



TELVAK, Vitalii – YANYSHYN, Bohdan. „Dejiny ukrajinského (rusínskeho) národa“ Michaila Hrušovského v diskusiách na začiatku XX. storočia. In *Studia Historica Nitriensia*, 2021, roč. 25, č. 1, s. 71-90, ISSN 1338-7219, DOI: 10.17846/SHN.2021.25.1.71-90.

Štúdia je venovaná výskumu historiografickej diskusie, ktorú vyvolalo vydanie nemeckého prekladu prvého dielu „Dejiny Ukrajiny-Rusi“, ktorých autorom bol M. Hrušovskij. Identifikuje špecifické črty debaty o historiografických ideách Hrušovského v prostredí ukrajinských, poľských, nemeckých, českých a rumunských historikov. Medzi silné stránky Hrušovského vedeckej práce recenzenti zaradili dôslednosť pri zovšeobecnení pramennej bázy a historickej literatúry. Západoeurópski historici jednoznačne vyslovovali nesúhlas s revíziou tzv. normanskej teórie zo strany ukrajinských vedcov, keďže tým spochybňovali ustálenú víziu minulosti východnej Európy a ich závery substantívne presúvali dovedajšie akcenty výskumu. Považovali za nevhodný kategorický postoj autora pri obhajovaní vlastných hypotéz bez rozšírenia pramennej bázy. Nemecké vydanie „Dejiny ukrajinského národa“ M. Hrušovského bolo udalosťou, ktorá vyvolala pozornosť nielen v prostredí ukrajinskej, ale aj nemeckej historiografie.

**Kľúčové slová:** M. Hrušovskij; „Dejiny ukrajinského (rusínskeho) národa“; historiografia;

**Keywords:** Mykhailo Hrushevsky; “History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people”; historiographic discussion;

## Introduction

During the second part of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, Ukrainian historical science was passing the processes of institutional and conceptual proclamation. That was the reason why, Ukrainian historians, in this period, addressed their creative achievements almost only to a personal reader’s audience – Ukrainian speaking in Halychyna and Russian speaking in Dnieper Ukraine. Given that, the scope of the professional discussion of historiographic proposals of Ukrainian scientists was limited by Eastern Europe’s intellectual space, being practically unknown in the Western World. Historiographic constructs of Russian and Polish humanities constructed during the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, who incorporated Ukrainian issues into their own narratives continued to dominate there. At the beginning of the XX<sup>th</sup> century, Ukrainian historians understood that, in order to change established historiographical stereotypes, their own intellectual product should be popularized in a language of contemporary science – German. Thinking about this problem, the most authoritative Ukrainian historian of that time, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, made notes in his diary: „I was thinking a lot about the system of reticence as well as about the actual needs of our work’s popularization. I mistook a lot, having stood apart and, relying on the fact that our work will fight the way on itself. No, it may not fight the way, as it has many interesting contras“.<sup>1</sup>

M. Hrushevsky, actually, who, starting from the end of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century was writing and publishing volumes of this fundamental composition „History of Ukraine-Rus“, decided of being the first to make a practical step towards the awareness of Western colleagues about the existence of the Ukrainian model of the past of Eastern Europe, which fundamentally broke with the imperial historiographical traditions. For this M. Hrushevsky translated in German the first volume of the „History of Ukraine-Rus“. In fact, this book „opened“ Ukrainian history for the western world, evidence of what became its lively discussion in

<sup>1</sup> ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло. Щоденник. In Український історик, 2006 – 2007, ч.4/1 – 2, с. 24.

the science and journalistic literature of that period<sup>2</sup>. Despite its importance both for the Ukrainian studies of that period as well as for Slavonic studies in general, until this period this historiographic reception has never found a comprehensive historiographic analysis.

### **Edition history and the concept of „Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) Volkes“**

Before starting, let us outline the historiographic context of the first German volume appearance of the fundamental work of M. Hrushevsky. After relocation in 1894 to Lviv on the role of the Professor of the Department of World History with the special history of the Eastern Europe review, the scientist paid much attention to the popularization of the Ukrainian history and culture in the European environment. He understood that overcoming the centuries-old stereotypes of Eastern Europe as a space of indivisible domination of Russian and Polish culture is possible only through thorough popularization. So, the historian decided to give to a European reader a book written in a language of that period, which would enlighten the genesis of the Ukrainian people and their state competitions. The search for the relevant publisher ended up by the contract sign in 1903 for the edition of the first German volume „History of Ukraine-Rus“ at the Taibner Publishing House in Leipzig at the expense of the Shevchenko Scientific Society headed by M. Hrushevsky.

Especially for this edition the author significantly refined the previous version of the first volume, including the recent achievements of archeology, anthropology, ethnology and the new historiographic material (according to him „more than one and a half hundred explorations and various publications“).<sup>3</sup> All this, as it was mentioned in the critical literature of that time, not only increased the amount of the new edition but also deepened the proof of concepts supported by the author.<sup>4</sup> Among the Ukrainian intellectual circles, big hopes were put on the translation of the work of M. Hrushevsky on that science language, the general conviction in the importance of the implementation of this project for the popularization of the Ukrainian question in Europe was expressed. „It [the German edition of the work`s first volume - authors] will do honor not only to the author but also to the nation, - mentioned S. Tomashivsky, - until then the true and deeper interest of the European authoritative council in our past and present position will begin. The appearance of such solid scientific work will make for our people in „Europe“ more than the goals of the hundred political journal articles“.<sup>5</sup>

The updated edition of the first volume in Ukrainian was published the next year. Regardless the regulation of the financial and publishing side of the case,

<sup>2</sup> ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX - 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ-Дрогобич: Вимір, 2008, с. 75 - 99.

<sup>3</sup> ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло. Історія України-Руси. Львів, 1904, т. 1, с. 1.

<sup>4</sup> В. [ГНАТЮК, Володимир]. *Review: Михайло Грушевський. Історія України-Руси, т. II.* In Літературно-науковий вістник, 1905, т. 30, с. 184.

<sup>5</sup> ТОМАШІВСЬКИЙ, Степан. Нова книжка - нові часи (Проф. М.Грушевський - Очерк истории украинского народа. С-Пб., 1904). In Літературно-науковий вістник, 1905, т. XXIX, с. 46.

the German edition had to wait for a few years. The main reason for such a delay was the lack of relevant specialists, who would not only speak fluent German and Ukrainian but also would orientate in the historical problems and the terminology to adequately convey it to a foreign reader.

People who could manage to do such a responsible task, or, who were overloaded with work, or, as the correspondence of Ukrainian humanities of that time mentioned, they did not want to burden themselves with difficult tasks. Invited for such a work Felicia Nossig, even though she had experience translating Ukrainian compositions into German, particularly works of Ivan Franko and Vasył Stefanyk, was badly acquainted with the professional side of the case. All this led to rereading and correcting the translated text. I. Franko, a colleague of M. Hrushevsky, overburdened with various things had to do the work. Despite the efforts being made, the quality of the translation turned out to be poor, as most book reviewers subsequently wrote.

However, despite such difficult circumstances, the German edition of the first volume with the original name „The history of Ukrainian (Rusyn) population“ appeared in 1906. In a wide preface to the book M. Hrushevsky stressed on the importance of its appearance for the European reader introduction with the past, as he underlined, one of the biggest Slavic people who repeatedly stood guard on the European civilization before the devastating invasions of the steppe hordes. These were the Ukrainians, noted M. Hrushevsky, who directly contributed to the reformation of the Eastern European political space in the XVII century – their revolt led by Bohdan Khmelnytsky led to the fall of the power before the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and the transformation of the Moscow principality into a powerful empire.<sup>6</sup> Despite these factors, the author noticed, the history of the Ukrainians remains almost unknown even in educational communities, the reason for which was lasting dominance in the historical science of the state paradigm, which denied historical rights to the so-called „non-state nations“. His book, the author mentioned, was built on other conceptual bases – the recognition of the priority of the research of the historical evolution of different forms of populations life on all of the territories where they lived. In order to increase the evidence of his hypotheses, the historian emphasized, in addition to traditional written sources, he paid great attention to the evidence of archeology and ethnology, comparative linguistics and folklore. Considering the lack of knowledge of Eastern Slavic scientific literature in Europe, M. Hrushevsky published at the end of the book several historiographical essays related to the most important and debated scientific problems of the early history of the Slavs. M. Hrushevsky dedicated a special place to the words of gratitude for the translators and editors of the publication. Despite their diligent work, the scientist has apologized for numerous translation and typographical errors.

The structure of the book reflected the author's understanding of the Genesis of the Ukrainian people and aimed at a consistent unfolding in front of the reader of the historical picture of the past Eastern European region. In the first part

---

<sup>6</sup> HRUŠEVSKYJ, Michael. *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906, I Band, pp. III-IV.

terminology and theoretical principles of the work were explained as well as the vision of M. Hrushevsky of the geographical area, which was inhabited by the ancestors of the Ukrainians. The following parts of the work contained descriptions of East Slavic migration and colonization, a description of the religious, economic and cultural life of the Slavic tribes which inhabited the Ukrainian territories. Particular attention was paid to the beginnings of the state organization in the middle Dnieper Ukraine, the evolution of political forms of Kievan Rus', prosperity of the ancient state in the time of Vladimir the Great. The book concludes with excursions to the most important historiographical issues, several pointers, and a map.

In the basis of the work of M. Hrushevsky two key philosophical ideas were put.<sup>7</sup> The first was the idea of the uninterrupted development of the Ukrainian nation. It is about that many Russian historians of that time traditionally thought that Tatar invasion led to the depopulation of the Dnieper as well as to the departure of its indigenous population in the North-Eastern direction to the lands of the later Moscow state. Predecessors of M. Hrushevsky – Mykhaylo Maksymovych and Volodymyr Antonovych showed that the desolation was not absolute – a considerable part of the population remained. M. Hrushevsky, digging this thesis in stressed, the main role in the settlement of Dnieper and the re-establishment of the political traditions after the Tatar invasion belonged not to the new, but to the local population. The other important historiography idea was collectivism – the understanding of the unity of the geographical area of the residence of the Ukrainian ethnic group. In relation to this, the scientist paid a lot of time to the enlightenment of the history of the Ukrainian territories, which were located from both sides of the main, in the historical and ethnic understanding lands. For example, in his book we can find a deep excursus in the history of Transcarpathia (in the author's terminology – Hungarian Rus). Not less interesting are pages, dedicated to the history of Slavic colonization of the Steppe and Crimea. Built, generally, in the same scheme, these descriptions give a concrete idea about the territory, population, general tendencies of the economic, social, politics and cultural development. Actually, these conceptual innovations of M. Hrushevsky appeared in the focus of critical discussion of the majority of the new book reviewers.

### **Ukrainian estimations**

The importance of the appearance of the German translation of the book of M. Hrushevsky was difficult to overestimate as it was the first such compendium in the language of science of that time, written from the perspective of Ukrainian national historiography, which covered the early history of Ukrainians in such detail. Quite rightly, announcing a new edition on the pages of the Lviv newspaper „Dilo“, Ivan Kopach noted: „No doubt – this is an epoch-making edition for the fate of our people. It was for the first time that our people were represented in

<sup>7</sup> More precisely in: ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX-початок XX століття). Нью-Йорк; Дрогобич: б. в., 2002.

the cultural world through their greatest historian in the world's „conversation of scientists“ – and then presented so that we can be quite calm about the condemnation of Europe“.<sup>8</sup>

Similar to the significance of the new edition on the pages of the „Literary and Scientific Bulletin“, its editor I. Franko wrote: „This is the first decisive step of our scientific work to the wide world, the first attempt to introduce the widest circles of Western European specialists with the achievements of the new Russian and especially Ukrainian historiography. The first volume of the „History of Ukraine“ of the prof. M. Hrushevsky with its broad outline, the solidity of its performance and the great wealth of exquisite and critically crafted material, appears to be the most important to the interest of specialists at the beginnings of our history. At the same time, all the good features of the Russian original remain in the translation, so that for the non-expert, the main text is interesting proofreading, when numerous notes and excursions introduce us to the work of a professional historian“.<sup>9</sup>

The first German-speaking history of Ukraine was also perceived by Ukrainian intellectuals in the sub-Russian lands with enthusiasm. On the pages of „Kievskaya starina“ it was mentioned: „In this edition, Europe for the first time will meet the way it's supposed to with the history of Ukrainian people. Till now people in Europe thought that we did not have any separate history, any separate language and literature“.<sup>10</sup> In most overviews suggestions were expressed to the author and editors in order to continue and translate the following volumes of the „History of Ukraine-Rus“, which were published in the quantity of six.

Stepan Tomashevsky, representative of the Lviv School of M. Hrushevsky noticed on the importance of the appearance of the German translation of the work of M. Hrushevsky for the popularization of the Ukrainian question in the Western World, having given the accurate analysis of the work's content on the pages of the Viennese magazine „Ukrainische Rundschau“.<sup>11</sup> In his overview, he, first of all, stressed on the destructive influence of the Lviv professor's ideas on the historical stereotypes rooted in the European consciousness, above all, regarding the prevailing belief in the ethnic and cultural homogeneity of Eastern Europe as a space of indivisible Russian and Polish influence. This view, the reviewer noted, had the consequence of completely ignoring by researching the history and culture of Ukrainians as an independent European nation. And this, in turn, led to denying the justice of political aspirations of the Ukrainian movement of that period. And if the Ukrainian publicists with their speeches in the Western press were able to somewhat exacerbate these well-established stereotypes, then the book of M. Hrushevsky should make a real revolution in the European perception of Ukraine, after all, on the basis of many sources, where the origins of

<sup>8</sup> Діло, 15. 02. 1906, с. 5, КОПАЧ Іван. *Review: Hruševskij Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906.*

<sup>9</sup> І. Ф. [ФРАНКО, Іван]. *Review: Hruševskij M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906.* In *Літературно-науковий вістник*, 1906, т. 33, с. 595.

<sup>10</sup> *Історія України проф. Грушевського. In Киевская Старина*, 1906, т. 92, с. 31.

<sup>11</sup> TOMASCHIWSKYJ, Stefan. *Dr. Eine Geschichte der Ukraine in deutscher Sprache (Hruševskij M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. Leipzig, 1906).* In *Ukrainische Rundschau*, 1906, No. 12, pp. 457–462.

the Ukrainian people and their statehood were reproduced.<sup>12</sup> The reviewer then describes the content of the book stressing on those conceptual novations, which M. Hrushevsky proposes, opposing the traditional Russian and Polish vision of the Ukrainian past. By the end of the overview S. Tomashevsky expressed his conviction that the book of M. Hrushevsky will find an interesting response among European specialists as well as recognition of the readership. According to the estimations below his prediction was entirely justified.

The mentioned reviews belonged to representatives of the Ukrainophilia political camp. Instead, the assessments made by the Galician Muscophiles, ideological opponents of M. Hrushevsky, had a very different tone. As an example, let us remember a review by a well-known Eastern European history researcher, Professor at Chernivtsi University, Vladimir Milkovich. It was published on the pages of an authoritative Austrian magazine „Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung“.<sup>13</sup> At the beginning of his review, V. Milkovich announces that the peer-reviewed work is a „desert“ and „unknown images“. First, he emotionally criticizes the German language in the translation. Then, V. Milkovich doubts on the „criticism, judgment, and method of the author“, gives to his historical reconstruction the excess of hypothetical nature and uncertainty and, even, gives to M. Hrushevsky the lack of knowledge related to events and facts of World history. The historical scheme of the Lviv professor suffered the most severe criticism. The reviewer's conclusion sounds rather categorical – the history of the Ukrainian people remains unwritten, and the book of M. Hrushevsky has not come close to solving this problem.<sup>14</sup>

The critical criticism of V. Milkovich was picked up by the ideological opponents of M. Hrushevsky in Galicia. A number of Lviv editions published excerpts from the review of the Chernivtsi professor, often adding his own critical comments. Interestingly, the estimates of the Chernivtsi professor were also noticed by the right-wing monarch of the Russian Empire.<sup>15</sup> The Moscow-based newspaper „Galichanin“ and the opposite of the public activity of M. Hrushevsky newspaper of Galician conservatives „Ruslan“ made most of all in the matter of „popularization“ of the estimates of V. Milkovich. The editorial board of the magazine suggested discussing the work of M. Hrushevsky on their front pages, inviting the author himself to speak regarding critical remarks on the first volume of „History“. As the first step of such a discussion, the magazine published translations of the reviews of A. Brückner, R. Shtube and V. Milkovich. The text of V. Milkovich was added with a few own notices by editorial, on which it agreed with the author. This publication gave birth to the discussion between supporters of M. Hrushevsky, who expressed their position on the pages of the newspaper „Dilo“ and V. Milkovich, who opposed them from the front pages of „Ruslan“.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 460.

<sup>13</sup> MILKOWICZ. *Review: Hruševskij Michael, Geschichte des Ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes.* I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 1907, Band XXVIII, pp. 527 – 535.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 535.

<sup>15</sup> А. Б. Украйномания у нас и за рубежом. In *Окраины России*, 1907, № 45 – 46.

The first to defend his teacher was S. Tomashivsky in a sharp and emotional article under the characteristic name „Anger and Envy („Ruslan“ and Prof. Milkovich)“, which was published in a few numbers of „Dilo“.<sup>16</sup> First of all, S. Tomashivsky outlines a general palette of extremely positive perception of German-speaking work by M. Hrushevsky in a professional environment. Revealing the motives of V. Milkovich’s extremely unfavorable response, the author writes about the latter’s Russophile sympathies, which caused his ideological rejection of all the activities of the Lviv professor. Later, the student of M. Hrushevsky gives examples of falsifying quotes by V. Milkovich, taking them out from the context of the story, distorting thoughts and other numerous innuendos.

Wondering, in this article, S. Tomashivsky formed exactly for the first time his own scientific positions, which differed from his teacher’s ones. First, he announced his disapproval of M. Hrushevsky’s entire scientific argumentation in favor of the anti-Norman theory, emphasizing his Norman sympathies. The article itself was written in a sharp manner, which did not contribute to the continuation of the debate in the academic direction.

The harshness of S. Tomashivsky’s statements provoked a corresponding emotional reaction of V. Milkovich, who made an article in „Ruslan“ with the name „Response to my attackers“. In a sharp form, arguing with S. Tomashivsky, the author retells the main points of his German review, concluding, that „the case of prof. Hrushevsky says of completely different things, in particular, the author writes, without thinking, he writes without criticism“. Answering another reproach of his opponent regarding numerous positive reactions to the book of M. Hrushevsky in the Western European periodicals, V. Milkovich emphasized the political motivation of these estimations. „When the composition of M. Hrushevsky was praised by Germans, – he states, – they made it from the political perspective, which, apparently, gentlemen of „Dilo“ do not understand“.<sup>17</sup>

In the following numbers of „Ruslan“, V. Milkovich continued his polemic. In the article „One more response to my attackers“ he, again, turned to the mistakes of the translation, stressing on the systematic, but not a random manner of the latest: „The whole book is so scandalously retold, that I, having read it, was ashamed, that Russians could let something like that put into the world“.<sup>18</sup> Concluding the discussion, the author warns the opponents from its continuation, promising, otherwise, transferring the polemic on the pages of Western European specialized editions.

The last one to react to emotional reproaches of V. Milkovich was M. Hrushevsky. His wide answer in German under the name „Has the history of Russians already been written or not?“ appeared in 1908 in the next volume of the magazine „Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung“.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Діло, 25. 09. 1907, с. 1; 26. 09. 1907, с. 1–2; 30. 09. 1907, с. 1–2, ТОМАШІВСЬКИЙ, Степан. Злість і Зависть («Руслан» і проф. Милькович).

<sup>17</sup> Руслан, 7. 10. 1907, с. 1–3, МИЛЬКОВИЧ, Володимир. Відповідь моїм напасникам.

<sup>18</sup> Руслан, 14. 01. 1908, с. 1–3, МИЛЬКОВИЧ, Володимир. Ще одна відповідь моїм напасникам.

<sup>19</sup> HRUSCHEWSKYJ, Michael. Ist die Geschichte des ruthenischen Volkes geschrieben oder noch nicht? In Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 1908, Band XXIX, pp. 201–215.

M. Hrushevsky starts his answer by proving that the Ukrainian National Movement, as well as Ukrainian historiography, are not new apparitions for the XIX and XX centuries, as V. Milkovich described in his review. He gives a brief historiographical overview of the development of the Ukrainian past, beginning with the works of Johann Engel at the end of the XVIII century and finishing with his own scientific works. Therefore, the department of Ukrainian History, led by him at the University of Lviv, states M. Hrushevsky, emerged as a natural consequence of the quantitative and qualitative growth of Ukrainian studies, but not as a political project, which aimed to the realization of the plan of the creation of a complex synthesis of the Ukrainian past as opposed to existing Russian or Polish narratives.

For the Lviv professor, the aversion of V. Milkovich to the „History of Ukraine-Rus“ is incomprehensible. Ignoring this work, as the Chernivtsi historian particularly praised in his review, cannot embellish any serious researcher who must summarize all possible completeness of sources and literature. Because of such prejudice, M. Hrushevsky noticed, criticism of V. Milkovich is not unpleasant for him, especially since his tone clearly resonates with the general recognition of the German publication in the circle of Western European researchers. Then, M. Hrushevsky marks that he together with his opponent possess not only historiographic but also ideological and historical positions. „In the history of Eastern Europe, in its culture, in its social and historical life I look for a natural development of the Ukrainian nationality and I imagine the history of Ukrainian people as undivided organic integrity, – wrote M. Hrushevsky. – For professor Milkovich neither Ukrainian people nor Ukrainian history exist, he knows only „Russia“ starting from Rurik to Nicholas II [...]. He follows the old Pan-Russian scheme, this embodiment of the Moscow-Petersburg centralized spirit, which knows only the Russian and Polish empires, and intertwines the history of the Ukrainian people episodically in the history of Russia, then in the history of Poland“.<sup>20</sup>

The author rightly notices that V. Milkovich instead of, disagreeing with the fundamental conceptual moments of constructing the Eastern European past, resorted to the unsubstantiated denial of the provisions presented in the „History of the Ukrainian People“. He further presents numerous facts of V. Milkovich's biased and incorrect attitude to the ideas and concepts expressed in the book, showing the illogicality and meaninglessness of the reviewer's criticisms. It should be noted that the answers to all the criticisms of V. Milkovich towards the article of M. Hrushevsky are extremely detailed and substantiated, obviously aimed at getting European scientists better acquainted with the subject of discussion. A lot of space in the article is devoted to demonstrating the incorrectness of the reviewer, the arbitrary interpretation of the peer-reviewed text, the removal of quotations from the context, the misinterpretation of many expressions and more.

The second part of the answer is devoted to the controversy with V. Milkovich concerning the key points of the „History of the Ukrainian people“ – the features of Slavic colonization and migration, the problem of Ants, the culture and life of the meadows, the genesis of the state-political forms of Kievan Rus', etc.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 203.

Again, M. Hrushevsky demonstrated remarkable validity in the explanations, often appealing to the opinion of scientific authorities recognized in Europe, which, obviously, was intended to strengthen his own argument. Thus, summarizes M. Hrushevsky, the review of V. Milkovich in no way undermined the scientifically of the conceptual ideas of the „History of the Ukrainian people“. On the contrary, the Chernivtsi professor acted as *advocatus diaboli* – a scandalous character of his criticism made a kind of advertising for the book and attracted the attention of many European researchers. Summing up his amusements, the author states: „Whether it is pleasant to someone or not, but Ukrainian history, I firmly believe in it, exists and remains written“.<sup>21</sup>

M. Hrushevsky's thorough answer did not go unanswered by his opponent, who submitted his reply, printed immediately after the text of the Lviv professor.<sup>22</sup> At the beginning of the remark, V. Milkovich said: „If I allow myself to address this problem again, it is not for the reason that I see a threat to my position by the criticism of the author, but in order to properly cover his tactics of defense. After all, just listen to how the author defends himself!“ . Further, the Chernivtsi professor tries to prove that his opponent did not answer on the essence of the comments, but only once again retold the leading ideas of the „History of the Ukrainian people“. V. Milkovich again dismissed erroneous construction of M. Hrushevsky of the beginnings of ancient Russian statehood and the genesis of ethnic processes in the Eastern European region and accused of vanity and methodological incorrectness, in fact, rewriting previous remarks. At some points in the „History of the Ukrainian People“, such as anti-Normanism or the reconstruction of the Genesis of the Ukrainian ethnic group, he elaborated further, emphasizing that he did not fundamentally accept the main historiographical theses of M. Hrushevsky. The content and tone of the remark make the conclusion of V. Milkovich easily predictable: „When he [M. Hrushevsky] concludes with the words: „The history of Ukrainians exists and remains written, and there's no matter whether somebody likes it or not“, – then I must deny him: „Yes, it is written but how!“<sup>23</sup> In general, in our opinion, the remark of V. Milkovich gives the impression that the Chernivtsi professor did not hear his Lviv colleague, could not or did not want to penetrate his research logic. Therefore, the texts of both scholars appear to be somewhat hermetic, since the discussion, as such, did not take place – neither party acknowledged the least right of the opponent.

### **Polish and Czech reflections**

Immediately after the German translation of the first volume came out, a wide discussion of it in European historical science began. Slavic historians were among the first to respond<sup>24</sup>. A critical review was prepared by Alexander Brickner for the Polish magazine „Kwartalnik Historyczny“. In his thorough exploration of

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, p. 215.

<sup>22</sup> MILKOWICZ. Replik. In Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 1908, Band XXIX, p. 215.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, p. 219.

<sup>24</sup> More precisely in: ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Чеська грушевськіана першої третини ХХ століття. In Історіографічні дослідження в Україні, 2008, випуск 19, с. 240–258.; ТЕЛЬВАК,

the „Norman Dogma“, he proposed his own vision of the problems emphasized by M. Hrushevsky. As the title of the article indicates, the author came from the standpoint of the Norman theory in understanding the genesis of the political structure of the ancient Russian state. Therefore, the main focus of the review was directed at criticizing the anti-Norman concept of M. Hrushevsky, which A. Brickner called „the latest historical heresy“. At the beginning of the review, the author expresses his overall impression of the Ukrainian scientist's work and his professional skill: „The work of Mr. Hrushevsky is a glorious testimony to the Russian author's scholarship and versatility. He mastered completely the vast literature of the subject – archeological, historical, philological, first and foremost, Russian, which earlier was well-kept secret; he simply amazes us with the reading, knowledge of the most special, small, often forgotten works of Russian and German. With this fabulous reading, speed of thought, originality of judgment, the perfect method is to pair everything – all this is quite unusual...“.<sup>25</sup> The main criticism of M. Hrushevsky was that not being a linguist, the scientist in his philological arguments in favor of anti-Normans had to entirely rely on, according to him, the false and outdated ideas of Ukrainian and Russian researchers.

Having completed the criticism of the anti-Normanism of M. Hrushevsky, the reviewer also disagreed with the vision in antas direct ancestors of Ukrainians, explaining the position of the Lviv scholar in this matter solely by ideological motives – the desire to „have the earliest appearance of his Ukraine“ on the historical arena. Operating on philological arguments, A. Brickner also criticized the theory of M. Hrushevsky related to the ethnic processes at the Ukrainian-Polish border of the XI-XIII centuries. He regards as unsubstantiated the assertions of the Lviv professor about the Ukrainian character of the founding of „Cherven“ cities and, in general, rejects the scientist's theory of the expansionist policy of the Poles concerning the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia.

Recent sections on Slavic colonization and the material culture of the Eastern Slavic tribes of those times, the reconstruction of the beginnings of the ancient Russian state were estimated by the Polish researcher extremely high. In his opinion, interesting and informative are the extensive notes and excursions, which conclude the book and often form independent explorations. At the end of the review, A. Brickner highlighted the high signs of work that „impresses with size, erudition, research comprehensiveness“ and wished Polish scholars to create similar work about the beginnings of their own people and the state.<sup>26</sup>

The controversial remarks of A. Brickner provoked a discussion between Polish and Ukrainian researchers on the importance of the Norman factor in the formation and evolution of the state forms of Kievan Rus`. M. Hrushevsky himself responded to the remark of the Polish scientist with a small remark on the pages of the „Notes by the Shevchenko Scientific Society“. In response to A. Brickner's criticisms regarding the weakness of the philological arguments in

---

Віталій. Польська грушевськіана кінця XIX – початку XX ст.: постаті та ідеї. In: Studia polsko-ukraińskie, 2016, № 3, pp. 49 – 68.

<sup>25</sup> BRÜCKNER, Alexandr. Dogmat normański. In Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1906, t. XX, p. 665.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, s. 679.

favor of the anti-Norman theory, described, in the book, the Ukrainian scientist notes the obsolescence and helplessness of the purely historical arguments of the Polish philologist, his neglect of the broad research context of studying the problem. „Prof. Brickner, – sums up M. Hrushevsky, – having annoyed the society of philologists, he likes to visit historians in recent years. The guest is noisy and cheerful. He will turn over there, will put his head over heels, and on the occasion, he will quarrel with disgraceful historians – and let him go home, leaving the owners uncertain, whether to take everything that was said for serious discussion or to consider it worse than an anecdote“.<sup>27</sup>

S. Tomashivsky stopped in his review on the polemic remarks of A. Brickner rather thoroughly. Defending the scientific argumentation of his teacher, the researcher pointed to numerous weaknesses of the historical theses of a Polish colleague, emphasizing the falsity of one-sided philological argumentation of scientific theory, the need to take into account the whole spectrum of historical, archeological, linguistic data in the reconstruction of such a complicated problem as the genesis of state-building processes in the Eastern European region.<sup>28</sup>

A. Brickner responded with another remark on the pages of „Kwartalnika Historycznego“ on the criticism of Ukrainian colleagues. In further continuing his philological arguments, he generally outlined the previous theses but agreed with the criticism of the certainty of some conclusions.<sup>29</sup>

K. Kadlec wrote a broad review for the Czech magazine „Sborník Věd Právnických a Státních“ in the German edition of the first volume of the „History of the Ukrainian People“. Receiving as a gift from Lviv Professor his new work, the scientist in a Thank letter from the 30th of April 1908 expressed his admiration of the idea of M. Hrushevsky translating his main composition into German – the language of the science of that time, therefore, introducing his not generic ideas to Western European colleagues.<sup>30</sup>

Most of his review is a detailed analysis of the content of the work, made with true knowledge of the subject. In particular, the Czech researcher stopped on the introduction to the book, which outlines its conceptual background. K. Kadlec is in solidarity with the basic ideas of the theoretical model of the Ukrainian scientist, comparing his contribution to Ukrainian science with the value of the works of František Palacký for Czech historiography. Particularly courageous, in his opinion, is the assertion of M. Hrushevsky regarding the continuity and indivisibility of the Ukrainian state tradition from the time of Kievan Rus` and the emphasis on the weight of ancient Russian cultural heritage in the formation of Moscow, Lithuanian and whole Eastern European identity.

Along with these words of high recognition of the scientific level of work, K. Kadlec does not miss its controversial points. He notes the insufficient proof

<sup>27</sup> ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ Михайло. *Review: Brückner A. Próbkі najnowszej krytyki historycznej*. In Записки НТШ, 1907, т. LXXVII, с. 206.

<sup>28</sup> Наукова хроніка. In Записки НТШ, 1907, т. LXXX, с. 181 – 186.

<sup>29</sup> BRÜCKNER, Alexandr. O Rusi normańskiej jeszcze słów kilka. In *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 1909, t. XXIII, pp. 362 – 371.

<sup>30</sup> Центральний державний архів України у м. Київ (hereinafter ЦДІАУК), фонд 1235 Грушевські – історики та філологи, оп. 1, спр. 508 Листи К. Кадлеца до М. Грушевського, арк. 5.

of hypotheses put forward by M. Hrushevsky, the excessive categorical tone in their defense, which resonates with the general poverty of known and available historical sources. In his conclusions, the reviewer reiterates the importance of the first volume of the „History of the Ukrainian People“ as an important historiographical phenomenon: „The work of M. Hrushevsky is written with such extraordinary erudition and is based on such rich literature and such numerous sources which belong to the greatest achievements of Slavic literature for the last ten years“.<sup>31</sup>

The thorough review of the historian and publicist Jan Slavik in „Český Časopis Historický“ was noticeably more critical towards the „History of the Ukrainian people“. The reviewer begins with his own credo concerning the very essence of the Ukrainian – or in the reviewer’s terms – the „Little Russian“ question. J. Slavik claims that he does not support those scholars who, „in the Great and Little Russians discussions, take an extremely negative position, most clearly manifested in Petro Valuev’s (the Russian Minister during the 1860’s) words: „there was no Ukrainian nation, there is no and there cannot be“. Next, the reviewer admitted that „this part of the dispute, when the very existence of the Little Russians as a separate ethnographic unit was seriously questioned, is already left in the past. The Little Russian people exist and will always exist“.<sup>32</sup>

At the same time, the Czech scholar raised the question of whether the nation had existed for a long time or was distinguished at the beginning of the Slavic history. Jan Slavik doubted Mr. Hrushevsky’s positive answers to these questions. The Ukrainian scientist’s theses, as Jan Slavik emphasized, „are significantly different from our generally accepted view“. Making clear the generally accepted view, the reviewer said: „for us, the Ukrainians [...] are the part of the Russian (ruského) tribe, the product of a secondary, special development, which the Russian (ruský) people made during the historic period mainly“.

J. Slavik criticised M. Hrushevsky’s Anti-Normanist theory, which was substantiated in a special appendix to the first volume. The reviewer himself called this appendix „a good review on the history of controversy“. Though, J. Slavik admired the author’s exhaustive analysis of the literature. At the same time, he said: „M. Hrushevsky’s intention to undermine the Norman theory failed as well the efforts of his predecessors to undermine it. And the „Slavic“ hypothesis about the origin of the Kyiv principality obviously lacks objectivity“.<sup>33</sup>

## German and Romanian receptions

The greatest amount of reviews on the „History of the Ukrainian People“ appeared in the German scientific periodicals. So, for the Munich magazine „Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung“ the review was written by a professor at the local

<sup>31</sup> KADLEC, Karel. *Review: Hruševskij Mychajlo, Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy* (6. svazek, Lvov, 1907), *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes* (I sv. Lipsko, 1906). In *Sborník Věd Právnických a státních*, 1909, vol. IX, pp. 298–305.

<sup>32</sup> SLAVIK, Jan. *Review: Hruševskij Mychajlo, Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy* (6. svazek, Lvov, 1907), *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes* (I sv. Lipsko, 1906). In *Český časopis historický*, 1908, vol. XIV, p. 214.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid*, p. 217.

university Rudolf Stube.<sup>34</sup> At the beginning of his discussion, he attracted the reader's attention to the peculiarity of the book as an ideological manifesto of the young Ukrainian movement: „From the national aspirations of the Ruthenians, first of all, emerged the great „History of Ukraine-Rus“ by Lviv professor M. Hrushevsky, who is an inspired supporter of the Russian national movement“. The critic writes about his impressions of the scale of work and the number of sources and literature involved in writing it. The book, in his opinion, „with the greatest care and diligence“ summarized a wide range of different sources, which allowed to critically examine existing hypotheses and substantiate the legitimacy of their own models. The best-treated pages of the first volume, both under the review of the collected sources and the correctness of the formulated hypotheses, the reviewer considers the study of M. Hrushevsky's family and tribal organization at the Slavs, as well as ancient culture and mythology. R. Stube also applauds M. Hrushevsky's portrayal of Vladimir the Great's time, especially of the Prince's foreign policy activity, which, according to the critic, is „an example of a great historical characteristic“. „It is the first impression that the book of prof. Hrushkevsky, - says R. Stube, - points to a worthy wonder of scholarship and tireless hard work, combined with a penetrating speed of thought and inspiration for an affair. The author is noted for his extensive knowledge of even the often-inaccessible literature, and, as rarely happens, he masters the subject with bold critical appraisal. So, this is a glorious act that can be trusted to convey all the facts in the broadest sense. I raise the cost of labor more joyfully because at some points I cannot agree with the view of the author“.

Further, the researcher, while considering the structure, methodology and the method of writing the book, its conceptual foundations, formulates a number of comments. The author's desire to reveal in detail the subject of his research sometimes might have a negative side, the critic believes, as sometimes, by the mass of such details, the leading idea of the search is hidden, which makes the „proof-reading of the book tiresome and we are finally dissatisfied“. The book also improbably delineates the geographical range of the displacement of Ukrainians in the early Middle Ages, and far back into the historical retrospective, the beginnings of their history are moved. „I cannot agree with the author's expansionist aspirations“, the critic sums up. However, this problem, said R. Stube, is peculiar to the historiography of all young peoples, especially the Slavs, who try to move their own ethnicity into the gray antiquity and define it as possibly the largest habitat of settlement. In the context of the previous remark, the critic criticizes M. Hrushevsky for some artificiality in interpreting known events, for example, noting the weak evidence of the hypothesis about the autochthon of Ukrainians and the thesis about the complete originality of ancient Russian culture.

The author's reconstruction was faced with the most critical concerns about the origins and directions of the evolution of state forms in the Eastern Slavs. R. Stube does not spare the polemical arrows for the anti-Norman theory of the Ukrainian

---

<sup>34</sup> STÜBE, Rudolf. Eine Geschichte der Ruthenen (Hruševskýj Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906). In Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, 1907, Band III, pp. 617 – 623.

scientist, considering the relevant pages to be the most controversial and weak in the book. „The work is steeped in a trend that is worthy of attention, but has hurt it, – he concludes. – Hrushevsky wants to use the national aspirations of his live, gifted and active people, trying to prove that the Ruthenians are people with their own, peculiar culture, that they have created their own state system. Because of this, he sometimes misrepresents well-known facts: this can sometimes lead to distortions and exaggerations. This tendency also affects the presentation of the subject; the narration is often replaced by clarification of single issues“.<sup>35</sup>

From such ideological standpoints, the classic of Romanian historiography Nicolae Iorga was approached by M. Hrushevsky in an overview published on the pages of the Leipzig „Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland“. He, like R. Stube, linked the emergence of the Lviv professor's work with the general activation of the Ukrainian national movement and the desire of its leaders to promote Ukrainian national postulates in the European intellectual and political environment: „On the whole, we are dealing with a work that serves the national aspirations of the Ruthenians, who want to present themselves as a nation with 34 million people, their own culture and government entities“.<sup>36</sup> The reviewer attracted the readers' attention to the fact that the book is a translated volume of the first volume of a multivolume edition, which M. Hrushevsky continues in Ukrainian for a long time. Therefore, it is quite timely for N. Iorga to appear in the great work of a Ukrainian scientist in German, which introduces the European reader to the early history of Ukrainians.

The reviewer provides a general overview of the „History of the Ukrainian People“, noting its strengths and weaknesses. To the first, he traditionally to reviewers, attributes a great erudition of M. Hrushevsky, the solidity of the used sourced and historiographic material. According to N. Iorga, the special scientific value possesses the last part of the book, dedicated to the beginnings of ancient Russian statehood and the reign of Vladimir the Great. „Hrushevsky“, emphasizes the reviewer, „is an educated, critical, and resourceful mind; he owns his material perfectly“.<sup>37</sup>

The weaknesses of the peer-reviewed book by N. Iorga, no less traditionally than for Western European historiography, include the implausibility of the area of displacement of the ancestors of Ukrainians in the prehistoric period, the Ants theory and anti-normism of M. Hrushevsky, the exaggeration of Ukrainian culture and cultural heritage in ancient times, people's habits. The reviewer is also skeptical about the terminology of the „History of the Ukrainian People“. Here, perhaps the most controversial is the use of the ethnonym „Ukraine“. The structure of the book is also too cumbersome for the viewer, the overload of its content by numerous excursions, which distracts the reader from the main story. But this flaw, N. Iorga noted, is inherent in the representatives of Eastern European historiography.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, p. 623.

<sup>36</sup> JORGA, Nicolae. *Review: Hruševskyj M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes.* I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland*, 1907, № 17, p. 534.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, p. 533.

Contributing to the views of M. Hrushevsky, the reviewer draws special critical attention to the pages of the work, given the characteristics of the Slavic colonization of the Carpathian region<sup>38</sup>. Here, it is unclear to N. Iorga why the Ukrainian scientist avoids the use of the ethnonym „Romanians“ in every way, favoring the outdated „Wallachian“. Despite a rather critical tone of the review, the critic at the end of the review states: „A sensible and voluminous, and even colossal, book will be useful to many, but none will satisfy, although it testifies to the high level of scholarship, and sometimes insight of the author“.<sup>39</sup>

For Berlin-based „Deutsche Literaturzeitung“, a small but meaningful review was written by Leopold Karl Goetz. Having read the book, he decided to impose the epistolary dialogue with M. Hrushevsky. Leopold Karl Goetz wrote in his first letter to Lviv: „I was extremely glad by the appearance in the world of the German edition of the first volume of Your „History of the Ukrainian people“, I contributed to its acquisition in our university library and learned a lot from it“.<sup>40</sup> This letter of Leopold Karl Goetz became the impetus to the long correspondence between Ukrainian and German researchers.

He also noted the extremely low level of awareness of the European reader about the past of Eastern Europe. Of greater importance and value, the review emphasizes, are synthetic works that focus on the study of the beginnings of historical life in the vast expanse of the Carpathians to the Caucasus. Describing the peer-reviewed work, L. Goetz noted: „... It is likely that there will be no work long enough to thoroughly study this branch of science [the history of Eastern Europe] as the history of the Ukrainian people is presented“.<sup>41</sup> Then the reviewer focuses on the leading ideas of the „History of the Ukrainian People“, emphasizing many sources and literature involved by the Ukrainian researcher. The latest fact is of value to European experts, as Russian and Ukrainian literature is largely inaccessible to them. Independent scientific value, noted in the review, have annexed to the book, of which especially valuable, according to the reviewer, are excursions about ancient Russian chronicle and Norman theory.

The opinions of M. Hrushevsky, L. Goetz emphasizes, completely overturn the common in the environment of European researchers' vision of the past of Eastern Europe as a monocultural and mono-ethnic space. The reviewer admits that he has repeatedly used the following volumes of the main work of M. Hrushevsky in his work, and therefore emphasizes the need to translate further volumes of it: „This should merit greater attention in Germany in this poorly-lit, almost completely neglected field of science in European history and culture“.<sup>42</sup> It is noticeable that in this review there is no habitual criticism of M. Hrushevsky's

---

<sup>38</sup> More precisely in: ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Рецензія Ніколає Йорги на «Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes» Михайла Грушевського. In Український археографічний щорічник. Нова серія, 2007, випуск 12, с. 840–844.

<sup>39</sup> JORGA, p. 534.

<sup>40</sup> ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій – РАДЧЕНКО, Олег. Листи Леопольда Карла Гетца до Михайла Грушевського. in Архіви України, 2018, № 1, с. 249.

<sup>41</sup> GOETZ, Leopold Karl. *Review: Hruševskij Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd.* Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1908, № 8, band XXXIX, p. 495.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid*, p. 496.

anti-Normans and controversy with his historical scheme, which is familiar to European researchers. The review itself is written, as is evident from the content, in order to acquaint the reader with the leading ideas of the Ukrainian researcher.

Re-published in Germany by the historical journal „Historische Zeitschrift“ has responded to the new book by M. Hrushevsky with a small review.<sup>43</sup> The author, who hid behind the cryptonym J.L., after following other reviewers, noted that the work of a Ukrainian scientist is, in fact, the first since the essay of Johann Engel to completely recreate the early history of one of the largest East Slavic peoples. Briefly focusing on the basic ideas of the work and characterizing its structure, the reviewer notes that he cannot, in the absence of space, dwell on all the controversial issues of the publication. The most debatable for him is M. Hrushevsky's objection to the correctness of the Norman theory. Like other European critics, the reviewer raises the erudition of the Ukrainian author, which is especially reflected in the informative saturation of the book annexes, which for the first time introduces the reader to the Slavic context of the study of the Eastern European Middle Ages. The reviewer notes that the map of Eastern Europe, concluded by the author during the formation of the Kyiv state, is also interesting for the researchers. Despite the discussion points, as well as translation errors, the critic emphasizes the importance of the appearance of the book of M. Hrushevsky, which introduced the broad readership to the history of the Ukrainian people.

Wondering, that among all the mentioned critical overviews, the review by R. Shtibe the most affected the Ukrainian author as in the diary of that time he mentioned only it. M. Hrushevsky's reflection was provoked by the accusation of a German colleague about the excessive burden of the peer-reviewed book with numerous secondary plots. In the note dated with 30th of October 1907 we read: „As for [...] review of Shtibe, throwing episodic, lack of continuity, overloading with details, thinking of History – would not give a new edition completely „facilitated“ view, and I regret that I could not create the German version“.<sup>44</sup> Responding to the remarks of R. Shtibe, as well as to the wishes of other German colleagues, the Ukrainian historian decided to translate into German the popular science „Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People“, as his first edition in 1904 was published in Russian. However, the search for a suitable translator and the coordination of organizational aspects took a long time, so the first part of the translation appeared only during the First World War.

The active discussion of „Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes“ on the pages of Western European magazines convinced M. Hrushevsky in the validity of his efforts to promote the Ukrainian view of the Eastern European past through the implementation of the translated projects. Influenced by a lively, often polemical, but generally friendly discussion, the author wrote to his Russian colleague Alexander Lappo-Danilevsky: „My first volume of the „History“,

<sup>43</sup> J.L. *Review*: Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd.: Urgeschichte des Landes und Volkes. Anfänge des Kijever Staates. Von M. Hruševskýj. Autorisierte Übersetzung aus der zweiten ukrainischen Ausgabe. Leipzig, B.G. Teubner. 1906. XVIII u. 754 s. In *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1908, Band CI, pp. 180–182.

<sup>44</sup> ЦДІАУК, ф. 1235, оп. 1, спр. 25 Щоденник, арк. 163 зв. – 164.

published last year in German, is now experiencing a fiery baptism. Along with more or less harsh antics dictated by hostility to my „innovations“ or personal and political accounts, I was pleased to see that even the most unfriendly critics did not show me any real flaws in my conclusions or method; on this side, these unfriendly reviews should perhaps be appreciated even more than friendly, especially unfounded compliments. This sets me up very favorably with the new revision of the book“<sup>45</sup>. However, this idea was hampered by the chronic financial insecurity of Ukrainian science.

## **Conclusions**

According to the diverse and critical literature analyzed above, the German version of the „History of the Ukrainian People“ by M. Hrushevsky has become a notable phenomenon not only of Ukrainian but also of European historiography. In the course of the controversy, which appeared around the scientific concepts proposed in the book, the key points of his work were expressed not only by representatives of different directions in Ukrainian historical thought but also outlined the peculiarities of the ideas of the scientist in Polish, Czech, Romanian and German historiography. In each of them, discussions appeared around the lines on which M. Hrushevsky began to separate Ukrainian history from the „ordinary schemes“ of neighbors, creating a national grand narrative. For example, Polish researchers opposed the view of M. Hrushevsky related to ethnic processes on the Polish-Ukrainian border and the removal of the western ethnic border of the Ukrainian settlement near Kraków more vehemently.

The motivation of critics and Romanian colleagues was similar. Western European historians unanimously disagreed with the revision of M. Hrushevsky of the Norman theory, as it undermined their established vision of the past of Eastern Europe and significantly shifted traditional research accents. Note that to this day, Western Slavic studies are dominated by anti-Normanism. General points of criticism of the reviewers also touched on the image of M. Hrushevsky, the history of the original Ukrainian colonization and his vision of the beginnings of the Kyiv state. It was inappropriate for them to believe that the scientist was categorical in defending his own hypotheses without expanding the source base accordingly. One of the strong sides of scientific studies of M. Hrushevsky belonged to almost all reviewers of solidity in generalizing the source base and historiographic literature. The originality of the scientist's view of seemingly well-established scientific problems was also raised, which allowed them to resume their discussion from the standpoint of the alternative model. Thus, we can talk about the formation of national traditions in the study of the heritage of the author of „History of Ukraine-Rus“, and through his personality – the key postulates of all Ukrainian national historical science.

The criticisms of both his opponents and his supporters addressed to M. Hrushevsky, not only revealed certain controversial moments of his work but also attracted the attention of European historians to important problems that

---

<sup>45</sup> ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Листи Михайла Грушевського до Олександра Лаппо-Данілевського. In *Записки НТШ*, 2016, т. 270, с. 330.

were still to be covered by researchers of the Ukrainian past. Undoubtedly, numerous adjustments and clarifications, which touched on various individual issues, contributed to the study of these problems by M. Hrushevsky himself and other researchers of the Eastern European past.

### List of references and literature:

#### Archives:

Центральний державний архів України у м. Київ, фонд 1235 Грушевські – історики та філологи, оп. 1, спр. 508 Листи К. Кадлеца до М. Грушевського.

Центральний державний архів України у м. Київ, фонд 1235 Грушевські – історики та філологи, оп. 1, спр. 25 Щоденник.

#### Sources editions:

ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло. Щоденник. In Український історик, 2006 – 2007, ч.4/1 – 2.

#### Monographs:

Hruševskýj, Michael. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906, I Band.

ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло. Історія України-Руси. Львів, 1904, т. 1.

ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ–Дрогобич: Вимір, 2008.

ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX-початок XX століття). Нью-Йорк; Дрогобич: b. v., 2002.

#### Articles in Journals, Chapters in the Monographs:

BRÜCKNER, Alexandr. Dogmat normański. In Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1906, t. XX, pp. 664 – 679.

BRÜCKNER, Alexandr. O Rusi normańskiej jeszcze słów kilka. In Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1909, t. XXIII, pp. 362 – 371.

GOETZ, Leopold Karl. *Review*: Hruševskýj Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1908, № 8, band XXXIX, pp. 495 – 496.

HRUSCHEWSKYJ, Michael. Ist die Geschichte des ruthenischen Volkes geschrieben oder noch nicht? In Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 1908, band XXIX, pp. 201 – 215.

J.L. *Review*: Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd.: Urgeschichte des Landes und Volkes. Anfänge des Kijever Staates. Von M. Hruševskýj. Autorisierte Übersetzung aus der zweiten ukrainischen Ausgabe. Leipzig, B.G. Teubner. 1906. XVIII u. 754 s. In Historische Zeitschrift, 1908, band CI, pp. 180 – 182.

JORGA, Nicolae. *Review*: Hruševskýj M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland, 1907, № 17, pp. 533 – 534.

KADLEC, Karel. *Review*: Hruševskýj Mychajlo, Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy (6. svazek, Lvov, 1907), Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes (I sv. Lipsko, 1906). In Sborník Věd Právních a Státních, 1909, vol. IX, pp. 298 – 305.

- MILKOWICZ. Replik. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 1908, Band XXIX, pp. 213 – 215.
- MILKOWICZ. *Review: Hruševskij Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische geschichtsforschung*, 1907, Band XXVIII, pp. 527 – 535.
- SLAVIK, Jan. *Review: Hruševskij Mychajlo, Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy* (6. svazek, Lvov, 1907), *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes* (I sv. Lipsko, 1906). In *Český časopis historický*, 1908, vol. XIV, pp. 214 – 217.
- STÜBE, Rudolf. *Eine Geschichte der Ruthenen* (Hruševskij Michael, *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906). In *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, 1907, Band III, pp. 617 – 623.
- TOMASCHIVSKYJ, Stefan. Dr. *Eine Geschichte der Ukraine in deutscher Sprache* (Hruševskij M. *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*. Leipzig, 1906). In *Ukrainische Rundschau*, 1906, № 12, pp. 457 – 462.
- А. Б. *Україноманія у нас і за рубезом*. In *Україны России*, 1907, № 45 – 46.
- В. [ГНАТЮК, Володимир]. *Review: Михайло Грушевський. Історія України-Руси*, т. II. In *Літературно-науковий вістник*, 1905, т. 30, с. 184.
- ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ Михайло. *Review: Brückner A. Próbkі najnowszej krytyki historycznej*. In *Записки НТШ*, 1907, т. LXXVII, с. 205 – 206.
- Діло, 15. 02. 1906, с. 5, КОПАЧ Іван. *Review: Hruševskij Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906.
- Діло, 25. 09. 1907, с. 1; 26. 09. 1907, с. 1 – 2; 30. 09. 1907, с. 1 – 2, ТОМАШІВСЬКИЙ, Степан. *Злість і Зависть («Руслан» і проф. Милькович)*.
- І. Ф. [ФРАНКО, Іван]. *Review: Hruševskij M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906. In *Літературно-науковий вістник*, 1906, т. 33, с. 595.
- Історія України проф. Грушевського*. In *Киевская Старина*, 1906, т. 92, с. 31.
- Наукова хроніка*. In *Записки НТШ*, 1907, т. LXXX, с. 181 – 186.
- Руслан*, 14. 01. 1908, с. 1 – 3, МИЛЬКОВИЧ, Володимир. *Ще одна відповідь моїм напасникам*.
- Руслан*, 7. 10. 1907, с. 1 – 3, МИЛЬКОВИЧ, Володимир. *Відповідь моїм напасникам*.
- ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій – РАДЧЕНКО, Олег. *Листи Леопольда Карла Гетца до Михайла Грушевського*. in *Архіви України*, 2018, № 1, с. 244 – 254.
- ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. *Листи Михайла Грушевського до Олександра Лаппо-Данілевського*. In *Записки НТШ*, 2016, т. 270, с. 313 – 334.
- ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. *Польська грушевськіана кінця ХІХ – початку ХХ ст.: постаті та ідеї*. In: *Studia polsko-ukraińskie*, 2016, № 3, pp. 49 – 68.
- ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. *Рецензія Ніколає Йорги на «Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes» Михайла Грушевського*. In *Український археографічний щорічник*. Нова серія, 2007, випуск 12, с. 840 – 844.
- ТЕЛЬВАК, Віталій. *Чеська грушевськіана першої третини ХХ століття*. In *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*, 2008, випуск 19, с. 240 – 258.
- ТОМАШІВСЬКИЙ, Степан. *Нова книжка – нові часи (Проф. М. Грушевський – Очерк історії українського народу*. С-Пб., 1904). In *Літературно-науковий вістник*, 1905, т. XXIX, с. 43 – 53.

Words: 9 960

Characters including spaces: 65 725