

Ottoman lands) in the age of nationalism. This includes border regions as well as some of the so-called core imperial areas (e.g., Russian in Norris's and Kolstø's chapters and Ottoman/Turkish in Gasimov's text). The mesoregional approach permits looking "at de-territorialized yet not timeless units of analysis by way of intra-regional and inter-regional comparison in order to identify clusters of *longue durée*-like structural markers."⁴⁸ We are also fully aware of terminological intricacies in this sense (Ukraine and its many neighbors did not have sovereignty in this period and, thus, had no clearly defined state borders). Still, it is on the one hand fruitful to start from the classical view of *antemurale* rhetoric as the prerogative of Catholic countries. On the other hand, our approach allows us to introduce various multiconfessional and multiethnic perspectives on the whole region beyond the narrow scope of specific national discourses.

Recent historiography emphasizes that "mesoregion" is an analytical category, not an ontological one. As Diana Mishkova and Balázs Trencsényi argue in their latest book, "Regions thus do not emerge as objectified and disjointed units functioning as quasi-national entities with fixed boundaries and clear-cut lines between insiders and outsiders, but rather as flexible and historically changing frameworks for interpreting certain phenomena."⁴⁹

We assume that Eastern Europe as a mesoregion could be described in terms of multilayered, complex interactions of the steppe, of Rus, Polish, Habsburg, Russian, Ottoman imperial, and Soviet traditions.⁵⁰ We are aware that—with reference to long and intensive research debates—some of our authors (e.g., Seegel and Srodecki) could not follow the geographical term "Eastern Europe" and define these territories more concretely as East Central Europe, which includes German territories, or Central Europe, which also encompasses Austrian lands.

Whether called Eastern, Central, or East Central Europe, these were the lands of "several nested geographies,"⁵¹ at the same time being "a contact zone possessing a quite differentiated spectrum of social and cultural phenomena."⁵² Mary Louise Pratt defines contact zones as social arenas in which cultures "meet, clash, and grapple with each other within spaces of asymmetrical power relations."⁵³ These territories could otherwise be called a communication region that is characterized by dense internal interaction and multiple cultural practices and experiences.⁵⁴

The logic of the *antemurale* functioned on both sides there. For the local population, living on a front line required both cooperation and confrontation with close neighbors. In the case of danger, bulwark rhetoric was often in use, while the logic of cooperation across the border emerged in peaceful times. This region was seen both as a bulwark and as a bridge. Border conflicts gave rise to the formation of semi-independent military units, such

as the Ukrainian Cossacks, who were often portrayed as frontiersmen defending the Orthodox faith, the Ukrainian nation, or the Russian Empire.⁵⁵ The boundary between Christian and Islamic cultures, which is rooted in history, also influenced various interdependent debates about civilization, barbarism, religious missions, and self-identification with the role of a “chosen people” (e.g., as defenders of faith or culture) in the region.⁵⁶

Since the nineteenth century, the mythic narrative of bulwarks has undergone considerable change due to the rise of nationalism and the transformations of political borders. *Antemurale* myths have therefore experienced a revival as modern rampart nations were born. Recent statements by East European politicians and journalists, as analyzed in Kolstø’s chapter and Srodecki’s concluding remarks on the legacies of the *antemurale* rhetorics at the end of the book, show that ancient topoi of a chosen people and the civilization/barbarism divide remain intact today. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, anti-Islamic rhetoric has sometimes been replaced by a sharp anti-Russian/Soviet vocabulary.

This is aptly demonstrated in several case studies in this volume, particularly in those of Kolstø, Gasimov, and Srodecki. Political myths of *antemurale*, due to their semantic flexibility, are essential elements of national ideologies. A certain chain effect has been crucial in this respect. Despite the obvious “dividing function” of bulwark myths, many national traditions in the region have been determined in their modern (i.e., mainly nineteenth-century) development by the inclusion of mirroring images of the enemy from the other side of the border. Since the nationally motivated and accelerated enhancement of bulwark narratives in the nineteenth century, they have become an important source of legitimation for the ideologies of nation-states and empires in the region. Consequently, they are deeply engraved in today’s national consciousness.

One focus of our book rests upon the *longue durée* processes in national consciousness from the end of the eighteenth century until World War II. In the historical literature, this period has been given the name of “the age of nationalism.” It is generally supposed that this time witnessed the rise of nationalism, which became a generally recognized sentiment molding public and private life. However, such a universal definition is questionable. In the abovementioned region, the expression of nationalism had different forms. Some scholars define an “Eastern type of nationalism” as ethnic, as opposed to “Western nationalism,” which they say was a civic one. Hans Kohn, who coined this typology around World War II, described ethnic nationalism as inherently backward, while civic (political) nationalism was allegedly progressive.⁵⁷ The critique of such assertions concerned mostly the equation of nation and state, which in some East European cases is rather problematic. The often postulated equation

of nation and modernity also does not seem to work in Eastern European contexts in the “long” nineteenth century.⁵⁸

However, the most critical point deals with the dichotomy between nation-state and empire. For decades, historians have seen empires, in contrast to nation-states, in the, “tradition of negativity, which perceived social reality through a framework defined by the characteristics of the modern world of nation-states and its historicity. Empire within this old trend has been defined as the opposite and the subordinate: a historical archaism before the advent of the age of nationalism.”⁵⁹

Instead, we opt for a more balanced solution: one should not sharply oppose the nationalization of empires to the formation of nation-states during the long nineteenth century.⁶⁰ Both processes took place in the region; both were legitimized by bulwark myths. The examples discussed by Kravchenko and by Ghisa in this book demonstrate this statement *ex negativo*. Kravchenko and Ghisa raise the issue of historical contexts that prevent the spread of bulwark rhetoric. In Kravchenko’s article, these were territorial divisions that prevented the formation of *antemurale* mythology.

Early nineteenth-century Ukrainian territories were often perceived as “lands-in-between” suffering from “fatal geography.” Because Ghisa describes a rather peaceful coexistence in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Transylvania, one can presume that this particular situation was also the reason for the absence of the *antemurale* rhetoric. A “confessional security” could indeed prevent the feeling of threat and in this way hinder the dissemination of bulwark rhetoric in confessional polemics. For the Greek Catholic elites in Transylvania, the only apparent danger was that coming from inside, as the Orthodox threat. Although the rhetoric of belonging to the greater and more civilized Roman Catholic community was quite popular at the time, bulwark mythology did not find fertile ground in Transylvania. From these counterexamples, we can assume that a threat scenario from outside is one of the absolute prerequisites for the formation and popularization of bulwark myths.

The second focus of our book is on a synchronic perspective, allowing the tracing of reciprocal transfers and multisided national and interconfessional ideological competition and the intertwining of mythical narratives. The emphasis on transfers and the media of myth making allows us to apply the approach of transnational history to our subject. One of our key arguments is that, since the late Middle Ages, the main agents of *antemurale* mythology’s dissemination in Eastern Europe have been transnational actors. This is apparent in the studies of Weiland, Gasimov, and Seegel: whether in the case of Renaissance theologians, historians and diplomats, or modern émigré politicians and cartographers, these were all the stories of transnational lives, contacts, and careers. Our book is the history

of transfers and borrowings that demonstrate how *antemurale* rhetoric, colored with the stains of separation and delineation, has always been popularized by transnational actors.

In this book, we have scrutinized the peculiarities of *antemurale* rhetoric's application to various national and imperial ideologies and the respective processes of "mental mapping" in the region. We thus decided to focus on two important aspects: the abovementioned role of *antemurale* mythology in the (de-)sacralization and nationalization of borderland regions and the major forms, media, and actors of *antemurale* discourses. Our volume is hence organized in four parts: Background (Part I), (De-)Sacralizing and Nationalizing Borderlands (Part II), Promoting *Antemurale* Discourses (Part III), and Reflections on the Bulwark Myths Today (Part IV).

After an introduction by Berezhnaya and Hein-Kircher and a historical reframing presented by Weiland in Part I, all chapters of Part II deal with the (de-)sacralization and nationalization of the Eastern European borderlands. As explained above, Ghisa's chapter provides a counterexample and demonstrates that the denominational Othering functioned only within the ethnic community and not outside of it. As he discusses the early stage, it seems that this process embossed the further development of the national movement of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Hein-Kircher explains then, that due to the negative image of the Ruthenians/Ukrainians, the Polish *antemurale* topos picked up the denominational differences between these groups and lead finally to a legitimization of the national conflict within the city of Lviv and Galicia and to a de-sacralization of the *antemurale* topos.

In the next chapter, Heyde explains the inner-Jewish discussions on excluding or integrating the Jews mainly in postemancipational times in Galicia. One important finding is, like that of Ghisa, that innergroup conflicts using religious arguments also lead to the erection of inner walls. The same phenomenon is discussed in Berezhnaya's chapter, which demonstrates that through religious *antemurale* argumentations, nationalizing processes lead to national differentiations. Gasimov's chapter concludes the section by showing through the Turkish case—the imagination of an anti-communist and anti-Russian bulwark—that *antemurale* rhetoric does not necessarily lead to the sacralization of the nation. (De-)sacralization and nationalization of the Eastern European borders are hence highly entangled, possessing legitimizing and coherence-giving functions.

Part III is consecutively dedicated to the promotion of these discourses. At first, Kravchenko discusses why the *antemurale* myth had not developed in Ukraine during the first half of the nineteenth century. He concludes that, because of the late nation-building process, the promotion of *antemurale* thinking became possible only when the Ukrainian national movement

began to build its own national space at the beginning of the twentieth century. Hofeneder and Seegel explain in their chapters how seemingly “neutral” media, such as schoolbooks and maps, were used as key instruments for the dissemination of rampart myths and the construction of a national space that excluded Other ethnic and national groups.

The following chapters of Srodecki and Norris discuss the *longue durée* aspects of the lives of myths. Srodecki focuses on the new anti-Bolshevik narrative that emerged after World War I in Hungary and Poland, while Norris discusses the varying perceptions of one painting that represents the Russian founding myth from the nineteenth century until the first decade of the twenty-first century. To sum up the findings of this part, the promotion of *antemurale* myths could be carried out by different media, but they have to narrate the myth’s message verbally, visually, or even ritually.

The consequences of this promotion and implementation of bulwark myths in contemporary Eastern European historical consciousnesses are analyzed in Part IV. Kolstø focuses on the boundary-making *antemurale*, emphasizing their cultural and denominational differences, but concludes that they mostly refer to power relations. Srodecki’s chapter discusses the emergence of today’s *antemurale* rhetoric. The contemporary bulwark myth is experiencing a revival and is often used to legitimize and sharpen political conflicts in the region. It appears to be grounded on the historical legacies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries discussed in this book. Rampart myths have not yet lost their political impact on Eastern European rampart nations.

Our book demonstrates that *antemurale* rhetoric arises from the need of the border society to differentiate itself from a religious (confessional)/ethnic/national/civilizational Other when faced with a real or perceived threat. In modern Eastern Europe numerous actors took part in the dissemination of *antemurale* mythology: political and religious leaders, intellectuals, artists, cartographers, and journalists. As they crossed multiple state and regional borders to popularize threat scenarios, they became real protagonists of transnational history. In the age of nationalism, these actors used various media to reach an audience from schoolbook maps, newspapers, and paintings to historical texts, sermons, and political manifestos.

In a way, by legitimating lines of division, *antemurale* propagators have all worked against borderland traditions of coexistence and cross-border cooperation. By the end of the nineteenth century, as the traditional imperial orders of the Romanovs, Habsburgs, Ottomans, and Hohenzollern gradually waned, nationalizing discourses using *antemurale* rhetoric became dominant. These communicators of *antemurale* rhetoric often used

various religious and secular sites of memory in this mesoregion for the popularization of *antemurale* mythology within the framework of nationalist or imperial ideologies. Because this rhetoric was an effective weapon with high mobilizing potential, it was particularly attractive for the opposing sides during World War I. By the end of the war, East European borderlands had indeed become “bloodlands.”⁶¹

Our book is intended to provide a stimulus for further transnational studies of myth making in this East European mesoregion and to supply historical background knowledge for understanding the revival of bulwark mythology in contemporary Eastern Europe. It includes examples of Jewish and other non-Christian *antemurale* mythology in order to enrich scholarship on bulwark myths. However, our book cannot cover the whole geographical spectrum—for instance, Moldova is only touched on, while the Baltic lands are entirely missing from this book. The sample case studies use various methodological approaches (from art history to theology, with most chapters concentrated at the crossroads of political, social, and religious history) and introduce the diversity of bulwark myths, while also revealing their common foundations.

Nevertheless, our volume does not encompass a systematic or complete investigation of bulwark rhetoric in the region. Several questions remain to be answered: How is the use of bulwark mythology in political and religious ideologies to be distinguished from its abuse? Were there any differences between denominationally homogeneous areas and those that were mixed? Can we find any specifically confessional aspects in bulwark mythology? How did the panmovement ideologies (e.g., pan-Slavism) influence transformations in the *antemurale* myths? Although some questions remain to be answered, our book gives an overview of the way bulwark myths contributed to the “historization” of borderland communities. It also reveals how these myths were, and today still are, appropriated by national movements to demarcate themselves from other denominational and ethnic groups.

Liliya Berezhnaya is an assistant professor at the Cluster of Excellence “Religion and Politics” at the University of Münster, Germany. Her research interests are focused on comparative borderland studies, imperial and national discourses in Eastern European history, symbolic geography and the construction of “the Other,” Ukrainian religious and cultural history, and eschatological notions in Christian traditions. She coedited (with Christian Schmitt) *Iconic Turns: Nation and Religion in Eastern European Cinema since 1989* (Leiden: Brill, 2013). Her *The World to Come: Ukrainian Images of the Last Judgment*, cowritten with John-Paul Himka, was released in 2015 by Harvard University Press.

Heidi Hein-Kircher earned her M.A. and her Ph.D. (East European history, modern history, political sciences, and Yiddish) from Heinrich Heine-University in Düsseldorf. In 2018, she earned her habilitation degree at Philipps University in Marburg. Since 2003, she has been on the research staff of the Herder-Institute for Historical Research in East Central Europe in Marburg, Germany, and since 2009 she has been the head of department “academic forum.” In her research, she focuses on political and cultural myths in East Central Europe and on urban history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in East Central Europe, especially on Lviv in the nineteenth century.

Notes

1. A. Lawaty, “The Figure of ‘Antemurale’ in the Historiography,” in *East and Central European History Writing in Exile 1939–1989*, ed. M. Zadencka, A. Plakans, A. Lawaty (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 363. See also the contributions of Volodymyr Kravchenko, Liliya Berezhnaya, and Pål Kolstø in this volume.
2. *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* does not contain any entry on political or other types of myths. On political myths in comparative perspective, see M. Flacke, ed., *Mythen der Nationen: Ein europäisches Panorama* (Berlin/München: Koehler und Amelang, 1998).
3. A. Iriye and P.-Y. Saunier, “Introduction: The Professor and the Madman,” in *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), xviii. Transnational history is also often described in terms of postnational, postcolonial, and polycentric studies: I. Tyrell, “Historians and the Nation State,” in *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*, ed. A. Iriye and P.-Y. Saunier, 486–95; K.K. Patel, “Transnational History,” in *European History Online (EGO)* (Mainz: Institute of European History, 2010), retrieved 20 October 2016 from <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/patelk-2010-en>.
4. On the potential and limitations of applying transnational history methodology to the study of borderlands, see J. Cañizares-Esguerra, “Entangled Histories: Borderland Historiographies in New Clothes?” *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 3 (2007): 787–99.
5. G. Kasianov and P. Ther, eds., *A Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography* (Budapest/New York: Central European University Press, 2009).
6. P. Ther, “The Transnational Paradigm of Historiography and Its Potential for Ukrainian History,” in Kasianov and Ther, *Laboratory of Transnational History*, 86.
7. Contributors include Andrea Graziosi, George O. Liber, Mark von Hagen, Hiroaki Kuromiya, Steven Seegel, Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern, and Mayhill C. Fowler, in S. Plokhyy, ed., *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 97–276. See also, A.V. Wendland, “Randgeschichten? Osteuropäische Perspektiven auf Kulturtransfer und Verflechtungsgeschichte,” *Osteuropa* 58, no. 3 (2008): 95–116; Wendland, “Ukraine

- transnational: Transnationalität, Kulturtransfer, Verflechtungsgeschichte als Perspektivierungen des Nationsbildungsprozesses,” in *Die Ukraine: Prozesse der Nationsbildung*, ed. A. Kappeler (Köln and Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2011), 51–66.
8. H.G. Haupt and J. Kocka, eds., *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009).
 9. Y. Bizeul, “Theorien der politischen Mythen,” in *Politische Mythen und Rituale in Deutschland, Frankreich und Polen*, ed. Y. Bizeul (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2000), 17.
 10. H. Hein-Kircher, “Überlegungen zu einer Typologisierung von politischen Mythen aus historiographischer Sicht—ein Versuch,” in *Politische Mythen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, ed. H. Hein-Kircher and H.H. Hahn (Munich: Verlag Herder Institut, 2006), 408–10.
 11. P. Niedermüller, “Der Mythos der Gemeinschaft,” 6. *Kakanien revisited*, retrieved 15 August 2016 from <http://www.kakanien-revisited.at/beitr/fallstudie/PNiedermueller1/?alpha=n>.
 12. H. Hein-Kircher, “Deutsche Mythen und ihre Wirkung auf Europa,” *Jahrbuch für öffentliche Sicherheit* 8 (2016/2017): 529–40; R. Zimmerling, *Mythen in der Politik der DDR: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung politischer Mythen* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2000), 13; H. Hein-Kircher, “The Influence of Political Myth on Historical Consciousness and Identity as Factors of Mentality,” in *From Mentalities to Anthropological History: Theory and Methods*, ed. B. Klich-Kluczewska and D. Kałwa (Kraków: Historia Jagellonica, 2012), 103–20.
 13. K. Knabel, D. Rieger, and S. Wodianka, “Einleitung,” in *Nationale Mythen—kollektive Symbole: Funktionen, Konstruktionen und Medien der Erinnerung*, ed. K. Knabel, D. Rieger, and S. Wodianka (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 9.
 14. H. Hein-Kircher, “Zur ‘mythischen Lesart der Wirklichkeit’: Wirklichkeitskonstruktionen, Funktionen und Verflochtenheit politischer Mythen in der Erinnerungskultur,” in *Deutsch-Polnische Erinnerungsorte*, vol. 4: *Reflexionen*, ed. H.H. Hahn and R. Traba (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2013), 134–35.
 15. B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
 16. H. Münkler, *Die Deutschen und ihre Mythen* (Berlin: Rowohlt Berlin Verlag, 2009), 15–16.
 17. F. Becker, “Begriff und Bedeutung des politischen Mythos,” in *Was heißt Kulturgeschichte des Politischen?*, ed. B. Stollberg-Rilinger (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2005), 129–48.
 18. G. Schöpflin, “The Functions of Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths,” in *Myths and Nationhood* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 35.
 19. J. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 9.
 20. See also the contribution of Pål Kolstø in this volume.
 21. A. Smith, “Myths of National History in Belarus and Ukraine,” in *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. G. Hosking (New York: Routledge, 1997), 183.
 22. Thus, bulwark myths should also be regarded as a securitizing discourse, which could offer a promising new perspective for further research on political myths. In regard to securitization discourses relating to “threat design” and “threat management,” see T. Balzacq, S. Léonard, and J. Ruzicka, “‘Securitization’ Revisited: Theory and

- Cases," *International Relations* 2015, doi: 10.1177/0047117815596590, retrieved 16 July 2016 from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0047117815596590>. These conceptual reflections are inspired by the collaborative project SFB/TRR 138 "Dynamics of security."
23. G.L. Mosse, *The Nationalization of the Masses: Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1996).
 24. H. Hein-Kircher, "Überlegungen zur Ausprägung und Funktion von Raummythen," in *Deutschlands östliche Nachbarschaften: Eine Sammlung von historischen Essays für Hans Henning Hahn*, ed. E. Dmitrów and T. Weger (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang Verlag, 2009), 105–20.
 25. "Each community willing to consolidate itself aims at creating and securing places." P. Haslinger and K. Holz, "Selbstbild und Territorium: Dimensionen von Identität und Alterität," in *Regionale und nationale Identitäten: Wechselwirkungen und Spannungsfelder im Zeitalter moderner Staatlichkeit*, ed. P. Haslinger (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2000), 24–25.
 26. G. Simmel, "The Sociology of Space," in *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings*, ed. D.P. Frisby and M. Featherstone (London: Sage, 1997), 142. See also H. Medick, "Grenzziehungen und die Herstellung des politisch-sozialen Raumes: Zur Begriffsgeschichte und politischen Sozialgeschichte der Grenzen in der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Literatur der Grenze—Theorie der Grenze*, ed. R. Faber and B. Naumann (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1995), 211–24.
 27. G. Krumeich and H. Lehmann, "Nation, Religion und Gewalt: zur Einführung," in *"Gott mit uns": Nation, Religion und Gewalt im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 1.
 28. See M. Schulze Wessel, "Einleitung: Die Nationalisierung der Religion und die Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa," in *Nationalisierung der Religion und Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006), 7–14; M. Falina, "Svetosavlje: A Case Study in the Nationalization of Religion," *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Religions- und Kulturgeschichte* 101 (2007): 505–27; H. Lehmann, "Die Säkularisierung der Religion und die Sakralisierung der Nation im 20. Jahrhundert: Varianten einer komplementären Relation," in *Religion im Nationalstaat zwischen den Weltkriegen 1918–1939*, ed. H.-Chr. Maner and M. Schulze-Wessel (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002), 13–27; P.F. Sugar, *East European Nationalism: Politics and Religion* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1999); R. Vulpius, *Nationalisierung der Religion: Russifizierungspolitik und ukrainische Nationsbildung 1860–1920* (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 2005); H.-G. Haupt and D. Langewiesche, "Einleitung," in *Nation und Religion in Europa: Mehrkonfessionelle Gesellschaften im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. H.-G. Haupt and D. Langewiesche (Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag, 2004), 11–23.
 29. A.D. Smith, "Ethnic Election and National Destiny: Some Religious Origins of National Ideals," *Nations and Nationalism* 5, no. 3 (1999): 332. See also Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
 30. A. Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood. Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 190.
 31. Schöpflin, "Functions of Myth," 29; A.D. Smith, "The 'Golden Age' and National Renewal," in *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin (New York: Routledge, 1997), 36–59.

32. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism*; Armstrong, "Myth and History in the Evolution of Ukrainian Consciousness," in *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, ed. P.J. Potichnyj, M. Raeff, J. Pelenski, and G.N. Zekulin (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992), 125–39.
33. J. Osterhammel, "The Great Work of Uplifting Mankind: Zivilisierungsmission und Moderne," in *Zivilisierungsmissionen: Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. B. Barth and J. Osterhammel (Konstanz: UVK-Verlags-Gesellschaft, 2005), 363.
34. On debates on colonial, global, and transnational history in the context of the civilizing mission, see U. Hofmeister, *Die Bürde des Weißen Zaren: Russische Vorstellungen einer imperialen Zivilisierungsmission in Zentralasien* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2018). On the civilizing mission in general, see D. Olstein and S. Hübner, eds., "Preaching the Civilizing Mission and Modern Cultural Encounters," special issue *Journal of World History* 27, no. 3 (2016); J.P. Daughton, *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, and the Making of French Colonialism, 1880–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); H. Fischer-Tiné, *Colonialism as a Civilizing Mission* (London: Anthem, 2004); A.L. Conklin, *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).
35. J. Tazbir, "The Bulwark Myth," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 91 (2005): 73–97; P. Kolstø, "Introduction: Assessing the Role of Historical Myths in Modern Society," in *Myths and Boundaries in South-Eastern Europe*, ed. P. Kolstø (London: Hurst, 2005), 20; C. Delsol, J. Nowicki, and M. Maslowski, eds., *Mythes et symboles politiques en Europe centrale* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002), 95–162.
36. Schöpflin, "Functions of Myth," 20.
37. Hein-Kircher, "Zur 'mythischen Lesart,'" 133–34.
38. P. Haslinger, ed., *Grenzen im Kopf: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grenze in Ostmitteleuropa* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang Verlag, 1999).
39. With regard to Eastern European imagined regions, see L. Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996); T. Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); I.B. Neumann, *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); T. Zarycki, *Ideologies of Eastness in Central and Eastern Europe* (London: Routledge, 2014).
40. See also, P. Srodecki, "Antemurale-Based Frontier Identities in East Central Europe and Their Ideological Roots in Medieval/Early Modern Alterity and Alienity Discourses," in *Collective Identity in the Context of Medieval Studies*, ed. M.A. Malanikova and R. Antonin (Ostrava: University of Ostrava, 2016), 97–120.
41. P. Srodecki, *Antemurale Christianitatis: Zur Genese der Bollwerksrhetorik im östlichen Mitteleuropa an der Schwelle vom Mittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit* (Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 2015); W. Fritzemeyer, *Christenheit und Europa: Zur Geschichte des europäischen Gemeinschaftsgefühls von Dante bis Leibniz* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1931); J. Tazbir, *Polska przedmurzem chrześcijańskiej Europy* (Warszawa: Twój Styl, 2004); J. Armstrong, "Myth and History in the Evolution of Ukrainian Consciousness," in *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, ed. P.J. Potichnyj, M. Raeff, J. Pelenski, and G.N. Zekulin (Edmonton: Canadian

- Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992), 125–39; Kolstø, *Myths and Boundaries*; U. Borkowska, “The Ideology of ‘Antemurale’ in the Sphere of Slavic Culture (13th–17th Centuries),” in *The Common Christian Roots of the European Nations*, vol. 2: *Written Contributions*, ed. Pontificia Università Lateranense (Florence: Le Monnier, 1982), 1206–21.
42. S. Troebst, “Introduction: What’s in a Historical Region? A Teutonic Perspective,” *European Review of History—Revue européenne d’Histoire* 10, no. 2 (2003): 173–88. Mesoregion as a geographical description is derived from the *mesoregão* dividing the Brazilian federative states into smaller geographical units. The application of that concept to Eastern Europe aims to highlight the peculiarities of the Eastern European (former imperial) borderlands.
 43. L. Titarenko, “Teorii pogranchia,” *Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsialnoi antropologii* 2, no. 67 (2013): 28–48.
 44. S. Plokyh, “Nova Skhidna Ievropa: geopolitychna prymkha chy istoriohrafichna znakhidka?” Retrieved 20 October 2016 from <http://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/doslidzhennya/550-serhii-plokyh-nova-skhidna-yevropa-heopolitychna-prymkha-chy-istoriohrafichna-znakhidka>.
 45. N. Kovalchuk, “Kordonna tsivilizatsiia: osnova rozvytku demokratii v Ukraini,” *Osvita rehionu: politologiia, psykhologiia, komunikatsiia* 4 (2009): 100–104; L. Berezhnaya, “View from the Edge: Borderland Studies and Ukraine, 1991–2013,” in *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History*, ed. S. Plokyh (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 41–68.
 46. F.B. Schenk, “The Historical Regions of Europe: Real or Invented? Some Remarks on Historical Comparison and Mental Mapping,” in *Beyond the Nation: Writing European History Today* (Sankt-Peterburg: Zentrum für Deutschland und Europastudien, 2004), 22. Schenk refers to the publications of Maria Todorova in which she objected to the concept of “historical regions” (*ibid.*, 22–23).
 47. See K. Verdery, “Post-Soviet Area Studies?” *Newsnet: News of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies* 43, no. 5 (2003): 7–8; quoted from O. Ieda, “Regional Identities and Meso-Mega Area Dynamics in Slavic Eurasia: Focused on Eastern Europe,” in *Emerging Mesa-Areas in the Former Socialist Countries, Histories Revived or Improvised*, ed. K. Matsuzato, *Slavic Eurasian Studies* no. 7 (Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 2005), 21fn. 5.
 48. S. Troebst, “Meso-Regionalizing Europe: History Versus Politics,” in *Domains and Divisions of European History*, ed. J.P. Arnason and N. Doyle (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010), 79.
 49. D. Mishkova and B. Trencsényi, “Introduction,” in *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2017), 3.
 50. K. Matsuzato, “Preface,” in *Emerging Mesa-Areas in the Former Socialist Countries, Histories Revived or Improvised*, *Slavic Eurasian Studies* no. 7 (Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 2005), 7–18. See also A. Graziosi, “Viewing the Twentieth Century through the Prism of Ukraine: Reflections on the Heuristic Potential of Ukrainian History,” in *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History*, ed. S. Plokyh (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 99–100.
 51. Y. Hrytsak, “On Sails and Gales, and Ships Sailing in Various Directions: Post-Soviet Ukraine,” *Ab Imperio* 1 (2004): 252.

52. N. Yakovenko, "Early Modern Ukraine between East and West: Projectories of an Idea," in *Regions: A Prism to View the Slavic-Eurasian World: Towards a Discipline of "Regionology"*, ed. K. Matsuzato (Sapporo: Hokkaido University, 2000), 50; V. Kravchenko, "Ukraine: History Confronts Geography," in *The EU's Eastern Neighbourhood: Migration, Borders and Regional Stability*, ed. I. Liikanen, J.W. Scott, and T. Sotkasiira (London/New York: Routledge, 2016), 45.
53. M.L. Pratt, "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* 91 (1991): 34.
54. W.E.J. Weber, "Die Bildung von Regionen durch Kommunikation: Aspekte einer neuen historischen Perspektive," in *Kommunikation und Region, Forum Suevicum: Beiträge zur Geschichte Ostschwabens und der benachbarten Regionen*, vol. 4, ed. C.A. Hoffmann and R. Kiessling (Konstanz: UVK, 2001), 58–59; S. Rohdewald, D.A. Frick, and S. Wiederkehr, "Transkulturelle Kommunikation im Großfürstentum Litauen und in den östlichen Gebieten der Polnischen Krone: Zur Einführung," in *Litauen und Ruthenien: Studien zu einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.–18. Jahrhundert)* [Lithuania and Ruthenia. Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th–18th Centuries)] (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007), 7–33.
55. L. Berezhnaya, "'Kazacki bastion' 17 veka—vzgliad snaruzhi i iznutri," in *Religion und Integration im Moskauer Russland. Konzepte und Praktiken, Potentiale und Grenzen. 14.-17. Jahrhundert Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 76, ed. L. Steindorff (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 269–97; J. Bürgers, *Kosakenmythos und Nationsbildung in der postsowjetischen Ukraine*, Konstanzer Schriften zur Sozialwissenschaft, vol. 71 (Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre, 2006); S. Plokhly, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
56. A.D. Smith, *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); A. Mosser, *"Gottes auserwählte Völker": Erwählungsvorstellungen und kollektive Selbstfindung in der Geschichte* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang Verlag, 2001); Zarycki, *Ideologies of Eastness*.
57. H. Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1944).
58. G. Schöpflin, "Ethnic and Civic Nationalism (Hans Kohn's Typology)," in *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism*, ed. A.S. Leoussi (New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers, 2001), 60–61.
59. I. Gerasimov, S. Glebov, J. Kusber, M. Mogilner, and A. Semyonov, "New Imperial History and the Challenges of Empire," in *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, ed. I. Gerasimov, J. Kusber, and A. Semyonov (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3–4.
60. See J. Burbank and M. von Hagen, "Coming into the Territory: Uncertainty and Empire," in *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700–1930*, ed. J. Burbank, M. Von Hagen, and A.V. Remnev (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 2.
61. T. Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin* (New York: Basic Books, 2010).

Bibliography

- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Armstrong, J. 1982. *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- . 1992. "Myth and History in the Evolution of Ukrainian Consciousness." In *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, ed. P.J. Potichnyj, M. Raeff, J. Pelenski, and G.N. Zekulin, 125–39. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Balzacq, T., S. Léonard, and J. Ruzicka. 2015. "'Securitization' Revisited: Theory and Cases." *International Relations*. doi: 10.1177/0047117815596590. Retrieved 16 July 2016 from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0047117815596590>.
- Becker, F. 2005. "Begriff und Bedeutung des politischen Mythos." In *Was heißt Kulturgeschichte des Politischen?*, ed. B. Stollberg-Rilinger, 129–48. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Berezhnaya, L. 2010. "'Kazacki bastion' 17 veka—vzgliad snaruzhi i iznutri." In *Religion und Integration im Moskauer Russland: Konzepte und Praktiken, Potentiale und Grenzen. 14.-17. Jahrhundert Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 76, ed. L. Steindorff, 269–97. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag.
- . 2016. "View from the Edge: Borderland Studies and Ukraine, 1991–2013." In *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History*, ed. S. Plokhly, 41–68. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bizeul, Y. 2000. "Theorien der politischen Mythen." In *Politische Mythen und Rituale in Deutschland, Frankreich und Polen*, 15–39. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Borkowska, U. 1982. "The Ideology of 'Antemurale' in the Sphere of Slavic Culture (13th–17th Centuries)." In *The Common Christian Roots of the European Nations*, vol. 2: *Written Contributions*, ed. Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1206–21. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Burbank, J. and M. von Hagen. 2007. "Coming into the Territory: Uncertainty and Empire." In *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700–1930*, ed. J. Burbank, M. Von Hagen, and A.V. Remnev, 1–29. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bürgers, J. 2006. *Kosakenmythos und Nationsbildung in der postsowjetischen Ukraine, Konstanzer Schriften zur Sozialwissenschaft*. Vol. 71. Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre.
- Cañizares-Esguerra, J. 2007. "Entangled Histories: Borderland Historiographies in New Clothes?" *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 3: 787–99.
- Conklin, A.L. 1998. *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Daughton, J.P. 2004. *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, and the Making of French Colonialism, 1880–1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Delsol, C., J. Nowicki, and M. Maslowski. 2002. *Mythes et symboles politiques en Europe centrale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Falina, M. 2007. "Svetosavlje: A Case Study in the Nationalization of Religion." *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Religions- und Kulturgeschichte* 101: 505–27.
- Fischer-Tiné, H. 2004. *Colonialism as a Civilizing Mission*. London: Anthem.
- Flacke, M., ed. 1998. *Mythen der Nationen: Ein europäisches Panorama*. Berlin and München: Koehler und Amelang.

- Fritzemeyer, W. 1931. *Christenheit und Europa: Zur Geschichte des europäischen Gemeinschaftsgefühls von Dante bis Leibniz*. München: R. Oldenbourg.
- Gerasimov, I., S. Glebov, J. Kusber, M. Mogilner, and A. Semyonov. 2009. "New Imperial History and the Challenges of Empire." In *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, ed. I. Gerasimov, J. Kusber, and A. Semyonov, 3–32. Leiden: Brill.
- Graziosi, A. 2016. "Viewing the Twentieth Century through the Prism of Ukraine: Reflections on the Heuristic Potential of Ukrainian History." In *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History*, ed. S. Plokhii, 97–118. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haslinger, P., ed. 1999. *Grenzen im Kopf: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grenze in Ostmitteleuropa*. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Haslinger, P. and K. Holz. 2000. "Selbstbild und Territorium: Dimensionen von Identität und Alterität." In *Regionale und nationale Identitäten: Wechselwirkungen und Spannungsfelder im Zeitalter moderner Staatlichkeit*, ed. P. Haslinger, 15–38. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.
- Hastings, A. 1997. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Haupt, H.-G. and J. Kocka, eds., 2009. *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Haupt, H.-G. and D. Langewiesche. 2004. "Einleitung." In *Nation und Religion in Europa: Mehrkonfessionelle Gesellschaften im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, 11–24. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag.
- Hein-Kircher, H. 2006. "Überlegungen zu einer Typologisierung von politischen Mythen aus historiographischer Sicht—ein Versuch." In *Politische Mythen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, ed. H. Hein-Kircher and H.H. Hahn, 408–10. Marburg: Verlag Herder Institut.
- . 2009. "Überlegungen zur Ausprägung und Funktion von Raummythen." In *Deutschlands östliche Nachbarschaften: Eine Sammlung von historischen Essays für Hans Henning Hahn*, ed. E. Dmitrów and T. Weger, 105–20. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang Verlag.
- . 2012. "The Influence of Political Myth on Historical Consciousness and Identity as Factors of Mentality." In *From Mentalities to Anthropological History: Theory and Methods*, ed. B. Klich-Kluczewska and D. Kałwa, 103–20. Kraków: Historia Jagellonica.
- . 2013. "Zur 'mythischen Lesart der Wirklichkeit': Wirklichkeitskonstruktionen, Funktionen und Verflochtenheit politischer Mythen in der Erinnerungskultur." In *Deutsch-Polnische Erinnerungsorte*, vol. 4: *Reflexionen*, ed. H.H. Hahn and R. Traba, 134–35. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- . 2016/2017. "Deutsche Mythen und ihre Wirkung auf Europa." *Jahrbuch für öffentliche Sicherheit* 8: 529–40.
- Hofmeister, U. 2018. *Die Bürde des Weißen Zaren: Russische Vorstellungen einer imperialen Zivilisierungsmission in Zentralasien*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Hrytsak, Y. 2004. "On Sails and Gales, and Ships Sailing in Various Directions: Post-Soviet Ukraine." *Ab Imperio* 1: 229–54.

- Ieda, O. 2005. "Regional Identities and Meso-Mega Area Dynamics in Slavic Eurasia: Focused on Eastern Europe." In *Emerging Meso-Areas in the Former Socialist Countries: Histories Revived or Improvised*, ed. K. Matsuzato, 19–42. Slavic Eurasian Studies no. 7. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University.
- Iriye, A. and P.-Y. Saunier. 2009. "Introduction: The Professor and the Madman." In *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*, xvii–xx. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kasianov, G. and P. Ther, eds. 2009. *A Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press.
- Knabel, K., D. Rieger, and S. Wodianka. 2005. "Einleitung." In *Nationale Mythen—kollektive Symbole: Funktionen, Konstruktionen und Medien der Erinnerung*, 9–16. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kohn, H. 1944. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kolstø, P., ed. 2005. *Myths and Boundaries in South-Eastern Europe*. London: Hurst.
- . 2005. "Introduction: Assessing the Role of Historical Myths in Modern Society." In *Myths and Boundaries in South-Eastern Europe*, ed. P. Kolstø, 1–34. London: Hurst.
- Kovalchuk, N. 2009. "Kordonna tsivilizatsiia: osnova rozvytku demokratii v Ukraini." *Osvita rehionu: politologiia, psychologiia, komunikatsiia* 4: 100–104.
- Kravchenko, V.V. 2016. "Ukraine: History Confronts Geography." In *The EU's Eastern Neighbourhood: Migration, Borders and Regional Stability*, ed. I. Liikane, J.W. Scott, and T. Sotkasiira, 36–49. London/New York: Routledge.
- Krumeich, G. and H. Lehmann. 2000. "Nation, Religion und Gewalt: zur Einführung." In *"Gott mit uns": Nation, Religion und Gewalt im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. G. Krumeich and H. Lehmann, 1–6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lawaty, A. 2015. "The Figure of 'Antemurale' in the Historiography." In *East and Central European History Writing in Exile 1939–1989*, ed. M. Zadencka, A. Plakans, and A. Lawaty, 360–74. Leiden: Brill.
- Lehmann, H. 2002. "Die Säkularisierung der Religion und die Sakralisierung der Nation im 20. Jahrhundert: Varianten einer komplementären Relation." In *Religion im Nationalstaat zwischen den Weltkriegen 1918–1939*, ed. H.-Chr. Maner and M. Schulze Wessel, 13–27. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Matsuzato, K. 2005. "Preface." In *Emerging Meso-Areas in the Former Socialist Countries: Histories Revived or Improvised*, 7–18. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University.
- Medick, H. 1995. "Grenzziehungen und die Herstellung des politisch-sozialen Raumes: Zur Begriffsgeschichte und politischen Sozialgeschichte der Grenzen in der Frühen Neuzeit." In *Literatur der Grenze—Theorie der Grenze*, ed. R. Faber and B. Naumann, 37–51. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Mishkova, D. and B. Trencsényi. 2017. "Introduction." In *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History*, 1–12. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Mosse, G.L. 1996. *The Nationalization of the Masses: Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

- Mosser, A. 2001. *“Gottes auserwählte Völker”: Erwählungsvorstellungen und kollektive Selbstfindung in der Geschichte*. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang Verlag.
- Münkler, H. 2009. *Die Deutschen und ihre Mythen*. Berlin: Rowohlt Berlin Verlag.
- Neumann, I.B. 1999. *Uses of the Other: “The East” in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Niedermüller, P. 2016. “Der Mythos der Gemeinschaft.” *Kakanien Revisited*. Retrieved 15 August 2016 from <http://www.kakanien-revisited.at/beitr/fallstudie/PNiedermueller1/?alpha=n>.
- Olstein, D. and S. Hübner, eds. 2016. “Preaching the Civilizing Mission and Modern Cultural Encounters.” Special issue *Journal of World History* 27, no. 3.
- Osterhammel, J. 2005. “The Great Work of Uplifting Mankind: Zivilisierungsmission und Moderne.” In *Zivilisierungsmissionen: Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. B. Barth and J. Osterhammel, 363–426. Konstanz: UVK-Verlags-Gesellschaft.
- Patel, K.K. 2010. “Transnational History.” In *European History Online (EGO)*. Mainz: Institute of European History. Retrieved 20 October 2016 from <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/patelk-2010-en>.
- Ploky, S. 2012. *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2016a. “Nova Skhidna Ievropa: geopolitychna prymkha chy istoriohrafichna znakhidka?” Retrieved 20 October 2016 from <http://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/doslidzhennya/550-serhii-plokyi-nova-skhidna-yevropa-heopolitychna-prymkha-chy-istoriohrafichna-znakhidka>.
- , ed. 2016b. *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pratt, M.L. 1991. “Arts of the Contact Zone.” *Profession* 91: 33–40.
- Rohdewald, S., D.A. Frick, and S. Wiederkehr. 2007. “Transkulturelle Kommunikation im Großfürstentum Litauen und in den östlichen Gebieten der Polnischen Krone: Zur Einführung.” In *Litauen und Ruthenien: Studien zu einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.–18. Jahrhundert)* [Lithuania and Ruthenia: Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th–18th Centuries)], 7–33. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Schenk, F.B. 2004. “The Historical Regions of Europe: Real or Invented? Some Remarks on Historical Comparison and Mental Mapping.” In *Beyond the Nation: Writing European History Today*, 15–24. Sankt-Peterburg: Zentrum für Deutschland und Europastudien.
- Schöpfli, G. 1997. “The Functions of Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths.” In *Myths and Nationhood*, 19–35. New York: Routledge.
- . 2001. “Ethnic and Civic Nationalism (Hans Kohn’s Typology).” In *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism*, ed. A.S. Leoussi, 60–61. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Schulze Wessel, M. 2006. “Einleitung: Die Nationalisierung der Religion und die Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa.” In *Nationalisierung der Religion und Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa*, ed. M. Schulze Wessel, 7–14. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Simmel, G. 1997. “The Sociology of Space.” In *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings*, ed. D.P. Frisby and M. Featherstone, 137–86. London: Sage.

- Smith, A.D. 1997. "Myths of National History in Belarus and Ukraine." In *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin, 36–59. New York: Routledge.
- . 1997. "The 'Golden Age' and National Renewal." In *Myths and Nationhood*, ed. G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin, 36–59. New York: Routledge.
- . 1999. "Ethnic Election and National Destiny: Some Religious Origins of National Ideals." *Nations and Nationalism* 5, no. 3: 331–55.
- . 1999. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2003. *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snyder, T. 2003. *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2010. *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books.
- Srodecki, P. 2015. *Antemurale Christianitatis: Zur Genese der Bollwerksrhetorik im östlichen Mitteleuropa an der Schwelle vom Mittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit*. Husum: Matthiesen Verlag.
- . 2016. "Antemurale-Based Frontier Identities in East Central Europe and Their Ideological Roots in Medieval/Early Modern Alterity and Alienity Discourses." In *Collective Identity in the Context of Medieval Studies*, ed. M.A. Malanikova and R. Antonín, 97–120. Ostrava: University of Ostrava.
- Sugar, P.F. 1999. *East European Nationalism: Politics and Religion*. Brookfield: Ashgate.
- Tazbir, J. 2004. *Polska przedmurzem chrześcijańskiej Europy*. Warszawa: Twój Styl.
- . 2005. "The Bulwark Myth." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 91: 73–97.
- Ther, P. 2009. "The Transnational Paradigm of Historiography and Its Potential for Ukrainian History." In *A Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*, ed. G. Kasianov and P. Ther, 81–114. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Titarenko, L. 2013. "Teorii pogranychia." *Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsialnoi antropologii* 2, no. 67: 28–48.
- Troebst, S. 2003. "Introduction: What's in a Historical Region? A Teutonic Perspective." *European Review of History—Revue européenne d'Histoire* 10, no. 2: 173–88.
- . 2010. "Meso-regionalizing Europe: History Versus Politics." In *Domains and Divisions of European History*, ed. J.P. Arnason and N. Doyle, 78–90. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Tyrell, I. 2009. "Historians and the Nation State." In *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*, ed. A. Iriye and P.-Y. Saunier, 486–95. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Verdery, K. 2003. "Post-Soviet Area Studies?" *Newsnet: News of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies* 43, no. 5: 7–8.
- Vulpus, R. 2005. *Nationalisierung der Religion: Russifizierungspolitik und ukrainische Nationsbildung 1860–1920*. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag.
- Weber, W.E.J. 2001. "Die Bildung von Regionen durch Kommunikation. Aspekte einer neuen historischen Perspektive." In *Kommunikation und Region, Forum Suevicum: Beiträge zur Geschichte Ostschwabens und der benachbarten Regionen*. Vol. 4, ed. C.A. Hoffmann and R. Kiessling, 43–67. Konstanz: UVK.
- Wendland, A.V. 2008. "Randgeschichten? Osteuropäische Perspektiven auf Kulturtransfer und Verflechtungsgeschichte." *Osteuropa* 58, no. 3: 95–116.

- . 2011. "Ukraine transnational: Transnationalität, Kulturtransfer, Verflechtungsgeschichte als Perspektivierungen des Nationsbildungsprozesses." In *Die Ukraine: Prozesse der Nationsbildung*, ed. A. Kappeler, 51–66. Köln and Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Wolff, L. 1996. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Yakovenko, N. 2000. "Early Modern Ukraine between East and West: Projectories of an Idea." In *Regions: A Prism to View the Slavic-Eurasian World: Towards a Discipline of "Regionology"*, ed. K. Matsuzato, 50–69. Sapporo: Hokkaido University.
- Zarycki, T. 2014. *Ideologies of Eastness in Central and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Zimmerling, R. 2000. *Mythen in der Politik der DDR: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung politischer Mythen*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.