

KAPITEL 13 / CHAPTER 13¹³ONCE AGAIN TO THE QUESTION OF THE CRITERIA FOR
MEMBERSHIP OF PROMINENT HISTORIANS OF THE 19th – EARLY 20th
CENTURIES TO THE UKRAINIAN SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

DOI: 10.30890/2709-2313.2025-45-01-027

Introduction.

Some aspects of the controversial topic of national identification of historians Ukrainian lands have recently become the subject of analysis by O. M. Bohdashyna, I. B. Hyrych and O. L. Rybalka, A. Kappeler, I. P. Kutsy, P. R. Magocsi, V. V. Masnenko and others. V. O. Vengerskaya, O. I. Zhurba, Ya. S. Kalakura, S. I. Lyman, T. M. Popova, V. A. Potulnytskyi, O. A. Udod have repeatedly spoken out in favor of the regional, that is, territorial, and not just ethno-cultural principle of studying the peculiarities of the development of historical science [2, p. 6–7; 4, p. 12–16, 70–75].

The purpose of our article is to will clarify the criteria for national identification of historians, who in the 19th and early 20th centuries lived in Ukrainian lands, which at that time were part of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires.

The research methodology consists of general scientific principles of historicism, systematicity and objectivity, special historical methods, in particular problem-historiographic, historical-comparative, historical-genetic, historical-typological, as well as biographical approach.

Main text. One of the controversial topics of modern Ukrainian historiography remains the criteria of belonging of a particular scientist to the Ukrainian or (and) other national historical science.

It is not only historians who recognize the debatable nature of the topic. Representatives of related fields of socio-humanitarian studies offer various interesting approaches to the concept of «national identity» of ethnic groups in general, rather than small scientific communities.

British political scientist and sociologist E. Smith wrote about the multiplicity of

¹³Authors: Bohdashyna Olena Mykolayivna

Author's sheets: 0,62



identities (tribal, territorial or regional, socio-economic (class), religious, ethnic, national) and the variety of identification criteria [14, p. 66]. Among the latter, he attributed a person's recognition of the values, symbols and traditions of an individual nation as his own.

Ukrainian philosopher M. T. Stepiko generally believes that «Ukrainian identity is not identical to either national or ethnic», but rather similar to «civil identity as a phenomenon of a political nation» [15, p. 171].

The analysis of various precise approaches to the concept of «national identity» allowed L. P. Nagorna to argue about the insufficiency of the two main criteria (territorial and ethnic). In her works the researcher showed the role of other socio-cultural (including professional, gender, religious) criteria in the formation of Ukrainian identity. L. P. Nagorna calls the main marker of belonging to a certain ethnic group the worldview: «Common ideas that arise as a result of the awareness by members of a certain ethnic group of a common origin, culture, language, traditions, territory, history» [11, p. 17–18].

I. P. Lysyak-Rudnytskyi considered scientists of Ukrainian origin, who lived most of their lives outside Ukraine to be representatives of the Ukrainian intellectual tradition [18, p. 207]. He put forward as criteria the nationally oriented views of these scientists, their involvement in the Ukrainian cause, which sometimes had catastrophic consequences for their official careers [18, p. 207].

Meanwhile, A. V. Portnov considers erroneous the criteria of ethnic origin and language in determining the nationality and self-consciousness of individual historical figures of Ukrainian history [13]. We agree with A. V. Portnov. Ethnic origin is not the main criterion for national identification of scientists. Most of the historians whose fate was connected with Ukraine did not belong to ethnic Ukrainians. For example, V. K. Nadler and V. E. Krusman came from Germans, V. P. Buzeskul – from Moldovans, M. N. Petrov – from Mordvins.

The biographies of V. B. Antonovich and V. K. Lypynsky prove the unreliability of the criterion of family origin. Polish (on his mother's side) and a Catholic (before converting to Orthodoxy), V. B. Antonovich became a leader of the Ukrainian



movement in the late 1850s.

Another representative of the old Polish noble family V. K. Lypynsky founded the magazine «Przegląd krajowy» in Kyiv in 1909 with the aim of promoting the Ukrainian idea among the Poles of Ukraine. He considered the task of his journalistic and scientific activities to be «to draw the attention of the Polish community in Ukraine to the need for a clear awareness of their position in relation to the liberation movement of the Ukrainian people» [17, p. 3]. V. K. Lypynsky's self-identification as a Ukrainian historian and political figure is evidenced by his pseudonyms: Pravoberezhets, Nobilis Ruthenus, Ukrainiec. A quarter of his works, including those on the history of Ukraine, are written in Polish.

The concept of «double» or «triple» loyalty of Ukrainian historians, formulated by P. R. Magocsi, Z. Kohut and other authors, also does not solve the problem of national identification, because, in our opinion, the attitude of scientists to the authorities is not the main criterion of national self-identification. The long-term presence of Ukrainian lands in the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, the multinational structure of the population, the higher education system, and government policy contributed to the spread of the «double» (sometimes «triple») loyalty to the worldview of some historians.

On the Ukrainian lands, that were part of the Russian Empire, were Kiev University of St. Vladimir and the Historical Society of Nestor the chronicler under him, Kharkiv and Novorossiysk universities, Nezhinsky historical and philological Institute and historical and philological societies under them.

In Lviv the main Polish scientific institutions were the Franz I University (in 1918–1939 named after Jan-Kazimir), the Ossolinsky institution, the Historical Society, and the Ukrainian institution – Shevchenko scientific society. V. B. Antonovych explained the «triple» loyalty of the professor of Austrian history at Lviv University, I. I. Sharanevych, precisely by his official position [4, p. 72].

An Austrian (in 1918–1940 – Romanian, in 1940–1991 – Soviet) university operated in Chernivtsi since 1875.

Representatives of different national historiographies worked in all these



institutions.

Higher educational institutions and scientific institutions of a historical profile did not operate in Transcarpathia until the middle of the 20th century. Uzhhorod University was opened only in 1945. The scientific works of the few representatives of Hungarian historiography were mainly factual in nature.

Like the Hungarian historians, Jewish historians were outside the universities and leading scientific societies. The specificity of the religious worldview of most Jewish historians for the most part prevented them from perceiving the essentially rationalistic positivism (with reservations, this remark does not apply to S. M. Dubnov) [4, p. 14].

About half of the historians of sub-Russian Ukraine studied at universities outside its borders (mainly in St. Petersburg and Moscow).

A significant part of scientists of Ukrainian origin in Galicia, Volhynia, Bukovina, and Transcarpathia had a Polish (Austrian) education and worked in Austrian (since 1918 – Polish, Czech, and Romanian) institutions.

It is significant that the scientists of the 19th and early 20th centuries themselves did not see a problem in such a double (self)identification. For example, at a meeting of the Society of Slavic Culture on April 29, 1909, B. O. Kistyakivskyi argued that it is possible «to be both Ukrainian and Russian at the same time» [12, p. 121]. O. Ya. Yefimenko, using the example of M. V. Gogol, noted the «bifurcation and contradiction» of the worldview of many Ukrainians: «Gogol broke away from his national soil to serve the Russian state, but did not get rid of and could not get rid of the exclusivity of his national sympathies» [7, p. 98].

A typical example of «dual» loyalty is the creativity and cultural and educational activities of D. I. Bahaliy. A Ukrainian by origin, a student of the leader of the Kyiv Old Community V. B. Antonovych, Dmytro Ivanovych made a successful career: professor and rector of Kharkiv University, member of the State Council of the Russian Empire and Kharkiv City Mayor.

D. I. Bahaliy's cultural and educational activities had a double standard. We agree with V. V. Kravchenko's opinion: «In general, D. I. Bahaliy's Ukrainian identity until 1917 did not conflict with the „all-Russian” one, existing on the basis of dual loyalty.



His works on Ukrainian topics easily fit into the stream of historical local history or regional studies, and the national feeling, at least externally, did not go beyond the centuries-old tradition of the „unity and indivisibility” of the three ethnic branches of the East Slavic tree: „Little Russians”, „Great Russians” and „Belarusians”. The public activity of D. I. Bahaliy, like his scientific activity, had a dual national and cultural character. On the one hand, it was part of the Ukrainian national movement in its cultural forms. On the other hand, it was part of the general stream of Russian liberalism» [10, c. 14].

A Ukrainian by nationality and from a Ukrainian-speaking family D. I. Bahaliy, after moving to Kharkiv, completely switched to Russian in official and family communication.

D. I. Bahaliy and his family knew the Ukrainian language, literature and culture well and the scientist himself was engaged in collecting folklore in his youth.

In the scientist’s family the Ukrainian language was usually heard during reading aloud, performing Ukrainian songs and theatrical performances. Later the family also tried to speak German and French, especially when the two eldest daughters went to study at the Second (German) Gymnasium.

Almost all of D. I. Bahaliy’s works were published in Russian by 1917. The first known public speech in Ukrainian (lecture «Kharkiv as a Ukrainian city») and the first Ukrainian-language works date back to 1917–1918 [5].

Later D. I. Bahaliy would become one of the symbols of Soviet Ukrainization of the 1920s and early 1930s [more details: 5].

Works could not be printed in the Russian Empire in Ukrainian from 1863 to 1906 due to the well-known bans on the use of the Ukrainian language, particularly in print, in 1863 (Valuev’s Circular) and 1876 (Em’s Decree of Emperor Olexander II).

University lecturers in lectures were supposed to explain facts from Ukrainian history as part of all-Russian history in accordance with the regional theory of the state school, prevailing in all-Russian historiography.

Ukrainian historians showed the separateness of Ukrainians from Russians (Poles) in history, culture and language. For this they used (oddly enough) the regional



theory. Only some researchers openly supported the scheme of Ukrainian history proposed by M. S. Hrushevsky.

In turn some Russian and Polish scholars, who lived in Ukrainian lands, did not perceive the history of Ukraine as the history of a separate people. S. O. Yefremov wrote about such chauvinist teachers as follows: «Universities in Ukraine simply scorned the science of their native land, fulfilling the same mission that everything served in centralized Russia» [8, p. 4]. On this occasion M. S. Hrushevsky expressed himself as follows about the historiographical situation of the late 19th and early 20th centuries: «Modern Polish scholars interpret Ukraine-Rus, Belarus and Lithuania as domains of Polish science, which ex officio must be included in the circle of Polish research, just as scientists of the All-Russian direction involve ... subjects into the circle of Russian science as its integral components» [6, c. 16].

A similar situation was observed, for example, in Bukovina. O. G. Barvinsky recalled: Chernivtsi University and other «scientific institutions... could not educate a conscious Ukrainian intelligentsia that would love its land and people and take care of its cultural development» [1, c. 107].

A similar situation developed in the socio-political thought of Galicia. Western Ukrainian historians argued for the existence of a separate people of Ruthenians-Ukrainians from the Poles and for their historical rights to their own political and cultural development. That is why the reaction to great-power tendencies, which were clearly manifested in Polish journalism and historiography from the end of the 19th century, was so sharp.

Living in Ukraine may not always be a criterion for national identification of scientists.

Some famous Ukrainian historians lived outside the borders of the ethnic Ukrainian lands. For example, F. K. Vovk, P. O. Kulish, M. I. Kostomarov lived in St. Petersburg and Moscow, P. O. Kulish lived for some time in Warsaw. Some Ukrainian scientists, who had Russian citizenship, lived outside the borders of the Russian Empire for a long time. F. K. Volk (Volkov) also lived in France from 1879 to 1905. M. P. Dragomanov also lived for some time in Vienna, the capital of the Austro-



Hungarian Empire. Then the scientist lived in Geneva (Swiss Confederation), and in the last years of his life taught at Sofia University (Principality of Bulgaria). D. I. Doroshenko lived for a long time (1919–1951) in Prague (Czechoslovak Republic) and Munich (Germany).

A historian, sociologist and jurist of Ukrainian origin (also from a famous Cossack-starshyn family), M. M. Kovalevsky lived most of his life abroad. First, after graduating from Kharkiv University, he studied at the University of Berlin and the the School of charters in Paris, and then, after being dismissed from Moscow university, he taught at Stockholm, Oxford and other universities in Europe and at the Russian Higher School of Social Sciences in Paris (1887–1905) [детальніше: 16, p. 31–37].

In his memoirs and letters, M. M. Kovalevsky recognized himself as a Ukrainian («Little Russian») and a Russian, a reformer and a conservative, a cosmopolitan and a patriot. This, in our opinion, showed that in his imagination the data of loyalty and identity do not contradict, but mutually complement each other. For M. M. Kovalevsky personally, his own self-identification was not important.

The scientist humorously wrote in his memoirs about his national self-identification as follows: «How little the purity of Little Russian blood was preserved even in Cossack families is proved by the portraits of my grandmother from ...the Russian family. She was a close relative of Admiral Nakhimov, the hero of the Battle of Sinop. On my mother's side, I descend from the Polish Poznansky's family and my mother's mother was German, from the Münster family... After that, I leave it to you to decide which nationality I actually belong to. Add in the German governesses and French tutors, who surrounded me since childhood, the study of many subjects, including history and mythology in French, and an earlier acquaintance with Schiller and Marmontel than with Pushkin or Gogol - and it will be easy for you to conclude that in the Ukrainian setting, a descendant of the Little Russian Cossacks, with an admixture of Polish and of German blood, he joined the pan-European culture from childhood» [9, p. 51].

The methodology of the works of representatives of Russian, Ukrainian, Polish and other national historiographies, who lived in the Ukrainian lands at that time, is



much more similar in comparison with the subject matter of their works and socio-political views.

The recognition and application of positivist methodology and research techniques (or its individual elements) in many cases contradicted the national idea. Researchers of Ukrainian history often came into conflict with national myths and their own feelings of patriotism and national dignity.

Researchers of world history, who were better acquainted with European ideas, were much less likely to support myths about the history of Ukraine.

Summary and conclusions.

In our opinion, the main criteria for attributing historians of the 19th and 20th centuries as Ukrainian scholars are their active participation in the Ukrainian national movement; clearly formulated pro-Ukrainian socio-political and historical views in their scientific, artistic and journalistic works.

The nationally-oriented nature of scientists work can be traced when analyzing their socio-political beliefs, the issues of scientific studies and the specifics of approaches to researching the history of their nation.

At the same time, in works on world history, national (Ukrainian or other) motifs are in most cases difficult to find.

Thus, it can be argued that there is a certain inverse relationship between the formation and development of university-academic historiography and the spread of the national idea in Ukrainian historical science.

In our opinion, an analysis of the conditions of creativity of representatives of various national historiographies is necessary not only in the ethnocultural plane (Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, Jewish and other political and scientific communities).

Modern researchers underestimate and sometimes silence the influence of state (at that time) Russian (in its imperial and soviet versions), Austrian (in the period between the two world wars Polish, Czech or Romanian) science on the life and work of researchers, who belonged to the stateless society of that period (with the exception of the events of 1917–1920) of the Ukrainian nation.



In our opinion, there are often broader grounds for studying the work of a particular scholar in the context of the development of Ukrainian historical science. In this case, the selection criterion is not only Ukrainian origin, but also pro-Ukrainian views, assistance or participation in the Ukrainian national movement, the work of Ukrainian educational and scientific institutions, etc.