatorial territory, which existed for a bit over half a century and before the end of the XIXth c. became archaic. However, some cultural and educational institutions on the territory of the south of Ukraine were still called “Novorussian” until 1917 – 1921.

Beginning from the second half of the XVIIIth c. Russian ideologists derived the name “Novorussia” from the concept New Russia. It is precisely due to joining the region into the Russian Empire the intentions grew to modernize Russia and put it into the world’s leaders. For example, A. Gavriil (Gavriil, 1853, pp. 81–83) emphasized that it was Russia’s government that brought civilization onto the south of Ukraine about which on “wild lands” no one knew anything. O. Platonov paid attention to the “Novo Russia” project too. It was him, who gave birth to the opposition theory of southern-Ukrainian to Northern-Russian territories, which was actively used by the Russian power (for example, Kherson – St. Petersburg, Mykolaiv – Kronstadt, Katherinoslav – Katherinodar).

O. Platonov, contemplating on the significance of the Novorussia project, developed a theory of regions’ opposition, which became the foundation for home policy, according to which the south of Ukraine was opposite to Russia’s North with the aim of surpassing the policy of Great Kyiv Prince Vladimir Svjatoslavich and Russia’s Emperor Peter I.

The opposition of above-mentioned regions was exercised by the way of singling out an informal centre in every region to which other towns gravitated, becoming integral provincial parts of it. Thus, Kherson was opposed to St. Petersburg, Mykolaiv to Kronstadt, Katherinoslav to Katherinodar and Katherinograd. There was no full accord mainly because of absence of an informal centre opposing to St. Petersburg. Its functions in the south were divided among Katherinoslav, Kherson and Odessa. Actually, Odessa became a political, economical and cultural centre of the south around which other towns of the region became provincialized (Platonov, 2001, pp. 112–124).

Thus, the south of Ukraine became a special region in the policy of Russia's government, which was presented as properly Russian in opposition to the north of Russia. Besides, it were the southern towns, due to which there appeared new opportunities for modernization and renovation of all the Russian Empire in particular:

- political – forming a new model of state order and foreign policy;
- economical – orientation of market model onto the ports of the Azov and Black seas, facilitating capitalistic relationships' development;
- social – ruining old and forming new social relationships thus turning town's estates into bourgeoisie;
- world outlook and ideological – forming new philosophy based on rationality's principles (Cheremisin, 2017, pp. 82–83).

Colonization and urbanization processes were to become important components of this policy by the way of which the Tsar's government tried to prove that the region was populated by the Russians properly. That's why substantial concessions were made and exclusive privileges given to new settlers. However, Russia's government failed to colonize the region by proper Russia's population and to totally russificate the territory. The region appeared to be populated mainly by the Ukrainians (up to 60–90 %) (Kabuzan, 1976, pp. 136–149; Danilchenko, 2009, pp. 43–98; Donik, 2011, pp. 86–198), and Russia's settlers were afraid of proper Russian troops, who unmercifully robbed colonizers, moving from Russia's provinces on their way to the south (IMNLV, f. 9, cases 17450–17491, pp. 11–14; IMNLV, f. 9, cases 20745–20750, pp. 2–9). The most numerous nationalities in town's population were the Ukrainians, the Russians and the Jews. Thus, southern Ukrainian towns may be justly called not proper Russian, but Ukrainian-Russian-Jewish. The government of Russia did not manage even statistically to present southern Ukrainian towns as Russian properly. According to statistical data before 1897 it was not possible to discern the Ukrainians, the Russians and the Byelorussians, as these three nationalities were artificially united into "the Russians". In reality, the Russians proper were not a lot, in the comments to statistical data it was noted that the Ukrainians in towns were a great lot. The same time, it was noted in provincial statistics that the Russians constituted 7,09 %, the Ukrainians – 49,3 %, the Byelorussians – 2,8 %. In regional statistics there were data indicating that the Ukrainians were 89 %. Besides, in statistical data it was noted that more substantial influence on the Russian population was executed by the Ukrainians, as new Russian settlers knew quickly a lot of Ukrainian words, sayings and peculiarities of the Ukrainian language (Maikov, 1968, p. 35; Records, 1863, pp. 20–26). According to statistical data from 1897 it appeared that the Ukrainians constituted a dominant number of the population in villages and towns of the region (especially in provincial towns) (Troinitskiy, 1904, pp. 8–12).

As a result, the government failed to form a national composition acceptable to the "Novorussia project", so it made maximum efforts to russificate the region regarding the

Russian language as the only means of communication and a fast adaptation. But this project was a failure from the very beginning, as in most cases the Ukrainians and the Crimean-Tatars opposed russification and did not want to be turned into “Novorussians”. The artificiality of the “Novorussia project” proves pretty well the fact that the population of the region was not turned into Novorussians. The government of Russia pretended that the region was Russian-speaking, whereas the Russian language did not dominate in the region. As a rule, the terms “Malo (Small) Russia” and “Veliko (Great) Russia” were made clear by the fact that the Ukrainians and the Russians, who have their own and different history, traditions, customs, folklore, etc., constituted full-bodied ethnic groups themselves. In the case of “Novorussia” it was not possible to refer to a certain ethnic group, not to restore Novorussia’s history, folklore, customs, etc. They were just absent in history and weren’t existent at the time.

The evidences that the southern Ukraine did not become a properly Russian region can be found in memorial inheritance of the XIXth c. figures. For example, the British travelers M. Gutri, M. Holderness, R. Layall wrote about southern Ukraine as a European region being distinct from the rest of territories of the Russian Empire. An American D. Stephens, a Russian of Sweden origin F. Vigel characterized southern-Ukrainian territories as a link between Russia and civilization (Gutri, 2012, pp. 19–20, 22–91, 100–261). Sometimes even the Russians stressed un-Russian character of southern-Ukrainian towns (for example Zabolotnyi, a Russian public figure) when he described Odessa; Vsevolzhskiy (Tver’s civil gubernator in 1817 – 1826), A. Demidov (Russian academician), P. Sumarokov (Russian writer), F. Vigel (Russian of Sweden origin) (Vsevolzhskiy, 1839, pp. 89–156; Demidov, 1853, pp. 189–267; Sumarokov, 1800, pp. 124–189; Vigel, 2006, pp. 156–168).

Russia’s government stated that it was the State itself, which founded all the towns in the south of Ukraine and that municipal administrations consisted of the representatives of the Russian nationality. But the importance of Russia and the Russians in this aspect is rather overestimated, as Russia did not found towns on vacant (deserted) places but only refounded already existent settlements and military fortresses of Zaporozhskiy Cossacks, Crimean Tatars and used the territories of Old Greeks’ towns for settlement. For instance, a former military fortress Alexander-Schanz, where the Cossacks lived once, became a place for building the city of Kherson, an old-Greek Chersonesus and Tatar settlement Achtiar for Sebastopol, the territory of former Zaporozhska Setch for Alexandrovsk, a settlement Kodak for the city of Dnepro and a Tatar settlement Chadzhibey for Odessa.

According to the materials of the first census of the population in 1897 in municipal administrations of the region the Russians did not always prevail. For example, in municipal self-government of Berislav the Ukrainians constituted 83,3 %, the Russians – 10 %; in Olexandria the Ukrainians were 58,8 %, the Russians – 35 %. in Bobrinets the Ukrainians were 61,9 %, the Russians – 28,68 %; in Olviopol the Ukrainians were 55,6 %, the Russians – 55,6 %; in Majaki the Ukrainians were 55,6 %, the Russians – 44,4 %; in Ochakiv the Ukrainians were 55,6%, the Russians – 44,4 %; in Olexandrivsk the Ukrainians were 58 %, the Russians – 37,7 %; in Bachmut the Ukrainians were 68,9%, the Russians – 22,2 %; in Verchnedneprovsk the Ukrainians were 60,7 %, the Russians – 39 %; in Novomoskovsk the Ukrainians were 53 %, the Russians – 38 %; in Slavjanoserbsk the Ukrainians – 50 %, the Russians – 50 %; in Orechov the Ukrainians were 81,8 %, the Russians – 18,2 %.

In Kherson, Mykolajiv, Odessa, Novogeorgievsk, Anan’ev, Elisavetgrad, Voznesensk, Novomirgorod, Ovidiopol, Katherinoslav, Mariupol, Pavlograd, Lugansk, Simpjeropol, Sebastopol, Karasubazar, Nogaïsk, Oleshky, Eupatoria, Melitopol, Perekop, Yalta, Feodosija,

Staryi Krym, Kertch the amount of the Ukrainians in municipalities ranged from 5 % to 40 %. Only in Crimean towns an amount of the Crimean Tatar in municipal self-government dominated – 40,5 %, the Ukrainians – 5,8 %, the Russians – 11,8 % (Troinitskiy, 1904, pp. 275–285, Troinitskiy, 1897, pp. 175–186).

Thus, an amount of the Russians in municipal administrations in the south of Ukraine was prevalent in 26 towns, an amount of the Ukrainians prevailed in 12 towns, in 1 (one) town an amount of the Russians and the Ukrainians was equal and in 1 (one) town an amount of the Crimean Tatar prevailed.

That is why Russia's administration failed to present the southern Ukraine region as Russian or Novorussian; the south of Ukraine did not become an ethnic territory of Russia. Moreover, the term Novorussia was regarded as archaic before the end of the XIXth c.

The authors of the present research carry out ideas of the name New Ukraine as a phenomenon of a new life's beginning and modernization for the Ukrainians properly. It has more rights to exist in comparison with artificially elaborated Novorussia, produced for justification of Russia's aggressive policy. The Ukrainian factor became crucial in the process of turning the south of Ukraine into New Ukraine.

The New Ukrainian region became a stimulating factor, which set all Ukraine into motion economically, culturally, ideologically and united it into Great Ukraine. If early trading relationships of the right bank Ukraine were oriented to Poland, whereas the left bank Ukraine – to Russia, the south of Ukraine directed trading streams from both left and right banks Ukraine to West Europe. It was the south of Ukraine from which ideas of modernization and renovation of all Ukrainian life were spreading. The Ukrainian population received a chance to make use of new standards and go away from traditional and archaic forms of coexistence.

The Russian population underwent modernization too. It was caused by the distance from the capitals and undeveloped transportation system. The Russians understood very soon that it was closer to civilized Europe and it was more attractive, too. Thus, being brought up in traditions of military patriotism and proud of their Russian origin, they learnt foreign languages sooner than they started shaving their beards.

The Ukrainian population was also modernized. The right bank Ukraine (whose trading traditionally was oriented onto Poland) and the left bank Ukraine (with trading interests in Moscow and St. Petersburg) grew actively: from there caravans of goods for sale went to the south from where they arrived on West European markets. However, the traders from other regions seldom came back with money. They gambled money away, gambled everything in southern towns (Vigel, 2000, pp. 57–68). As a result, the resettlement to the south was a symbol of “new”, free from serfdom and burden of feudalism life.

Simultaneous with the development of economical life the south of Ukraine was integrated on a regional level in Western, Eastern and Northern Ukraine. At the same time, particulars of the region's integration into the Russian Empire provided conditions for forming new social-economical, administrative-territorial and national relationships, too. That is why it is absolutely possible to share the thought of I. Lysak-Rudnytskiy that the south united Ukraine, first economically by participating in an international division of labor's process, then on a national level, and on the whole it became the centre of economical gravitation of modern Ukraine (Lysak-Rudnytskiy, 1994, pp. 145–171).

The Conclusions. During the second half of the XVIIIth century the Russian Empire with the help of artificial Novorussia project made an attempt to renew its home policy and to break an international isolation aiming at turning itself into a world-wide power. That was

a chance to organize a better life on new territories and by this way to renew the Empire, to transit it from backwardness to “prosperity and well-being”. The ambitious plans of the Empire appeared to have been unrealized. It succeeded to renew the Empire’s outward appearance only, whereas inward bureaucracy, the officialdom’s escapades, embezzlement of public funds, bribery and corruption drew it back. Novorossia did not become Russian, but it turned itself into New Ukraine instead and it became a unifying economical construct for all Ukraine.

The unfeasibility of Novorossia project was so obvious that at the end of the XIXth century the term became archaic and there remained only a few names.

The Tsar’s ideology made an attempt to implement a myth, to create an unhistorical theory according to which the region was always Russian, although, in reality, during the whole history it was formed as a proper Ukrainian where Ukrainian Cossacks and the Crimean Tatars had lived. Russia’s government attempted to prove that the region was vacant at the time it was incorporated into the Russian Empire; in fact, there lived the Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar population. The Tsar’s government made an attempt to prove that it was Russia, which brought light of civilization in the region, but, in reality, civilization and high level of culture came from Western Europe. The Tsar’s government made an attempt to prove that the region was populated by the Russians only; in reality, up to 60–90% of it was populated mainly by the Ukrainians. Even in towns the number of Ukrainian population was substantial, which was proved by Russian statistics. The fact that the region was not perceived as properly Russian was proved by the Europeans and the Russians calling it Italy, Europe, Florence and constantly making comparison with towns of Western Europe. Russia’s government attempted to prove a myth that in municipal administration of the region were the Russians only; in reality, only in 26 towns the majority of posts were held by the Russians; in reality, in 11 towns the Ukrainians dominated. Only in 1 (one) municipality a number of the Russians and the Ukrainians was equal and in 1 (one) of self-governments the Crimean Tatars were a majority.

Thus, the region for the greater part should be regarded as Novoukrainian, as the Tsar’s government did not answer, who Novorussians were, at the same time, the policy of colonization led to settlement of the region by different nationalities, who did not want to be russified. The greater part of the region was populated by the representatives of the Ukrainian nationality proper (compact groups lived both in towns and in villages) Moreover, it was the Ukrainian population, who to a greater extent, exerted the influence on other nationalities in linguistic and cultural aspects.

It was here that Ukrainian population was able to reach new (modern) patterns of life. It was in the new Ukrainian region where urbanization and modernization started already at the end of the XVIIIth century. The rates of modernization and urbanization processes in the south of Ukraine substantially exceeded the indicators in other regions. Russia’s government did not found towns on vacant places, but it was busy with reconstruction and rebuilding of already existent Ukrainian and Tatar settlements as well as military fortresses. The Russians, the Jews, the Moldavians and others constituted pretty large compact groups of town’s population in whose hands commerce, trading, public service, industry and education were held. It was connected with particulars of a military-administrative and commercial character of activities in southern Ukrainian towns. In the structure of countryside population of the region the Ukrainians also prevailed; they were more mobile on all other territories of Ukraine. They were busy not only in agriculture but were also engaged in salt, fish and cart businesses. In the structure of town’s population the Russians prevailed in officialdom, in municipal and

estate self-government, among intelligence as well. The Ukrainians prevailed in the sphere of agriculture. The towns in the south of Ukraine were multinational but only 3 ethnoses prevailed: the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Jews. The Ukrainian population influenced other ethnic groups in cultural aspect. It were the Ukrainians, whom the Russians, the Serbs and other nationalities took speech and cultural traditions from.

Acknowledgments. We express a sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bagaley, D. I. (1889). *Kolonizacija Novorossijskogo kraja i pervye shagi ego po puti kul'tury* [Colonization of the Novorussia territory and its first steps in the field of culture]. Kyiv: G. T. Korchak-Novitskiy's printing-house, 115 p. [in Russian]

Cheremisyn, O. V. (2017). *Mis'ke samovrjaduvannja Pivdnja Ukraïni v 1785 – 1917 gg.* [Municipal self-government in South of Ukraine (1785 – 1917)]. Kherson: Oldi-plus, 582 p. [in Ukrainian]

Danilchenko, O. (2009). *Etnichnij rozvitok i mizhnarodni zv'jazki Pivdnja Ukraïni (kinec' XVIII – persha chvert' XX stolittja)* [Ethnic composition and international relationships of the south of Ukraine (the end of XVIII – 1st quarter of XX c.)]. Vladivostok, 119 p. [in Ukrainian]

Demidov, A. N. (1853). *Puteshestvie v Juzhnuju Rossiju i Krym cherez Vengriju, Valahiju i Moldaviju, sovershennoe v 1837 godu* [Travel to Southern Russia and the Crimea via Hungary, Walachia and Moldova made in 1837]. Moskva: A. Semen's printing-house, 543 p. [in Russian]

Donik, O. M. (2011). *Ukraina: U skladi dvoh imperij (ostannja chvert' XVIII – persha polovina XIX stolit')* [Ukraine: Inside the two Empires (the last quarter of XVIII – the 1st half XIX c.)]. Kyiv: KRION, 247 p. [in Ukrainian].

Druzhinina, H. I. (1955). *Severnoe Prichernomor'e v 1775 – 1800 gg.* [The Northern Black Sea Region in 1775 – 1800]. Moskva: Nauka, 267 p. [in Russian]

Druzhinina, H. I. (1981). *Juzhnaja Ukraina v period krizisa feodalizma. 1825 – 1860 gg.* [Southern Ukraine in the period of feudalism's crisis. 1825 – 1860]. Moskva: Nauka, 216 p. [in Russian]

Gavriil, A. T. (1853). Otryvok povestvovanija o Novorossijskom krae s 1751 po 1786 gg. [Excerpt of Narration on the Novorussia Territory from 1751 till 1786]. *Writings of Odessa's society of history and antiquities*, (3), 81–83. [in Russian]

Gerligi, P. (1999). *Odessa. Istorija goroda 1794 – 1914* [Odessa. History of the City 1794 – 1914]. Kyiv: Krytyka, 382 p. [in Russian]

Gutri, M., Holderness, M., Layall, R., Pinkerton, R., & Stephens, D. (2012). *Odessa glazami Britancev* [Odessa through the eyes of the Britains]. Odessa: Optium, 265 p. [in Russian]

Kabuzan, V. M. (1976). Chysel'nist' ta nacional'nij sklad Novorosii v 60–80-ti rr. XVIII st. [Size of the population and national composition of Novorussia in 60–80 of XVIII c.]. *Ukrainian historical-geographical book*, (1), 136–149. [in Ukrainian]

Konstantinova, V. M. (2010). *Urbanizacija: pivdenoukraïns'kij vimir (1861 – 1904 rr.)* [Urbanization: Southern Ukrainian dimension (1861 – 1904)]. Zaporizhje: AA Tandem, 569 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lysak-Rudnytskiy, I. (1994). *Rolja Ukrainy v novitnij istorii. Istorychni ese* [The role of Ukraine in Modern History. Historical essays]. (pp. 145–171). Kyiv: V. I. K. [in Ukrainian]

Maikov, L. (1863). *Spisok naselennyh mest Rossijskoj imperii* [The lists of settlements of the Russia Empire. Katherinoslav Province. Vol. XIII]. (pp. 20–26). St-Petersburg: The central statistical committee's printing-house of MHA. [in Russian]

Maikov, L. (1868). *Spiski naselennyh mest Rossijskoj imperii. Hersonskaja gubernija po svedenijam na 1859 g.* [Lists of settlements of the Russian Empire. Kherson Province according to data in 1859. Vol. XLVII]. (p. 35). St-Petersburg: The printing-house of the central statistical committee of the Ministry of Home Affairs. [in Russian]

Platonov, O. (2001). *Svjataja Rus'. Jenciklopedicheskij slovar' [Saint Russ. Encyclopedia Dictionary]*. Moskva, 634 p. [in Russian]

Polonska-Wasylenko, N. (1978). *Istorija Ukrainy [History of Ukraine. V. 2: From the half of XVIII c. till 1924]*. (p. 276). Munich. [in Ukrainian]

Ravesskiy, M. (1865). *Spisok naselemyh mest Rossijskoj imperii [The list of settlements of the Russia Empire. Vol. XLI: Tavria Province]*. (p. 53). St-Petersburg: MHA's printing-house. [in Russian]

Sumarokov, P. I. (1800). *Puteshestvie v Krym i Bessarabiju v 1799 g. [Travel to the Crimea and Bessarabia in 1799]*. Moskva: University printing-house of Ridiger's and Claudiy's, 238 p. [in Russian]

Troinitskiy, N. A. (1897). *Pervaja vseobshhaja perepis' naselenija Rossijskoj imperii. [The 1st general census of the population of the Russian Empire. Vol. 13: Katherinoslav Province]*. St-Petersburg: Porochovschikova's printing-house, 234 p. [in Russian]

Troinitskiy, N. A. (1904). *Pervaja vseobshhaja perepis' naselenija Rossijskoj imperii [The 1st general census of the population of the Russian Empire. Vol. XLVII]*. (pp. 8–12, 275–285). St-Petersburg: Mescherskiy's printing-house. [in Russian]

Troinitskiy, N. A. (1904). *Pervaja vseobshhaja perepis' naselenija Rossijskoj imperii [The 1st general census of the population of the Russian Empire. Vol. XLI]*. (pp. 75–285). St-Petersburg: Mescherskiy's printing-house. [in Russian]

Turchenko, F. G. & Turchenko, H. F. (2003). *Pivdenna Ukraina: modernizacija, svitova vijna, revoljucija (kinec' XIX st. – 1921 r.): Istorichni narysy [The southern Ukraine: Modernization, The World War, Revolution (the end of XIX c. – 1921): Historical narratives]*. (pp. 11–15). Kyiv: Geneza. [in Ukrainian]

Turchenko, F. G. & Turchenko, H. F. (2015). *Proekt "Novorosija" 1764 – 2014 rr. Juvilej na krovi ["Novorussia" project 1764 – 2014. Jubilee on the blood]*. Zaporizhje: ZNU, 304 p. [in Ukrainian]

Vigel, F. (2006). *Zapiski [Records]*. (pp. 156–168). Odessa: "Optium" Publishing-house. [in Russian]

Vsevolzhskiy, N. S. (1839). *Puteshestvie cherez Juzhnuju Rossiju, Krym i Odessu v Konstantinopol', Maluju Aziju, Severnuju Afriku, Mal'tu, Siciliju, Italiju, Juzhnuju Franciju i Parizh v 1836 i 1837 godah [Travels via Southern Russia, the Crimea and Odessa to Constantinople, Asia Minor, North Africa, Malta, Sicily, Italy, Southern France and Paris in 1836 – 1837. Vol. 1]*. Moscow: The printing-house of August Semen at the Imperial Medico-surgical academy, 495 p. [in Russian]

Instytut rukopysu Nacional'noi biblioteky im. V. Vernads'koho [Institute of Manuscripts of National Library of V. Vernadskiy – IMNL of V. Vernadskiy], f. 9. Archives of the Fortress of St Elizabeth, cases 20745 – 20750: Reports, appeals and correspondence concerning the investigation of the robbery of Elizavetgrad merchant Grigorija Illina, 12 p. [in Russian]

Instytut rukopysu Nacional'noi biblioteky im. V. Vernads'koho [Institute of Manuscripts of National Library of V. Vernadskiy – IMNL of V. Vernadskiy], f. 9. Archives of the Fortress of St Elizabeth, cases 17450 – 17491: Reports of Major to the Commandant of the Fortress of St Elizabeth on the events in the city, 84 p. [in Russian]

*The article was received on July 10, 2019.
Article recommended for publishing 26/02/2020.*