

УДК 94 (477) (092) Грушевський
DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2024.1\(45\).699](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2024.1(45).699)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND EARLY HISTORICAL INTERESTS OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY: RECEPTIVE ASPECT

*Vitalii Telvak*¹, *Bohdan Yanyshyn*², *Volodymyr Nakonechnyi*³

¹ Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Drohobych, Ukraine)
e-mail: telvak1@yahoo.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X>

² Institute of the History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)
e-mail: bogdanyanyshyn@gmail.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0386-2530>

³ Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (Kyiv, Ukraine)
e-mail: nakonechniy.ua@gmail.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0386-2162>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research paper is to summarize a wide range of issues of an archaeological and early historical nature, actualized in the reviews of M. Hrushevsky.

The scientific novelty of the study is in the first special attempt at a complex reconstruction of archaeological and early historical subject matters of M. Hrushevsky's heritage.

Conclusions. The scope of M. Hrushevsky's archaeological interests is noted. Having been trained by V. Antonovych in archaeology, having practical experience in field excavations, and creating platforms for professional communication in the form of museums and journals, the scholar formed a panoramic vision of the achievements and problems of contemporary science. The picture of the state of archaeology in the late 19th – early 20th century offered by him was characterized by academic correctness, the accuracy of critical observations, and the innovative nature of proposals. He strived for the disciplinary modernization of Eastern European archaeological science, which, according to the reasoned opinion of M. Hrushevsky, was delayed at the stage of forming an empirical base. Of particular importance at the time was the scholar's defense of Ukrainian archaeological interests in typologizing the historical cultures in our ethnic lands in a polemic with Russian, Polish, and Western European colleagues. Such activity had a considerable public impact and was an organic component of the scholar's struggle for recognition of the academic rights of Ukrainian science.

In general, today, most of M. Hrushevsky's observations, expressed in discussions with fellow archaeologists, are mainly of historiographical interest. However, his calls to avoid haste in the classification of archaeological material, to interpret it in the widest possible cultural context, to select reflectively a theoretical and methodological array of tools, and to treat artifacts of the past with responsibility are relevant guidelines for Ukrainian science even nowadays.

Keywords: M. Hrushevsky, archaeological and early historical issues, review, reception, history of archaeological science

АРХЕОЛОГІЧНІ ТА РАННЬОІСТОРИЧНІ ЗАЦІКАВЛЕННЯ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО: РЕЦЕПТИВНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Віталій Тельвак¹, Богдан Янишин², Володимир Наконечний³

¹ Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет ім. Івана Франка (Дрогобич, Україна)
e-mail: telvak1@yahoo.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X>

² Інститут історії України НАН України (Київ, Україна)

e-mail: bogdanyanyshyn@gmail.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0386-2530>

³ Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв (Київ, Україна)

e-mail: nakonechniy.ua@gmail.com; ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0386-2162>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Мета статті – узагальнити широкий спектр проблематики археологічного та ранньоісторичного характеру, актуалізованої у рецензіях М. Грушевського.

Наукова новизна дослідження полягає у першій спеціальній спробі комплексної реконструкції археологічних і ранньоісторичних сюжетів спадщини М. Грушевського.

Висновки. У підсумку відзначено широту археологічних зацікавлень М. Грушевського. Пройшовши археологічний вишкіл у В. Антоновича, маючи практичний досвід польових розкопок, творячи майданчики професійної комунікації у вигляді музеїв і часописів, учений сформував панорамне бачення здобутків і проблем тогочасної науки. Запропонована ним картина стану археології кінця 19 – першої третини 20 ст. відзначалася академічною коректністю, влучністю критичних спостережень і новаторським характером пропозицій. Їхньою метою була дисциплінарна модернізація східноєвропейської археологічної науки, що на аргументовану думку М. Грушевського затрималася на стадії формування емпіричної бази. Особливу вагомість у той час мало обстоювання вченим у полеміці з російськими, польськими та західноєвропейськими колегами українського археологічного інтересу при типологізації історичних культур на наших етнічних землях. Ця діяльність мала чимале громадське навантаження та була органічною складовою змагань ученого за визнання академічних прав української науки.

Загалом, більшість спостережень М. Грушевського, висловлених у дискусіях з колегами-археологами, мають на сьогодні лише історіографічний інтерес. Втім, його заклики уникати поспішності в класифікації археологічного матеріалу, інтерпретувати його у можливо широкому культурному контексті, рефлексивно підбирати теоретико-методологічний інструментарій і відповідально ставитися до артефактів минулого і сьогодні є актуальними орієнтирами для української науки.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, археологічна та ранньоісторична проблематика, рецензія, рецепція, історія археологічної науки

INTRODUCTION

For a long time, Mykhailo Hrushevsky's reputation as the most prominent researcher of the Ukrainian past obscured other aspects of his diverse scientific interests. Only in recent decades, Hrushevsky studies have increasingly emphasized the universality of the scientist's creative personality, which is rare in our socio-humanities, and thus the need to pay special attention to his archaeographic, genealogical, numismatic, and other similar studies, which are traditionally grouped into the so-called special historical disciplines, only increased. At the same time, it is rightly noted that with a balanced understanding of the diversity of scientific interests

of the author of the History of Ukraine-Rus can we successfully solve the problem of creating his intellectual biography¹.

Given the above, the purpose of the study is to summarize a wide range of archaeological and early historical issues actualized in M. Hrushevsky's reviews.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Among other things, there are a few texts about the legacy of Hrushevsky-archaeologist. For the first time, the authoritative Ukrainian archaeologist Mykhailo Braichevsky specifically addressed this important historiographical subject. He focused on the participation of prominent scholar in some of the field expeditions of the time and, in particular, on his skilful handling of archaeological material in writing the first volume of the History of Ukraine-Rus². In turn, Volodymyr Petegyrych clarified the important issue of M. Hrushevsky's contribution to the formation of archaeological science in the Shevchenko Scientific Society (hereinafter – the SSS), which he headed. The Lviv researcher proved that Hrushevsky initiated field archaeological research, carried out scientific and theoretical interpretation of archaeological sources, initiated the creation of an archaeological department in the museum of the Society³, and so on. Oksana Surmach focused on the last of these subjects, reconstructing M. Hrushevsky's persistence in forming and replenishing the archaeological collections of the SSS⁴.

These studies, having reproduced the practical component of M. Hrushevsky's archaeological interests, drew research attention to their historiographical dimension. This refers to the fruitfulness of turning to the large-scale review heritage of the scientist, in which archaeological and early historical issues were reflectively comprehended. In his critical reviews of the works of his Ukrainian, Russian, and Western European contemporaries the prominent historian diagnosed the state of archaeological research in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, spoke decisively about many controversial issues and boldly proposed ways to solve them. All this evidence determines the relevance of the topic of our research.

PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

The most interesting for a researcher of Ukrainian science are M. Hrushevsky's observations on the state of contemporary archaeology, scattered throughout many critical texts. In general, the scientist was quite pessimistic in his assessments, as he repeatedly emphasized categorically: "The situation with our archaeology is quite sad"⁵. The main reason for this was the dominance of, in his words, "old-school amateurism"⁶ among his colleagues. The researcher was referring to the tragic situation of many

¹ Тельвак В. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4-16.

² Браїчевський М. Михайло Грушевський та археологія. *Український історик*. 1991-1992. Ч. 3-4 (110-111) / 1-4 (112-115). С. 200-217.

³ Петегирч В. Михайло Грушевський і формування археологічної науки в Науковому товаристві ім. Шевченка. *Вісник ХНУ: Серія: Історія*. 2018. Вип. 54. С. 143-156.

⁴ Сурmach О. Внесок Михайла Грушевського у розвиток українського музейництва. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. 2016-2021. Спецвипуск. С. 246-255.

⁵ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. В.В. Хвойко. Каменний век середнього Придніпров'я. *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах*. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 50.

⁶ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Н.Е. Бранденбург. Об аборигенах Киевского края... *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах*. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 52.

archaeological sites on Ukrainian lands, when their research in the 19th and early 20th centuries was often carried out by people without appropriate methodological training and sometimes even without basic professional knowledge. They ineptly laid pits, kept excavation diaries irregularly and without accurate recording of findings and their registration, poorly preserved the archaeological sites under study, contributed to the dispersal of artifacts across many private collections, and so on. As a result, many outstanding archaeological sites on Ukrainian lands were hopelessly lost to scientific study. Therefore, M. Hrushevsky repeatedly drew attention to the need to improve the methods of researching findings so that they are not irrevocably destroyed by various, in his words, pseudo-archaeologists. The scientist warned his colleagues against continuing old practices: “Nomina sunt odiosa, but before our eyes, such remains are being irrevocably destroyed by various ‘diggers’, even with very respectable names, cum summo appensu of scientific institutions, and as a result, ‘collections’ appear, and no one knows what to do with them later”⁷.

For M. Hrushevsky, the archaeological activities of the well-known amateur Vikentiy Khvoika were a telling illustration of this state of affairs. As is well known, he spent a long time exploring Paleolithic and Neolithic culture sites in the Ukrainian territories under the rule of the Russian empire. At the same time, the archaeologist did not familiarize the scientific community with the results of his work promptly. Among historians, this caused a growing concern about his professionalism. When the first generalizing studies by V. Khvoika appeared, they confirmed the validity of this concern. It was expressed by M. Hrushevsky in his review of the book ‘Stone Age of the Middle Prydniprov’ia’ by a Dnipro amateur. The critic complains that the author describes the various types of material excavated for many years in a few pages or even a few lines, and speaks of excavations and findings in general, without giving any detailed description of the excavation schemes and the location of findings. In addition, as M. Hrushevsky points out, V. Khvoika does not analyze the material he collected at all, and does not compare it with similar findings, giving only a priori observations, mostly of biased content. As a result, Hrushevsky renders a harsh verdict of the professional incompetence of the author, emphasizing the tragic consequences of his work for science. “In general, the authentic publication”, asserts M. Hrushevsky, “completely confirms the impression given by previous excerpts from second-hand reports: Khvoika, having an orientation letter, came across a large mass of very interesting stations and monuments of prehistoric life and, without the slightest scientific preparation and without consulting guidelines, instructions and restraint, and entrusting the excavations to various factors on his own, he irreversibly damaged a huge mass of precious archaeological material”⁸. It should be noted that the critical speech of M. Hrushevsky and some of his colleagues resulted in the St. Petersburg Archaeological Commission taking away V. Khvoika’s right to conduct excavations.

Another eloquent example that M. Hrushevsky cited from Galician archaeology was the study by his colleague at Lviv University, Isidor Sharanevych, of such a landmark of Vysotske culture as a large burial ground in the village of Chekhy, Brody district. Like his Naddniproian colleague, the Galician historian conducted the excavations without adhering to correct methodology, entrusting the work to his students and a local folk

⁷ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Археологическая летопись Южной России. *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 48.

⁸ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. В.В. Хвойко. Каменный век среднего Приднепровья... С. 50.

teacher without proper advisory supervision of their work. "These people, however, were not properly acquainted with scientific requirements, and as a result", M. Hrushevsky complained, "one of the largest tombs known on our territory was largely lost to science"⁹.

It is worth noting that M. Hrushevsky not only diagnosed the most desperate state of Ukrainian archaeology of his time but also explained to his colleagues the sad consequences of their lack of professionalism. By his example, he demonstrated and popularized the standards of modern science. This refers, for example, to the aforementioned excavations in Chekhy, which the researcher continued during the second half of the 1890s after I. Sharanevych. By publishing his excavation diary on the pages of the 'Notes of the SSS' M. Hrushevsky demonstrated in practice the scientific method of excavations and the requirements for keeping a field notebook¹⁰. Therefore, only 14 skeletons excavated and described by M. Hrushevsky became the property of further researchers of Vysotske culture, while 350-370 skeletons excavated by his predecessor were lost to science¹¹.

Along with condemning the unprofessional actions of some archaeologists, M. Hrushevsky, in contrast, popularized in his reviews the practices of archaeological research worthy of imitation. He most favorably evaluated the excavations conducted by his teacher Volodymyr Antonovych. The Lviv professor emphasizes that the long-term archaeological practice of his senior colleague has become a model for the professional community of systematized and 'planned research'. This, M. Hrushevsky argues, determined his teacher's special place in Ukrainian archaeology. For the first time in Ukrainian historiography, while writing an intellectual biography of the founder of the Kyiv school of documentalists, Hrushevsky noted: "Prof. Antonovych, having begun his scientific activity with archaeographic publications and documentary research, later began to divide his scientific interests between history and prehistoric archaeology [...] and in recent years has been working mainly in archaeology, where he has earned one of the most prominent places and the role of the main representative of Ukrainian-Rus archaeology. His work, seemingly mechanical, has its significant scientific advantages; Prof. Antonovych, as a deep connoisseur of archaeology, widely acquainted with archaeological Ukrainian-Rus material, could perform it exceptionally well, fully oriented and confident in his subject"¹².

Another important problem of modern archaeological science, which was a sign of its difficult professionalization, was the slow exit from the stage of empiric accumulation of materials. Hrushevsky meant that his fellow archaeologists, fascinated by excavations, were in no hurry to inform the public about their achievements and were too slow to process the findings. As a result, despite the considerable intensity of the field research, there was an acute lack of synthetic studies prepared by specialists or even just descriptions of the work performed. "Anyone who has dealt with Slavic archaeology in any way", explains the Lviv professor, "knows well what a chaotic state

⁹ *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. D[octo]r Izydor Szaraniewicz. Smentarzyska przedhistoryczne we wsiach Czechach i Wysocku, w powiecie Brodzkim. *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 40.

¹⁰ *Грушевський М.* Дальші розкопки в с. Чехах. *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2003. Т. 5. С. 145.

¹¹ *Отрощенко В.* Коментарі. *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2003. Т. 5. С. 455-457.

¹² *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. В.Б. Антонович. Археологическая карта Киевской губернии. *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 3.

it is in, how there is a lack of the simplest sets of materials scattered in various rare publications, a lack of any scientific reviews and monographs that would cover the entire Slavic region [...]”¹³. Given this, in many critical reviews, M. Hrushevsky strongly encourages his colleagues to summarize the material received and inform the general public about their achievements.

The author of the ‘History of Ukraine-Rus’ rightly considers the existence of a professional periodical to be an effective tool for such professional communication, as well as a tribune for promptly familiarizing oneself with the progress of excavations. M. Hrushevsky paid a lot of attention to abstracting and critically analyzing the content of archaeological journals. Among the publications from the Dnipro region, the Lviv professor was particularly sympathetic to Mykola Bilyashivskyi’s media brainchild, the Archaeological Chronicle of Southern Russia, which originally existed as a thematic supplement to ‘Kyivska Staryna’ and later became an independent publication. The historian carefully abstracted almost every issue of this journal for the readers of the ‘Notes of the SSS’. He highlighted the unusual circumstance that the only professional publication in the entire Russian Empire was being produced by one enthusiast, since in 1900 the Archaeological News and Notes of the Moscow Archaeological Society ceased to be published. Therefore, M. Hrushevsky called on researchers to unite around the journal, “so that his (M. Bilyashivsky’s) efforts would be more vigorously supported by all those interested in archaeology in Russian Ukraine and to enable him to continue to maintain this useful publication; otherwise, until now, the circle of assistants and employees is too small!”¹⁴.

Among the Western professional journals, M. Hrushevsky most actively reviewed the ‘Věstnik slovanských starožitnosti’ edited by the famous Czech Slavic scholar Lubor Niederle. Its pages also contained a lot about the results of research on archaeological cultures that existed on Ukrainian lands. L. Niederle’s plan to regularly familiarize the Western European public with the latest developments in Slavic archaeology was received by the Lviv professor ‘with the greatest sympathy’. M. Hrushevsky was particularly impressed by the editor-in-chief’s desire to turn his journal into a platform for interdisciplinary polylogue among specialists focusing on the early history of mankind. In reviewing the first issue of the ‘Journal of Slavic Starožitnosti’, he emphasized: “Given the close ties that exist, especially for the first stages of historical evolution, between anthropology, archeology, ethnology, history, linguistics, the existence of a review where the results of research in these sciences would be presented, is very necessary, especially for Slavic antiquities, which are being developed in seven (or more) Slavic literatures, not to mention non-Slavic ones, often in local, rare and inaccessible publications”¹⁵. Recognizing the importance of L. Niederle’s journal for popularizing the achievements of Slavic archaeology, M. Hrushevsky. and his students established fruitful cooperation with the publication¹⁶.

¹³ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. В.М. Флоринский. Первобытные славяне по памятникам их доисторической жизни. *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах*. Львів: Світ, 2008. Т. 14. С. 23.

¹⁴ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Археологическая летопись Южной России... *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах*. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 37.

¹⁵ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Věstnik slovanských starožitnosti... *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах*. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 88-89.

¹⁶ *Telvak V., Telvak V. Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Czech historiography (the first third of the 20th century). Codrul Cosminului*. 2019. Vol. XXV. No. 2. P. 265-286.

It is worth noting that M. Hrushevsky's understanding of the importance of archaeological periodicals for professional communication also had a practical dimension. Thus, while editing the historical publications of the SSS, the scientist constantly informed the public about the results of excavations carried out by the Shevchenko Society¹⁷. This is evidenced by both a considerable number of archaeological studies in the 'Notes of the SSS' and the chronicle of Galician excavations contained in the 'Chronicle of the SSS'. It should be noted that the elucidation of the considerable archaeological potential of these publications is a promising historiographical task.

Along with journals, M. Hrushevsky considered museums to be effective platforms for the professional communication of archaeologists and the popularization of their achievements. The historian explained their importance while contrasting them to private collections, popular at that time, that included smuggled artifacts that fell out of scientific circulation. Illustrating the problems of access to such collections, M. Hrushevsky cited the example of the Dzieduszycki Museum, which housed the bulk of the famous Mykhalkiv treasure. Despite the considerable scientific significance of this finding, the owner's decision, according to the scholar, kept it "jealously guarded for a long time, more firmly hidden under the mystery of the seven apocalyptic seals than underground". Condemning such a non-academic attitude of the owner of the collection, the Lviv professor noted: "This fact does not bring honor to the Dzieduszycki Institute or to the Polish science it represents, and the situation in front of these locked doors of the Galician circle of conservatives, who are supposed to provide antiquities for scientific use, becomes tragicomic"¹⁸.

Many scholars also wrote about the activities of the Naddniprians' museums of antiquities, reviewing descriptions of their collections and stock collections. At the same time, he expressed several methodological suggestions, insisting on the creation of as detailed inventories as possible, which would provide information on the origin of the artifacts, the method of their dating, the fact of originality or falsification, etc. The historian devoted most of his attention to the publications of the staff of one of the first Ukrainian museums, Borys Khanenko, whose collections, according to him, are of "considerable scientific interest"¹⁹. It should be noted that in this case, too, M. Hrushevsky's interest in archaeological museum collections was of practical interest. As we mentioned at the beginning of the article, it was the longtime head of the National Academy of Sciences who initiated the creation and authored the concept of the Shevchenko Society Museum, where the archaeological collection on the eve of the First World War was distinguished by the richness and value of the exhibits²⁰.

¹⁷ *Telvak V., Pedych V., Telvak V.* Historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Lviv: formation, structure, personal contribution. *Studia Historiae Scientiarum*. 2021. Vol. 20. P. 239-261.

¹⁸ *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. Doctor Izydor Szaraniewicz. Smentarzyska przedhistoryczne we wsiach Czechach i Wysocku, w powiecie Brodzkim... С. 42.

¹⁹ *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. Собрание Б. И. и В. Н. Ханенко. *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах.* Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 38-39.

²⁰ *Telvak V., Telvak V.* The First Institutional Encyclopaedia in Ukraine. Naukove tovarystvo imeni Shevchenka: Entsyklopediya (Shevchenko Scientific Society: Encyclopaedia). *Studia Historiae Scientiarum*. 2022. Vol. 21. P. 423-432.

TERMINOLOGICAL, CONCEPTUAL, THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES

M. Hrushevsky's observations on terminology, conceptual, theoretical, and methodological issues contained in his critical reviews of archaeological publications of the time are of no less interest to a researcher of Ukrainian science. The focus of the scientist's terminological investigation was the need to defend the historical right of the toponym 'Ukraine' and the expediency of its use in the scientific literature regarding the territories inhabited by our people since early history. The point was that in the times of Ukrainian statelessness, a manipulative tradition was formed to mark the space from the Syan to the Danube with the ethnonyms of the political dominants. Thus, the Ukrainian right bank was often labeled 'Polish lands', and the Naddniprianshchyna was usually called Russian territory. Following this logic, all archaeological cultures of Ukraine were covered with foreign ethnonyms, which created the idea of Ukrainianness as a somewhat artificial civilizational phenomenon that belonged exclusively to modern times. Overcoming this offensive tradition for our people, M. Hrushevsky in numerous reviews of works by Polish²¹, Russian²², German²³, Romanian²⁴, Czech²⁵, and French²⁶ colleagues consistently proved the autochthony of Ukrainians on their ethnic territory from the earliest historical period.

M. Hrushevsky's principled defense of the historical and cultural rights of Ukrainians at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries is also evidenced by the scientific policy implemented by the scientist as chairman of the National Academy of Sciences. His uncompromising position on the admission of Ukrainian-language reports to Russian archaeological congresses was particularly noticeable. This situation first arose in 1899, when the XI Archaeological Congress was to be held in Kyiv. Even though all Slavic languages were recognized as its working languages, the Ukrainian delegation was denied the right to speak in its language. Therefore, at a meeting of the Historical and Philosophical Section of the Scientific Society, it was decided not to participate in the congress, as the organizing committee, at the Society's request, stated: "Reports can only be admitted in purely Russian to the pages of the Congress Proceedings"²⁷. At the

²¹ *Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V.* Between cooperation and conflict: Mykhailo Hrushevskiy through the eyes of Polish intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Echa Przeszłości*. 2023. Vol. XXIV/2. P. 89-104; *Telvak V., Telvak V.* Ukrainian historiography in the mirror of polish journalism (Mykhailo Hrushevsky contra Francishek Ravita-Gavronsky). *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. 2018. Вип. 7. С. 46-53; *Тельвак В., Курилишин К., Тельвак В.* Михайло Грушевський та часопис «Діло»: співпраця, конфлікти, рецепція (до 1914 р.). *Рукописна та книжкова спадщина України*. 2022. Вип. 28. С. 347-371.

²² *Telvak V., Salata O.* Reception of Hrushevsky studies: epistolary aspect. *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. 2021. Вип. 20. С. 32-39.

²³ *Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V.* Between history and politics: the image of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in German Slavic studies of the first third of the 20th century. *Przegląd nauk historycznych*. 2021. R. XX. Nr 2. S. 103-125.

²⁴ *Telvak V., Ilnytskyi V.* Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Nicolae Iorga: scholars' struggle over the national history. *Codrul Cosminului*. 2018. Vol. XXIV. No. 1. P. 53-64.

²⁵ *Telvak V., Yanyshyn B.* „Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) volkes“ of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the discussions of the beginning of the XXth century. *Studia Historica Nitriensia*. 2021. Vol. 25. No. 1. P. 71-90.

²⁶ *Тельвак В., Луняк Є.* Листи Андре Мазона до Михайла та Катерини Грушевських. *Український історичний журнал*. 2022. № 5. С. 244-256; *Тельвак В.В., Тельвак В.П.* Михайло Грушевський у колі французьких колег: проблеми рецепції. *Емінак*. 2022. № 4 (40). С. 120-138.

²⁷ *Справа українсько-руської мови на Київському археологічному з'їзді й участь в нім Товариства. Записки НТШ*. 1898. Т. XXIX. С. 2.

same meeting, a decision was made to publish the abstracts submitted for the congress in separate volumes of the 'Notes of the SSS'.

M. Hrushevsky's reaction to the terminological prejudices of his colleagues from other national historiographical environments was especially emotional in the post-revolutionary period. The historian rightly expected that the collapse of European empires should have given foreign researchers an understanding of the justice of Ukrainians' claims to cultural and historical equality with their neighbors. Instead, as the scholar repeatedly lamented in critical reviews, imperial stereotypes were fading extremely slowly, as evidenced by the continued conflation of ethnic and political categories in the scholarly literature. Thus, in a review of M. Rostovtsev's well-known work 'Hellenism and Iranianism in the South of Russia', M. Hrushevsky reasonably accused the author of deliberate manipulations with the ethnonyms 'Rus' and 'Russia', which in the context of studying early history rather disoriented the Western reader than gave him any cognitive guidance. "[...] The author himself does a disservice to his readers by diligently twisting into one tangle of 'Russia' all these cultural areas and epochs, so far removed from the forms and phenomena that are usually thought of under this term", M. Hrushevsky summarized his critical review. The author's attempts to emphasize the historical continuity of this formation and its organic ties to those distant epochs and cultures will not clarify but obscure their historical perspective. The Moscow scribes of the eleventh and seventeenth centuries worked in seven directions, and Ukrainian historiography set one of its tasks to unwind this tangle of intentional and unintentional substitutions and mix-ups. Unfortunately, Ilovaysky's old scheme, contrary to the decentralizing tendencies of the revolution, finds new defenders among scholars that are supposed to know better"²⁸.

But if terminological biases on the part of the students of the Russian imperial historiographical school could still be explained by the mental trauma of the collapse of the Romanov state, then M. Hrushevsky was completely unable to understand the inertia of thinking of his colleagues who represented other Slavic countries that had similar experiences of imperial cultural oppression to Ukrainians. Thus, in a review of the popular book of the Czech Slavic scholar L. Niederle 'Slovanské Starožitnosti', the Ukrainian researcher accuses the honored worker of science of "...various Russophile and other prejudices that he considers it his duty to manifest in his works"²⁹. The reviewer argues that they only distract the reader from the logic of the author's reconstruction and do no honor to the scholar himself or to Czech Slavic studies.

Along with discussing terminological issues in an axiological way, M. Hrushevsky initiated terminological discussions of a purely scientific nature in his reviews. In this case, the impetus for the scientist was a certain habit of East Slavic colleagues to apply the names of archaeological cultures proposed by Western researchers to the material of Ukrainian excavations without proper methodological reflection. Warning Ukrainian researchers of antiquity against such terminological indiscriminacy, the author of the 'History of Ukraine-Rus' calls on them to comprehensively study the archaeological material obtained as a necessary basis for its definition. Thus, summarizing the dispute between F. Vovk and V. Khvoyka about the definition of the era (according to the

²⁸ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. М.И. Ростовцев. Эллинство и иранство на юге России... Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2015. Т. 10. Кн. 2. С. 226.

²⁹ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Dr. Lubor Niederle. Slovanské Starožitnosti... Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2015. Т. 10. Кн. 2. С. 245.

versions of the debaters, the Late Magdalenian or 'pure mammoth era') to which the ornamented mammoth tusks found during the excavations of the Kyryliv site belong, M. Hrushevsky emphasized: "I will not go deeper into this controversy, but I will raise M. Bilyashivsky's idea, which I also raised when abstracting Mr. Vovk's research at the section of the National Academy of Sciences, that it is still quite premature to transfer the Western classification to our findings and adjust our phenomena to their types"³⁰.

In general, repeatedly updating in his reviews the terminological aspects of contemporary archaeological research, M. Hrushevsky defends the thesis of the fundamental conventionality and largely conventional concepts used by his colleagues. In this regard, the scientist's favorite example was the concept of 'Scytho-Sarmatian culture' that was widespread at the time. Demonstrating its exclusively instrumental suitability for analyzing archaeological sites of a certain time and type, the historian called on his colleagues to reflectively serve these definitions³¹. Explaining to the reader his own understanding of its content, M. Hrushevsky noted: "'Scythe type' in modern archaeology is a completely conventional name: it means all types of Iron Age culture before the Slavic migration; with a certain reservation, this name can be used as a definition of early Iron Age culture in general, as a term not ethnographic, but chronological and cultural"³².

His methodological observations were also important for the Ukrainian archaeology of M. Hrushevsky's time. In this regard, it should be noted that in his reviews of archaeological literature, the author of the History of Ukraine-Rus appears as an ardent advocate of interdisciplinary research. According to the scholar, interdisciplinary cooperation is especially important for researchers of early history, as in the face of an objective lack of sources of the same type for making correct scientific conclusions, the importance of the achievements of related scientific disciplines is growing significantly. Given this, M. Hrushevsky in many critical reviews proved the necessity and fruitfulness of cooperation between archaeologists, anthropologists, ethnographers, and linguists for the study of the early historical period of mankind.

For example, in his review of Fedir Leontovych's work 'Aryan Foundations of the Social Life of the Ancient Slavs', M. Hrushevsky shows how the author's use of only one type of source, linguistic, resulted in unreliable historical constructions. Illustrating the latter, the critic notes: "But what may be most offensive are the philological arguments on which the author bases his conclusions. For example, speaking of the influence of pastoral life on social relations, the author presents as a remarkable fact the connection between the meanings of shepherd, clan chief, prince, etc., and as proof gives a parallel between the Iranian pan, ban, gôbân and côban and the Slavic 'choban', 'zhupan', 'ban' and 'pan' [...]; the author lists many more similar analogies"³³. Thus, the critic advises the authoritative legal historian to familiarize himself with the achievements of his colleagues representing related disciplines.

³⁰ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Археологическая летопись Южной России... Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 48-49.

³¹ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Études sur l'archéologie de l'Ukraine antérieure à notre ère, par le baron de Baue. Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 14.

³² Грушевський М. [Рец.]. В.Б. Антонович. Археологическая карта Киевской губернии... С. 8.

³³ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Ф. И. Леонтович. Арийские основы общественного быта древних славян... Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 92.

The absolutization of the evidence of linguistic sources, as M. Hrushevsky pointed out, misled his Russian friend Alexander Shakhmatov. As is well known, the author of the 'History of Ukraine-Rus' for a long time argued with the latter's theory of the existence of the Old Rus nation³⁴. This theory, according to the Ukrainian scholar, was built purely speculatively based on ancient Rus literary artifacts previously selected by the Russian academician. M. Hrushevsky equally consistently opposed A. Shakhmatov's hypothesis about the genesis and settlement of East Slavic tribes, also based solely on the study of the reconstruction of language dialects. As a result, the Ukrainian scholar emphasized, this "preference for theoretical construction over observation and analysis" in the works of the Russian linguist left his theories with only historiographical interest³⁵.

Similar to linguists, M. Hrushevsky argues, archaeologists and ethnologists also reach erroneous conclusions when they ignore the achievements of their colleagues in other fields of social sciences and humanities. As an example, the scholar cites Gustav Kossina's controversial book on the settlement of the Aryan tribe, in which he identified the territory of northern Germany as the homeland of the Germans solely based on fragmentary evidence from archaeological excavations. Accusing his German colleague of not ignoring the achievements of fellow linguists, M. Hrushevsky once again emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary understanding of early history. "I will not go into the arguments of Professor Kossina – his work is only of methodological interest, and it is negative", the reviewer concludes. "The author has been and remains one of the most vocal representatives of the skeptical view of the value of linguistic findings for prehistoric research, which is now very common among archaeologists and anthropologists. The methods of linguists, of course, need to be corrected and monitored, but all the skeptical notes of anthropologists and archaeologists lose all impression on linguists when they provide compositions similar to [...] this article by Dr. Kossina in place of linguistic elucidations"³⁶.

Another methodological problem of the archaeology of the time, which M. Hrushevsky actualized in his reviews, was the abuse of the so-called 'ethnological' method by researchers of early history. In his opinion, it was a matter of hasty attempts by his colleagues to apply ethnic markers to archaeological findings caused by the rapid growth of national identity among European nations at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. As a result, a public demand was formed to find the earliest possible genesis of their ethnicity. As a consistent supporter of positivist skepticism about theorizing, M. Hrushevsky urged his archaeological colleagues not to rush to conclusions in cases where the discovered fragment of the past is not sufficiently informative for broader generalizations. Offering a methodological alternative, the scholar advised "to stick to the typological method for now and not to rush to ethnographic classification"³⁷.

³⁴ *Telvak V., Salata O.* Reception of Hrushevsky studies: epistolary aspect. *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. 2021. Вип. 20. С. 32-39.

³⁵ *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. А.А. Спицын. Обзорение некоторых губерний и областей России в археологическом отношении... *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 53-55.

³⁶ *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. Die indogermanische Frage archäologisch beantwortet... *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 51.

³⁷ *Грушевський М.* [Рец.]. Д[окто]р Любор Нидерле. Человечество в доисторические времена. *Грушевський М.С.* Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 10-13.

Along with methodological observations, M. Hrushevsky's reviews contain many purely methodological reflections. For example, for a long time keeping in view the activities of fellow archaeologists, the scientist repeatedly pointed out the need for uniformity of archaeological interest. The point was that the efforts of most Ukrainian researchers of early history focused on the then fashionable and 'spectacular' problems of studying the Hellenistic culture of the Northern Black Sea region or the Old Rus period. Instead, many other, no less important archaeological cultures and epochs, according to the historian's apt observation, remained 'under siege'. Therefore, M. Hrushevsky fully supported and popularized in many reviews M. Bilyashivsky's call to Ukrainian colleagues "that all the attention of researchers should not be drawn to prehistoric and princely archaeology, but should also be engaged in later antiquities"³⁸.

The intensity of M. Hrushevsky's appeal to archaeological and early historical literature allows us to draw conclusions about his reviewing style. In general, in his critical reviews, the historian appears to be a thorough and rather friendly analyst who shows great respect for the hard work of his colleagues. Given this, the architectonics of his critical reviews always prioritizes the discussion of the innovative and successful aspects of the work under review. Furthermore, professing the maxim "every human work always has something to correct"³⁹, the scholar proceeds to identify polemical subjects and clarify shortcomings. At the same time, M. Hrushevsky necessarily expresses his vision of the problem that is being worked out in the text under discussion. At the end of the critical review, the scholar usually thanks the reviewed author for the work done, thereby 'sweetening' sometimes rather sharp polemical criticisms or outright miscalculations. A striking example of such a narrative strategy is M. Hrushevsky's review of Volodymyr Yastrebov's work 'Experience of Topographic Survey of Antiquities of the Kherson Province'. Having made many methodological and substantive criticisms of the Russian archaeologist, the Ukrainian reviewer summarized: "To reiterate, our attention does not diminish the value of Mr. Yastrebov's work, it touches on minor points, and the work remains a useful contribution to the archaeological literature on Ukraine-Rus"⁴⁰.

As friendly and constructive as M. Hrushevsky's attitude is to the work of his professional colleagues, he is equally sharp and ironic in his assessment of the opuses of amateurs. This sharpness was caused both by the aforementioned barbaric attitude to some archaeological sites and by the academic culture of the scientist, who consistently advocated a responsible attitude to scientific popularization, which was often carried out by people who were not prepared for it. Therefore, in many of the historian's reviews, we find requirements for the works under discussion to be 'clear, transparent, consistently systematic'⁴¹ to avoid 'unscientific elucidations', to adhere to basic linguistic and stylistic norms, and so on. M. Hrushevsky's tone becomes especially sarcastic in cases of the pretentiousness of amateurs to scientific discoveries. An idea of the style of such criticism is given by the historian's response to the work of Russian anthropologist Richard Weinberg 'Slavs and their physical evolution'. "It [the article] is

³⁸ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Археологическая летопись Южной России. С. 49.

³⁹ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. В.Б. Антонович. Археологическая карта Киевской губернии... С. 3-8.

⁴⁰ Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Ястребов В.Н. Опыт топографического обозрения древностей Херсонской губернии... Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2008. Т. 14. С. 8.

⁴¹ Грушевський М. Огляд праць Н. Кондакова з історії староруської штуки. Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2005. Т. 7. С. 483-494.

written noisily, with great claims, with a willingness to make predictions in a nationalistic tone, and at the same time, it is unusually vague, unfounded, and with obvious lack of knowledge about the subject”, the Ukrainian scholar concludes. – The author, however, does not want the Slavs to be a mixed race, and he argues in favor of this stance but in such a way that I cannot summarize the arguments into any clear theses. He is especially interested in the apologia of the Great Rus type [...]. With emphasis, he exalts that his ‘hypotheses and positions’ were first expressed by him and that they show the way ‘to the ultimate goal’ of science. That’s not the way, sir!”⁴².

Finally, we would like to mention M. Hrushevsky’s self-reflection as an archaeologist. Despite his aforementioned participation in excavations, organization of specialized museums, and interested reaction to the flow of historiographical products, the historian was rather modest in his assessment of his professional status in this field. This is evidenced by the fact that he used the pseudonym ‘Stranger’ when signing the article ‘Ukrainian Scientists and Russian Archaeological Congresses’, as discovered by Olha Kakovkina. Paying tribute to the modesty of the author of the ‘History of Ukraine-Rus’, the Dnipro historian rightly noted: “However, his statesmanlike position of protesting the ban on the Ukrainian language as a working language at the XI-XIV archaeological congresses is a model not only for archaeologists of the time. M. Hrushevsky organically introduced archaeology into the context and concept of the history of Ukraine-Rus’. This fact alone is enough to not consider him an outsider to our science”⁴³.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we would like to note the breadth of Hrushevsky’s archaeological interests as a historiographer. Having passed the school of archaeological training with V. Antonovych, having practical experience in field excavations, creating platforms for professional communication in the form of museums and magazines, the scientist formed a panoramic vision of the achievements and problems of the science of that time. The picture of the state of archaeology in the late 19th and early 20th centuries offered by him was characterized by academic correctness, accurate critical observations, and innovative proposals. Their goal was the disciplinary modernization of Eastern European archaeological science, which, according to M. Hrushevsky’s reasoned opinion, was delayed at the stage of forming an empirical base. Of particular importance at the time was the scientist’s defense of Ukrainian archaeological interests in the typology of historical cultures in our ethnic lands in a polemic with Russian, Polish, and Western European colleagues. This activity had a considerable public impact and was an organic component of the scientist’s struggle for the recognition of the academic rights of Ukrainian science. In general, most of M. Hrushevsky’s observations expressed in discussions with fellow archaeologists are of historiographical interest today. However, his calls to avoid haste in the classification of archaeological material, to interpret it in the broadest possible cultural context, to select theoretical and methodological tools reflectively, and to treat artifacts of the past responsibly are still relevant guidelines for Ukrainian socio-humanities today.

⁴² Грушевський М. [Рец.]. Приват-доцент Р. Вейнберг. Славяне и их физическая эволюция... *Грушевський М.С. Твори у 50-и томах. Львів: Світ, 2012. Т. 15. С. 100.*

⁴³ Цит. за: *Отрощенко В. Коментарі. С. 456.*

REFERENCES

- Braichevskiy, M.** (1991-1992). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy ta arkheolohiia [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and archeology]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk, 3-4 (110-111) / 1-4 (112-115)*, 200-217 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2003). Dalshi rozkopky v s. Chekhakh [Further excavations in the village Czechs]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 5. Lviv: Svit, p. 145 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2005). Ohliad prats N. Kondakova z istorii staroruskoi shtuky [Review of N. Kondakov's works on the history of the Old Russian piece]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 7. Lviv: Svit, pp. 483-494 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2008). [Rec.]. V.M. Florinskiy. Pervobytnye slaviane po pamiatnykam ikh doistoricheskoi zhyzni [[Rev.]. V.M. Florinskiy. Primitive Slavs according to the monuments of their prehistoric life]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 14. Lviv: Svit, p. 23 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2008). [Rec.]. Yastrebov V.N. Opyt topograficheskogo obozreniya drevnostei Khersonskoi gubernii... [[Rev.]. Yastrebov V.N. Experience of topographical survey of antiquities of the Kherson province...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 14. Lviv: Svit, p. 8 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Arkheologicheskaya letopis Yuzhnoi Rossii... [[Rev.]. Archaeological chronicle of Southern Russia...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 37 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Arkheologicheskaya letopis Yuzhnoi Rossii... [[Rev.]. Archaeological chronicle of Southern Russia...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, pp. 48-49 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Sobranie B.I. i V.N. Khanenko [[Rev.]. Collection of B.I. and V.N. Khanenko]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, pp. 38-39 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Die indogermanische Frage archäologisch beantwortet... [[Rev.]. The Indo-European question answered archaeologically...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 51 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Doctor Izydor Szaraniewicz. Cmentarzyska przedhistoryczne we wsiach Czechach i Wysocku, w powiecie Brodzkim [[Rev.]. Doctor Izydor Szaraniewicz. Prehistoric cemeteries in the villages of Czechach and Wysock, Brody powiat]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 40 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Doktor Liubor Nyderle. Chelovechestvo v doistorycheskye vremena [[Rev.]. Dr. Lubor Niederle. Humanity in prehistoric times]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, pp. 10-13 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Études sur l'archéologie de l'Ukraine antérieure à notre ère, par le baron de Baye [[Rev.]. Studies on the archeology of Ukraine before our era, by Baron de Baye]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 14 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. F.I. Leontovich. Ariyskie osnovy obshchestvennogo byta drevnikh slavian... [[Rev.]. F.I. Leontovich. Aryan foundations of the social life of the ancient Slavs...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 92 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. N.E. Brandenburh. Ob aboryhenakh Kyevsokho kraia... [[Rev.]. N. E. Brandenburg. About the natives of the Kyiv region...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 52 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Privat-dotsent R. Veinberg. Slaviane i ikh fizicheskaya evoliutsiya... [[Rev.]. Private Associate Professor R. Weinberg. Slavs and their physical evolution...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 100 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. V.B. Antonovich. Arkheologicheskaya karta Kievskoi gubernii [[Rev.]. V.B. Antonovich. Archaeological map of the Kyiv province]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 3 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. V.V. Khvoiko. Kamennyi vek srednego Pridneprov'ia [[Rev.]. V.V. Khvoiko. Stone Age of the Middle Dnieper region]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, p. 50 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. Věstnik slovanských starožitnosti... [[Rev.]. Bulletin of Slavic Antiquities...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, pp. 88-89 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2012). [Rec.]. A.A. Spitsyn. Obozrenie nekotorykh gubernii i oblastei Rosii v arkheologicheskoi otnoshenii... [[Rev.]. A.A. Spitsyn. Review of some provinces and regions of Russia in archaeological terms...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 15. Lviv: Svit, pp. 53-55 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2015). [Rec.]. Dr. Lubor Niederle. Slovanské Starožitnosti... [[Rev.]. Dr. Lubor Niederle. Slavic Antiquities...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S. Tvory**. Vol. 10 (2). Lviv: Svit, p. 245 [in Ukrainian].

- Hrushevskiy, M.** (2015). [Rec.]. M.I. Rostovtsev. Ellinstvo i iranstvo na yuge Rossii... [[Rev.]. M.I. Rostovtsev. Hellenism and Iran in the South of Russia...]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S.** *Tvory*. Vol. 10 (2). Lviv: Svit, p. 226 [in Ukrainian].
- Otroshchenko, V.** (2003). Komentari [Comments]. In **Hrushevskiy, M.S.** *Tvory*. Vol. 5. Lviv: Svit, pp. 455-457 [in Ukrainian].
- Petehyrych, V.** (2018). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i formuvannia arkeolohichnoi nauky v Naukovomu tovarystvi im. Shevchenka [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and the formation of archaeological science in the Scientific Society named after Shevchenko]. *Visnyk KhNU: Seriya: Istoriia*, 54, 143-156 [in Ukrainian].
- Surmach, O.** (2016-2021). Vnesok Mykhaila Hrushevskoho u rozvytok ukrainskoho muzeinytstva [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's contribution to the development of Ukrainian museology]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu, seriya istorychna (spetsvypusk)*, 246-255 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V. & Ilnytskyi, V.** (2018). Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Nicolae Iorga: scholars' struggle over the national history. *Codrul Cosminului*, XXIV, 1, 53-64 [in English].
- Telvak, V., Kurylyshyn, K. & Telvak, V.** (2022). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy ta chasopys «Dilo»: spivpratsia, konflikty, retseptsiia (do 1914 r.) [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and 'Dilo' newspaper: cooperation, conflicts, reception (before 1914)]. *Rukopysna ta knyzhкова spadshchyna Ukrainy*, 28, 347-371. DOI: 10.15407/rksu.28.347 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V. & Luniak, Ye.** (2022). Lysty Andre Mazona do Mykhaila ta Kateryny Hrushevskiykh [Andre Mazon's letters to Mykhailo and Kateryna Hrushevskiy]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 5, 244-256. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2022.05.204 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V. & Pedych, V. & Telvak, V.** (2021). Historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Lviv: formation, structure, personal contribution. *Studia Historiae Scientiarum*, 20, 239-261. DOI: 10.4467/2543702XSHS.21.009.14040 [in English].
- Telvak, V. & Sabinskyi, M.** (2022). «Boi za Hrushevskoho»: doba Ukrainsoi revoliutsii v dyskusiakh diaspornykh intelektualiv povoiennoho dvadtsiatylittia [‘Battles for Hrushevskiy’: era of Ukrainian Revolution in Diaspora intellectuals discussions of post-war twenty years]. *Eminak*, 1 (37), 100-109. DOI: 10.33782/eminak2022.1(37).574 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V. & Salata, O.** (2021). Reception of Hrushevsky studies: epistolary aspect. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 20, 32-39. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240046 [in English].
- Telvak, V. & Telvak, V.** (2018). Ukrainian historiography in the mirror of polish journalism (Mykhailo Hrushevsky contra Francishek Ravita-Gavrinsky). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 7, 46-53. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130671 [in English].
- Telvak, V. & Telvak, V.** (2019). Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Czech historiography (the first third of the 20th century). *Codrul Cosminului*, XXV (2), 265-286. DOI: 10.4316/CC.2019.02.002 [in English].
- Telvak, V. & Telvak, V.** (2022). The First Institutional Encyclopaedia in Ukraine. Naukove tovarystvo imeni Shevchenka: Entsyklopediya (Shevchenko Scientific Society: Encyclopaedia). *Studia Historiae Scientiarum*, 21, 423-432. DOI: 10.4467/2543702XSHS.22.013.15979 [in English].
- Telvak, V. & Yanyshyn, B. & Telvak, V.** (2021). Between history and politics: the image of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in German Slavic studies of the first third of the 20th century. *Przeglad nauk historycznych*, XX (2), 103-125. DOI: 10.18778/1644-857X.20.02.05 [in English].
- Telvak, V. & Yanyshyn, B.** (2021). „Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) volkes“ of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the discussions of the beginning of the XXth century. *Studia Historica Nitriensia*, 25 (1), 71-90. DOI: 10.17846/SHN.2021.25.1.71-90 [in English].
- Telvak, V.** (2017). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy ta polsko-ukrainskyi konflikt u Lvivskom universyteti: sproba rekonstruktsii [Mykhaylo Hrushevsky and the Polish-Ukrainian conflict in Lviv university: reconstruction]. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 4, 28-35. DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.4.111458 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V.** (2021). Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdotuky, vtraty, perspektyvy [Modern Hrushevsky studies: achievements, defeats, prospects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 5, 4-16. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2021.05.004 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V.V. & Telvak, V.P.** (2022). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy u koli frantsuzkykh koleh: problemy retseptsii [Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the works of his French colleagues: problems of reception]. *Eminak*, 4 (40), 120-138. DOI: 10.33782/eminak2022.4(40).610 [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V., Yanyshyn, B. & Telvak, V.** (2023). Between cooperation and conflict: Mykhailo Hrushevskiy through the eyes of Polish intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Echa Przeszłości*, XXIV (2), 89-104. DOI: 10.31648/ep.9668 [in English].