

UDC 94 (477.83) (092):930.25
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159171

Olga VLADYGA

PhD (History), Associate Professor of Lviv Professional College of Computer Technologies and Building, 23 Lincolna Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (olhavladyha@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164>

ResearcherID: B-9392-2019 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/B-9392-2019>)

Ольга ВЛАДИГА

кандидат історичних наук, викладач історії Львівського вищого професійного училища комп'ютерних технологій та будівництва, вул. Лінкольна, 23, м. Львів, Україна, 79000 (olhavladyha@gmail.com).

Бібліографічний опис статті: Vladyga, O. (2019). Archeographical component of volumes IX–X of the «History of Ukraine-Rus» by Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 10, 43–48. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159171

**ARCHEOGRAPHICAL COMPONENT OF VOLUMES IX–X
OF THE «HISTORY OF UKRAINE-RUS» BY MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY**

Summary. *The purpose of the research is to reconstruct M. Hrushevsky's archaeographic plan during the preparation and writing of the ninth and tenth volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus». The specificity of the chosen theoretical and methodological model of the study is to involve a complex of diverse tools (principles, methods, and methodical techniques) for the reconstruction of the archaeological activity of an outstanding scientist in the last Soviet period of his activity. The heuristic possibilities of comparative, hermeneutic, heuristic, statistical, as well as inductive and deductive methods are used in the research process. The scientific novelty lies in the fact that for the first time in Ukrainian historiography the archeographic component of the last volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus» was discovered. Conclusions.* Summarizing the archaeographic component of the recent volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus» by M. Hrushevsky, it was noted that since then the amount of primary source material, introduced for the first time by the researcher to scientific use, increased significantly, which motivated him to publicize the found texts as a whole or in some most important fragments. Such an approach, fulfilling illustrative-proving tasks, also correlated with the methodological preferences of the scientist, in particular, the absolutizing of the role of a historical source as a kind of a mirror of the past. As a result, Ukrainian historiography received the fundamental history of Khmelnytsky, which had the character of the anthology. On this occasion, there are different opinions in the literature – from the persistent criticism of the architectonics of the latest volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus» to a more balanced analysis. In our opinion, there are considerable reasons to agree with the thesis that due to this source-focus accent of late works of M. Hrushevsky, a layer of the unique source material is available to us, given the fact that a lot of it suffered irreversible losses during the turbulent historical events of the last century.

Key words: M. Hrushevsky, «The History of Ukraine-Rus», archaeography, Ukrainian historiography, Cossacks.

**АРХЕОГРАФІЧНА СКЛАДОВА IX – X ТОМІВ
«ІСТОРІЇ УКРАЇНИ-РУСИ» МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО**

***Анотація.** Мета дослідження полягає у відтворенні археографічного задуму М. Грушевського при підготовці та написанні ним дев'ятого та десятого томів «Історії України-Руси». Специфіка обраної теоретико-методологічної моделі дослідження полягає у залученні комплексу різнопланового інструментарію (принципів, методів та методичних прийомів) для реконструкції археографічної діяльності видатного вченого в останній радянський період його діяльності. У процесі дослідження використані евристичні можливості компаративістського, герменевтичного, евристичного, статистичного, а також індуктивного та дедуктивного методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає в тому, що вперше в українській історіографії з'ясовано археографічну складову останніх томів «Історії України-Руси». **Висновки.** Підсумовуючи археографічну складову останніх томів «Історії України-Руси» М. Грушевського, відзначено, що, оскільки від тому до тому кількість періоджерельного матеріалу, уперше введеного дослідником до наукового вжитку, помітно зростала, це підштовхувало його оприлюднювати віднайдені тексти цілком чи у найбільш важливих фрагментах. Такий підхід, виконуючи ілюстративно-доказові завдання, корелювався також з методологічними уподобаннями вченого, зокрема, абсолютизацією ним ролі історичного джерела як своєрідного дзеркала минулих часів. У підсумку, українська історіографія отримала фундаментальну історію Хмельниччини, що мала характер антології. З цього приводу в літературі існують різні думки – від завзятої критики архітектоніки останніх томів «Історії України-Руси» до більш виваженого аналізу. На нашу думку, є всі підстави погодитися з тезою про те, що завдяки саме такому джерелознавчому акценту пізніх праць М. Грушевського до нас дійшов пласт унікального джерельного матеріалу, котрий зазнав незворотних втрат протягом бурхливих історичних подій минулого століття.*

***Ключові слова:** М. Грушевський, «Історія України-Руси», археографія, українська історіографія, козаччина.*

The statement of the problem. A popular belief is that M. Hrushevsky was the initiator of the modern stage of Ukrainian archaeography, whose representatives were oriented towards the purposeful search and publication of documents covering the national past. Most of the sources collected by the scientist and his students should have served as original building blocks for a large-scale national grand narrative, presented in ten volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus». At the same time, the archaeological component of this work rarely attracts attention of the researchers. Let us demonstrate the importance of such research optics on the example of the ninth and tenth volumes of M. Hrushevsky's multi-volume.

The analysis of researches. The archaeographic component of the multifaceted work of M. Hrushevsky and his pupils in his monograph on the scientific school of the scientist was analyzed by V. Telvak and V. Pedych (Telvak, Pedych, 2016, pp. 54–83). The reception of archaeological activity of the prominent historian was reconstructed by Vitalii and Victoria Telvak (Telvak, 2008, p. 48, 52–53, 323–327; Telvak & Telvak, 2018). The historiographic analysis of the recent volumes of M. Hrushevsky's History of Ukraine-Rus was carried out in the writings of O. Vladyga (Vladyga, 2018), O. Pritsak (Pritsak, 1992) and Ya. Fedoruk (Fedoruk, 2013). At the same time, the names of the pear-belligerents only afflicted the problem of archaeological content of labor.

The article's purpose – to recreate the archaeologic conception of M. Hrushevsky during the preparation and writing of his latest volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus».

The statement of the basic material. The source base for the last volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus» was formed mainly by students and staff of M. Hrushevsky, concentrated in the Archeographical Commission of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The prominent scientist himself did not conceal that the archaeological expeditions organized by him to

Moscow and Leningrad, among other things, had to help him «to restore materials destroyed by war, cowards and finally the fire that burnt down my house» (Hrushevsky, 1996, p. 5).

M. Hrushevsky also devoted a lot of attention to the problem of copying work in the Galician and Polish archives. He raised this question in letters to Western Ukrainian colleagues already during the first months of his stay in Kyiv. Thus, in one of the letters to K. Studinsky, we may read: «Among the other plans of great history [«History of Ukraine-Rus»], I would need to restore my notes from some of the manuscripts of the Ossolinium from the Czartorysky library and new ones. Do you have at hand some men who are very clever or at least keen on the history of the XVIIIth century? Who would have done the notes and copies of the manuscript in Lviv and Krakow [libraries]?» (Lysty, 1998, p. 161). The importance and urgency of setting up copying work in the Polish archives for M. Hrushevsky are evidenced by the fact that he addressed the chairman of SSS with similar requests several times. Later, the problem of copying the necessary materials in the Galician and Polish archives was resolved by the scientist through the help of his Lviv students who became the members of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

The collected material of the archaeological expedition and the Galician students M. Hrushevsky's source material was so significant in the quantitative and informative terms that, as pointed out in the preface to the ninth volume of the author, «he filled some of the current gaps and gave new interpretation of the events» (Hrushevsky, 1996, p. 5). Due to this, as M. Hrushevsky convinces, the actual content of Khmelnytskyi era enriched significantly, making the established in a historiographical literature image of that era considerably complicated. According to his objectivistic beliefs, the researcher pointed out that he was trying to convey to the reader the authentic content of the available documentary material in order to «not schematize, not to simplify it artificially, so as not to adjust to his subjective beliefs» (Hrushevsky, 1996, p. 6).

The embodiment of these theses has become peculiar architectonics of the last volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus», where, in comparison with the previous volumes, a lot of space was allocated to the publication of sources. However, if this trend was already noticeable in the seventh and eighth volumes of the multi-volume, then starting from the ninth part of the work, M. Hrushevsky not only directly in the text, but also in the annexes published full-text versions of sources. As a result, the volume of the source material, printed in the book, significantly exceeded the author's statement. Published materials were obtained from many collections in Eastern Europe: the Ossolinsky and Czartorysky libraries, the Moscow and Leningrad archives, the archives of the Krakow Academy of Sciences and numerous Ukrainian repositories. They, in the opinion of the author, should have enabled his contemporaries to hear the voice of that violent revolutionary epoch.

Along with the sources published directly in the ninth volume of the text, a block of materials that was more important in the author's opinion was given in the appendices to the book. There M. Hrushevsky printed documents from the «Embassy Affairs» of the Moscow Embassy Office, which were stored in the former archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – a part of the newly formed Moscow «Drevlehranilishche» (archive). These materials, as evidenced by the author's explanation, were copied by V. Yurkevich, V. Evfimovsky and O. Kravtsov (Hrushevsky, 1997, p. 1508–1550). In general, in the appendices, M. Hrushevsky gave twenty-six units of documents.

It should be noted that such uniqueness of the architectonics of the ninth volume was immediately met by the criticism, which responded with many substantive reviews of

M. Hrushevsky's continuation of his main work (Telvak, 2008, p. 305–355). Thus, Lviv edition «Novi riadky» reacted with the review to the new book of the scientist. The author of the critical article, signing it with the cryptonym MZ, transposed the leading ideas of the academician in his analysis of the period under study. The book itself, the columnist writes, is actually a carefully collected and systematized source material (M. Z., 1929, p. 412). Such a research approach, which is analyzed in the review, has both advantages and disadvantages. The first is to critically examine the vast amount of source material. The necessity of such systematization, according to the reviewer, was in radical revision of the romantic conceptions of Khmelnytsky, M. Kostomarov, and P. Kulish. The main disadvantage of the study appears as a continuation of its advantages, being the complication of the perception of the text by an unprepared reader, who will find more analytical information than synthetic conclusions.

Simon Narizhnyi gave the most comprehensive review on the ninth volume on the pages of the «Literary and Scientific Herald», noting that two of its parts «among publications of the post-war period [...] are the most outstanding phenomenon in the field of Ukrainian historiography, with impressive effort invested in them» (Narizhnyi, 1931, p. 1030). Like the previous reviewer, S. Narizhni also noted the originality of the architectonics of M. Hrushevsky's new book. The observer pointed out that the unsatisfactory state of Khmelnytskyi era research, the lack of monographic studies on certain important problems urged Kyiv academician to take on the difficult task of collecting a large quantity of heterogeneous source material and its simultaneous systematization and interpretation. This negatively affected the structure of the study, making it abundant in a large volume of quotations and sources, providing very few authors' assessments of the events of that time.

V. Herasymchuk, a well-known researcher of the Cossacks, also responded to the ninth volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus». In his unpublished review, he noted the «universal significance» of his teacher's book on the era of Khmelnytskyi. Unlike other reviewers, V. Herasymchuk clearly pointed out that the providing a significant amount of source material in a book was a right decision as it allows the reader to develop his own opinion and experience the peculiarities of the era (Herasymchuk, 1999, p. 536). Another representative of the Lviv historical school of M. Hrushevsky M. Korduba also agreed with this opinion (Korduba, 1932).

The peculiarity of the author's style in the ninth volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus» was noted by foreign researchers. Thus, on the pages of the Prague «Časopis národního musea», both parts of the ninth volume were analysed by a well-known scholar of the Ukrainian heritage, J. Bidlo. The ninth volume, as the reviewer emphasized, contains an enormous amount of a new source material, which thus became accessible to a wide range of researchers. In many respects, this allowed the Ukrainian scholar to reconsider some established opinions in science (Bidlo, 1931, p. 131).

M. Hrushevskyi made a noticeable Source study emphasis in the next tenth volume of «History of Ukraine-Rus», which, as we know, he did not finish, and his work was prepared for printing by his daughter in a manuscript variant. The text of the last part that was printed in 1936, we can also find a large number of sources, which the author cites, either entirely, or providing quotes of their most important parts. The vast majority of these materials come from the main Moscow archive («Drevlekhranilishche»). The reviewers of the last volume, therefore, just as it was with the ninth volume, understood the author's logic of the organization of the text and, in general, appreciated M. Hrushevsky's unitary work. Such posi-

tive evaluations marked critical reviews of Galician and emigration periodicals. On pages of the Lviv journal «Dilo», Mykhailo Mochulsky pointed out that the book «is written on the basis of fresh material, and it mainly resolves some puzzling questions; the book is composed in such a way that everyone can make his/her own opinion about this question» (M. M-sky, 1937).

The tenth volume of the «History of Ukraine-Rus» was also noted on the pages of Western Slavic periodicals. For example, on the pages of the Prague «Časopis národního musea» J. Bidlo, highlighting the original structure of the book, appreciated the emergence of an «invaluable» work on the Ukrainian past, which resembles previous volumes in the method, structure and newly-derived source material applied (J. B., 1937).

The conclusions. Summing up the archaeological component of the latest volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus» by M. Hrushevsky, we would like to note that since the publication of the first volume the amount of primary source material that was first introduced by the researcher to scientific use increased significantly. This urged him to publicize the found texts as a whole or in the most important fragments. Such an approach, fulfilling illustrative-proof tasks, also correlated with the methodological preferences of the scientist, in particular, the absolutizing of the role of a historical source as a kind of mirror of the past. As a result, Ukrainian historiography received the fundamental history of Khmelnytskyi era, which had the character of the anthology. There are different opinions in the literature about this issue – from the persistent criticism of the architectonics of the latest volumes of «History of Ukraine-Rus» to a more balanced analysis. In our opinion, there is every reason to agree with the thesis that due to this very source-focused accent of late works of M. Hrushevsky, a layer of unique source material became available to us, given the fact, that considerable amount of it has suffered irreversible losses during the turbulent historical events of the last century.

Acknowledgments. I express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bidlo, J. (1931). Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj, Istorija Ukrainy–Rusy. Tomu devjatoho perša polovyna (Chmelnyččyny roky 1650 – 1653). DVU, 1928. – Tomu devjatoho druha polovyna (Chmelnyččyny roky 1654 – 1657). DVU, 1931 [M. Hrushevsky. History of Ukraine-Rus. Volume nine, part one ... (Years of Khmelnytsky era 1650 – 1653) (Chmelnyččyny roky 1650 – 1653). DVU, 1928. – Volume nine part two (Years of Khmelnytsky era 1650 – 1653). DVU, 1931]. *Časopis národního musea*, CV, 129 – 132. [in Czech].

Fedoruk, Ya. (2013). Tvorchist Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v ostannii period yoho zhyttia (1931 – 1934 rr.) [Creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky during the last period of his life (1931 – 1934 years)]. *Zapysky NTSH. Tom CCXLVI. Pratsi Istorychno-filosofskoi sekcii*, 123–146. [in Ukrainian].

Herasymchuk, V. (1999). Z nahody poiavy IX tomu «Istorii Ukrainy-Rusy» M. Hrushevskoho [On the publication of IX volume of M. Hrushevsky's «History of Ukraine-Russ»]. *Ukrainskyi arkhеографічний shchorichnyk. Nova seriia*, 6/7, 535–540. [in Ukrainian].

Hrushevsky, M. (1996). *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy [History of Ukraine-Rus] (v 11 t., 12 kn., t. 9., kn. 1)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 880 p. [in Ukrainian].

Hrushevsky, M. (1997). *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy [History of Ukraine-Rus] (v 11 t., 12 kn., t. 9., kn. 2)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 776 p. [in Ukrainian].

Hrushevsky, M. (1998). *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy [History of Ukraine-Rus] (v 11 t., 12 kn., t. 10)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 408 p. [in Ukrainian].

- J. B. [Bidlo J.]**. (1937). Zprávy [Cases]. *Časopis národního musea. Oddíl duchovnědný, CXI*, 156–157. [in Czech].
- Korduba, M.** (1932). Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung [Ukraine's decline and revival]. *Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte, VI*, 36–60, 193–230, 358–385. [in German].
- M. M–skyi**. (1937). Nadmohylnyi pamiatnyk i literaturna spadshchyna M.Hrushevskoho [Gravestone monument and literary heritage of M. Hrushevsky]. *Dilo. 1937, 27*, 5–6. [in Ukrainian].
- M. Z.** (1929). Mykhailo Hrushevsky. Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. Tomu dev'iatoho persha polovyna [Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of Ukraine-Rus. Volume nine part one]. *Novi shliakhy, 4*, 411–413. [in Ukrainian].
- Narizhnyi, S.** (1931). M. Hrushevsky. Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. Tomu dev'iatoho persha polovyna ... – Tomu dev'iatoho druha polovyna [M. Hrushevsky. History of Ukraine-Rus. Volume nine, part one ... – Volume nine part two]. *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk, 107*, 1029–1031. [in Ukrainian].
- Pritsak, O.** (1992). Mykhailo Hrushevsky yak istoriosof [Mykhailo Hrushevsky as a historiosopher]. *Visnyk Akademii Nauk Ukrainy, 2*, 51–54. [in Ukrainian].
- Svarnyk, G. (ed)**. (1998). *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevskoho do Kyryla Studynskoho (1894 – 1932 rr.) [Letters from Mykhailo Hrushevsky to Kyryl Studynsky (1894 – 1932 years)]*. Lviv – New-York: Vydavnytstvo M.P. Kots, 266 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V., Telvak, V.** (2018). Ukrainian historiography in the mirror of polish journalism (Mykhailo Hrushevsky contra Francishek Ravita-Gavrinsky). *Skhidnoevropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk, 7*, 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.7.130671>.
- Telvak, V.** (2008). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]*. Kyiv – Drohobych, 494 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V., Pedych, V.** (2016). *Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky]*. Lviv, 440 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Vladyga, O.** (2018). By the estuary of the Archeografic Commission of the NTSh (Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society): Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's activity in 1894 – 1895. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk, 7*, 31–39. [in English]. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.7.131616>.

*The article was received on December 23, 2019.
Article was recommended for publishing 10.02.2019*