

UDC 94 (477) (092)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/67-2-5>

Viktorii TELVAK,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X

Candidate of Historical Sciences,

Associate Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines

Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University

(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine), viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com

Vitalii TELVAK,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X

Doctor of Historical Sciences,

Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines

Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University

(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine), telvak1@yahoo.com

Sviatoslav ZHURAVLOV,

orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-4038

Candidate of Historical Sciences,

Junior Researcher at the Department of source studies of Modern History of Ukraine

Mykhailo Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies

National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

(Kyiv, Ukraine), zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com

IMAGES OF THE UKRAINIAN CLIO OF THE 19TH – 20TH CENTURIES ON THE PAGES OF THE MAGAZINE “KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY”

The article's target is to reconstruct the reception of the achievements of Ukrainian historiography at the turn of the 19th – 20th centuries by the authors of the magazine “Kwartalnik Historyczny”. The methodological basis of the work is an interdisciplinary approach. At the same time, methods of philosophical, general-scientific and specific-historical character are applied as well. Scientific novelty is in the research of a little-known topic of the reception of the achievements of Ukrainian historiography at the turn of the 19th – 20th centuries by the authors of the magazine “Kwartalnik Historyczny”. Summarizing the collective image of Ukrainian historiography presented on the pages of “KH”, we can make several conclusions. Firstly, it should be noted that Polish scientists, being under the powerful assimilation influences of the German and Russian states, were quite sympathetic to the efforts of their Ukrainian colleagues to resist the official Russian historical ideology, which did not recognize the independence and originality of the Ukrainian people and their culture. Secondly, the general tone of scientific criticism was rather benevolent and positive than negative, which is explained both by the similarity of the tasks that faced our historiographies on the eve of the war, and by the commonality of theoretical and methodological priorities that were at the heart of the positivist paradigm. Thirdly, the sharpness of the Ukrainian-Polish theoretical debate, which increased significantly at the beginning of the 20th century, never went beyond the academic tone. It should be noted that even at the time of the greatest tension in Ukrainian-Polish relations, associated with the activation of national-democratic forces on both sides, the editorial staff of the magazine did not allow frank politicking and chauvinism to enter its columns. All this confirms the thesis, repeatedly noted in the literature, about the national correctness and tolerance of the “KH” editorial policy. The experience of solving international scientific disputes from the standpoint of universal human values, offered by Polish authors on the pages of the pre-war “KH”, was laid as a basis for the subsequent periods of the periodical existence, which allowed it to take an honorable place in a number of the most respected world historical publications.

Key words: “Kwartalnik Historyczny”, Polish historiography, Ukrainian historiography, scientific press, reception.

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X

кандидатка історичних наук,

доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com**Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК,**

orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X

доктор історичних наук,

професор кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) telvak1@yahoo.com**Святослав ЖУРАВЛЮВ,**

orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-4038

кандидат історичних наук,

молодший науковий співробітник відділу джерелознавства нової історії України
Інституту української археографії та джерелознавства
імені Михайла Грушевського Національної академії наук України
(Київ, Україна) zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com

ОБРАЗИ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ КЛЮ ЗЛАМУ XIX–XX СТОЛІТЬ НА СТОРІНКАХ ЧАСОПИСУ “KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY”

Метою статті є реконструкція рецепції здобутків української історіографії зламу XIX–XX ст. авторами часопису “Kwartalnik Historyczny”. Методологічне підґрунтя становить міждисциплінарний підхід. При цьому важливу роль відіграли методи філософського, загальнонаукового та конкретно-історичного характеру. Наукова новизна статті полягає у дослідженні малознаної проблеми рецепції здобутків української історіографії зламу XIX–XX ст. авторами часопису “Kwartalnik Historyczny”. Узагальнюючи збірний образ української історіографії, презентований на сторінках “КН”, можемо зробити кілька висновків. По-перше, слід відзначити, що польські вчені, знаходячись під потужними асиміляційними впливами німецької та російської держав, досить співчутливо ставились до намагання українських колег чинити опір офіційній російській історичній ідеології, котра не визнавала самостійності й оригінальності українського народу та його культури. По-друге, загальний тон наукової критики був радше доброзичливим і позитивним, ніж негативним, що пояснюється як подібністю завдань, котрі стояли перед нашими історіографіями напередодні війни, так і спільністю теоретико-методологічних пріоритетів, які знаходились у рідній позитивістській парадигмі. По-третє, гострота українсько-польської теоретичної дискусії, що значно зросла на початку XX ст., ніколи не виходила за межі академічного тону. Зазначимо, що навіть у часи найбільшого напруження українсько-польських стосунків, пов’язаного з активізацією національно-демократичних сил обох сторін, редакція часопису не дозволяла проникати на його шпальта відвертому політиканству та шовінізму. Все це дозволяє підтвердити тезу, неодноразово відзначену у літературі, про національну коректність та толерантність редакційної політики “КН”. Досвід вирішення міжнародних наукових суперечок з позиції загальнолюдських цінностей, запропонований польськими авторами на сторінках довоєнного “КН”, був покладений в основу подальших періодів існування часопису, що дозволило йому зайняти почесне місце у ряді найбільш шанованих світових історичних видань.

Ключові слова: “Kwartalnik Historyczny”, польська історіографія, українська історіографія, наукова преса, рецепція.

Formulation of the problem. In the conditions of multiculturalism of the historiographical environment of Lviv in the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries professional periodicals have always occupied a special place. Despite its direct tasks related to the representation of the achievements of a certain scientific center, it was also aimed at developing a strategy for relations with representatives of other national environments. To a special extent, what has been said applies to the well-

known Lviv magazine “Kwartalnik Historyczny” (further – “КН”), which appeared in 1887 as a printed organ of the Historical Society in Lviv, founded a year earlier. After all, the collaborators of this publication were Polish, Russian, Jewish, German, and Ukrainian researchers. And if the first of them already had a formed historiographical tradition and an extensive system of scientific institutions, we cannot say the same about Ukrainian scientists. For quite a long time, until the beginning of the 90s of the

19th century, “KH” was almost the only professional platform for them. It is well known that I. Franko, M. Korduba, O. Kolessa, K. Studynskyi published their works on the pages of this publication, and such famous historians as M. Hrushevsky, O. Barvinskyi, I. Beley, Yu. Tselevich, M. Korduba and others. This little-known page of Ukrainian-Polish relations is still waiting for its detailed study.

The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the reception of the achievements of Ukrainian historiography at the turn of the 19th – 20th centuries by the authors of the magazine “Kwartalnik Historyczny”.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Modern researchers of the Lviv historiographic center note the importance of studying the contribution of Polish scientific periodicals to the formation of Ukrainian professional historiography (Maternicki, 1996). However, despite the exceptional role played by “KH” in structuring the Lviv historiographic center (Polish and Ukrainian), we can name only a few articles and memoirs devoted to its past (Руда, 2004; Тельвак, 2005; Лазурко, 2010; Telwak, Łazurko, 2013; Lazurko, Dikhtiiievskiy, 2021). The complete bibliography of the journal has not even been worked out yet; the existing one covers only the first thirty-five years of its publication and does not fully meet modern requirements. This determines the relevance of the topic of our research.

Presenting main material. For domestic researchers of Polish historical journals, the problem of presentation of Ukrainian historiography on their pages is of special interest. In the case of “KH”, this interest is strengthened by the fact of the active participation of Ukrainian scientists themselves in reviewing Slavic literature for the publication. For example, I. Franko and I. Sharanevich were regular reviews of the magazine. The studied period seems extremely interesting and important from several points of view: firstly, in the history of “KH” many traditions were laid at this time, which continued in the following periods; secondly, the studied district was unique from the point of view of the political situation of the Poles – such scientific and socio-political problems were actualized and discussed then, which in many ways allowed our neighbors to rethink their place on the world map and gave a new impetus to the independence struggle; thirdly, the coexistence at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century seems extremely interesting. of Polish and Ukrainian scientific centers within the same city, contacts between their representatives, mutual conceptual representations, which is a kind of reflection of general international relations. The chronological

limits we have chosen are also explained by the fact that after Poland gained independence, “KH” as a tribune not only of national historiography, but also of social and political ideology performed somewhat different functions, different from previous times. Considering the wide spread and high authority of “KH” in scientific circles, we can rightfully transfer the evaluation characteristics of Ukrainian historiography presented on its pages to the entire Polish historical literature.

The significant attention to Ukrainian history and historiography shown by the authors of “KH” from the very beginning of its foundation was far from accidental. The Historical Society in Lviv, as a regional organization of historians, among its priority tasks reflected in the statute, placed “awakening and helping the development of historical sciences with special attention to the past of Red Rus” (Statut, 1886: 1). That is why the printed organ of the Historical Society – “KH” – was primarily focused on the past of Galicia. Modern researchers of “KH” note that from the very beginning the magazine was theoretically oriented towards the defense of the rights of Poles within the boundaries of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Śreniowska, 1960). It is clear that in such a situation, the most tense line of theoretical discussion was the controversial issues of Ukrainian-Polish historiography.

In the studied period of Ukrainian historical thought, Polish researchers distinguished between the older and younger generations of domestic historians. Among Galician historians, they attributed, first of all, A. Petrushevich, O. Partytsky, I. Sharanevich, O. Ogonovsky, Yu. Tselevich and others to the older generation. In general, the tone of criticism of the scientific production of the older generation of Galician historians was not so much positive as condescending. Polish observers paid tribute to the dedication of their work, considerable erudition and talent, and the effort to investigate the past of their native land as fully and in detail as possible. However, the general evaluations always indicated the obsolescence of the methodological and theoretical tools used by Ukrainian historians. These scholars were considered to belong to a bygone, semi-professional and romantic era in historical thought (Kocowski, 1896: 682–685). Polish scholars attributed excessive micrographism and the lack of a wider civilizational context to the most significant defects of Galician literature. This, according to the commentators of “KH”, made it difficult to adequately understand the key moments of Ukrainian history, their correlation with the events of the European past. L. Dziedzitskyi’s remarks on Yu. Tselevich’s work on the Manyavsky hermitage

can be considered typical of the characteristics of the entire Galician historical literature. The reviewer noted the thoroughness of the source base of intelligence (“...the author perfectly drew in his work from all available sources”), the detail of the story and the considerable erudition of Yu. Tselevich. Along with this, the author was criticized for the narrowness of his research outlook. According to the reviewer, “...the cost of labor would have increased significantly if it had been built on a wider civilizational background” (Dziedzicki, 1887: 627).

The Polish reviewers noted the marked dominance of political and national tendencies as a serious flaw of Galician literature, which they also attributed to the low level of professionalism. In general, Polish scholars were sympathetic to the efforts of their colleagues to resist Russian expansion into Ukrainian cultural heritage. But patriotism, in their opinion, should not turn into chauvinism, as it contradicts itself by doing so. They convinced that party interests and patriotic slogans have little in common with scientific principles, and inflaming Ukrainian-Polish enmity is not beneficial to national understanding in multicultural Galicia. Yu. Tretyak expressed this thesis rather concentratedly, reviewing the essay on the history of Ukrainian literature by O. Ogonovskyi. Giving a general description of the work, he focused on revealing its leading ideas: “What is the tendency of this work? The author himself, when asked about it, would undoubtedly call her patriotic; we cannot recognize her this assessment, because we do not see healthy patriotism in her...”. This patriotism, the reviewer is convinced, would correspond to universal humane principles only if “if all the stories were not dominated by social and tribal hatred of Poles, which deprives the author of a sense of historical justice... and reduces his scientific position to the role of a political agitator” (Tretyak, 1890: 314). In the aspect of identifying political tendencies, the works of A. Petrushevich were a favorite object of Polish scientific criticism. Reviewers wrote about the author’s extreme subjectivity, hatred of everything Polish, sympathy for Russia. The most serious harm of many of his works, according to Polish historians, was the awakening of anti-Polish sentiments and their significant prevalence among broad sections of the people, intelligentsia, and clergy. Such an escalation of national hatred, in their opinion, cannot be acceptable to a historian. Due to a significant influx of tendency and political bias, insufficient understanding of the scientific status of historiography and a distorted interpretation of its social functions, some works of the older generation of Galician historians, according to Polish authors, “received the name of history only through usurpation” (A. L.,

1887: 120). But these “Polish gluttonous tendencies”, according to the words of one of the reviewers, were a thing of the past. The new generation of Ukrainian scientists, who were under the influence of the sociology of positivism, appealed less and less to the need for national accounting. One of the critics of A. Petrushevich’s works noted with hope: “However, since even not only in Polish historiography voices are raised against such a historical vision, but also in Ukrainian (Franko), we hope that this voice is only an echo of the era that is passing.” (A. S., 1890: 184).

The next important problem of the formation of professional Ukrainian historiography in Galicia was considered by Polish scientists to be the instability of scientific style and professional terminology. They were especially bothered by works written by a “heathen”. “...In Russian literature,” noted one of the reviewers, “sometimes there are works written by some kind of linguistic wonder, aptly named by someone as “Palamarschizna”, which no one has ever spoken and will never speak.” (Dziedzicki, 1887: 627). Even university professor I. Sharanevich, the most respected among the older generation of Galician historians, could not avoid this defect, whose works, according to the general recognition of the reviewers, were “unheard of, difficult and boring” (Kwiatkowski, 1887: 422).

The institutional problems of the formation of Galician Ukrainian historiography did not escape the attention of the authors of “KH”. And although Polish historians wrote with great respect about the scientific and publishing activities of one of the oldest Ukrainian institutions in Galicia – Stauropegion Institute, they still noted the need to expand and specialize the structure of historical and scientific institutions. In general, we note that the evidence of the objectivity of Polish historians regarding assessments of Ukrainian historiography in Galicia can be the fact that quite similar to the theses of Polish commentators, Ukrainian scientists themselves wrote about the shortcomings of the scientific output of the older generation of Galician historians.

The authors of “KH” evaluated the Transdnipr tradition of Ukrainian historiography much more seriously, the professional level of which generally corresponded to the state of Polish science at that time. It should be noted that almost no valuable scientific intelligence created in the sub-Russian Ukraine did not pass by the attention of the reviewers of the magazine. Polish scientists were extremely sympathetic to the Polonophile prism of the works of some Ukrainian scientists. The works of O. Konyskyi and P. Kulish were especially popular among the reviewers of “KH”. Thus, T. Korzon, one of the reviewers of P. Kulish’s

well-known work “The Fall of Little Russia from Moscow”, expressed complete agreement with the negative evaluative interpretations of the figure of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and the Cossacks in general as violators of public peace by the Ukrainian researcher. He was impressed by P. Kulish’s views on Poland as a carrier of civilization in the East Slavic lands. However, even the Polish historian was forced to notice in this monograph by P. Kulish some contradictions, evaluative inflections and political tendencies. “Mr. Kulish,” he noted, “could not stand on the heights of ruthless justice and the world-historical background.” (Korzon, 1892: 34).

Among the representatives of the older generation of Ukrainian historians, V. Antonovych, one of the founders of the “new era” policy in Galicia, enjoyed special respect among the columnists of “KH”. Polish historians wrote with great respect about the high professional level of the scientific works of the creator of the Kyiv historical school. The review of V. Antonovych’s essay about the past of Ukrainian lands as part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania can be called notable here. Among the positive points, “perfect critical method” and “thorough knowledge of the sources” were noted, and the work itself was characterized as extremely “...valuable, excellently written, critical and objective...” (Lewicki, 1888: 133).

It should be noted that Polish scholars pay close attention to the activities of historical institutions in the Transnistrian region. Among the most respected scientific centers, they noted the Faculty of History and Philology of St. Volodymyr University, the Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler, and others. Scientific periodicals and documentary series published by these institutions were also rated highly. Particularly favorable reviews were received by publications such as “Kyivska Starovyna”, “Archive of South-Western Russia”, “Readings in the Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler”.

The most significant shortcoming of Transdnieper historiography, as in the case of Galician historians, was called by the reviewers of “KH” the sharp national and social tendency of many works. T. Korzon, a regular reviewer of Ukrainian scientific literature, in one of his reviews even summarized and systematized, as he called it, the phenomena of the “incitement” of the Polish-Ukrainian confrontation in historical literature, starting with M. Kostomarov and ending with the latest historical science. These phenomena, in his opinion, formed a kind of historiosophical tradition of the “entire Kyiv scientific school”, which at the end of the 19th century “groups around the magazine “Kyivska Staryna” and spreads anti-Polish sentiments among young researchers.

If the work of the older representatives of Ukrainian historiography was always evaluated somewhat detachedly – in the context of the tradition and conditions in which they worked, then the work of the younger generation, armed with the theoretical and methodological innovations of the time, was always perceived extremely vividly and reflectively. Among the representatives of the younger generation of Ukrainian historiography, the works of the most prominent Ukrainian scientists of the specified region – I. Franko and M. Hrushevsky – were particularly fond of reviews in the columns of “KH”.

I. Franko, a long-time member of the Historical Society and a regular contributor to its periodical, repeatedly delivered reports at the Society’s meetings, which were later published on the pages of “KH”. Thus, in the 1892, his large treatise on Ukrainian literature of the 16th – 18th centuries was published, and in the 1895 volume, a study on the Union of Brest of 1596 was published. Reviewers of the outstanding writer’s works noted his perfect knowledge of the subject of research, the context of its historical and literary situation, methodology and methods of reconstruction of spiritual phenomena of the past, emphasized the advantages of the style and language of the story. For example, A. Kalina, reviewing I. Franko’s essay on the works of Ivan Vyshenskyi, noted: “The language of the work itself is marked by the same features as all the works of Dr. Franko. Is it clean, clear; the style is clear, understandable; the way of expression is simple, free of any exaggeration and unnecessary emotions. This work can be counted among the best that have recently appeared in the scientific field of Russian literature.” (Kalina, 1895: 714).

Not a single creation of M. Hrushevsky did not pass the attention of the editorial board, especially since almost all of the scientist’s works in one way or another touched on the problem of the situation of Ukrainians within the borders of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The extreme interest of Polish scientists in the work of M. Hrushevsky is evidenced by the fact that some of the scientist’s works, such as his debut exploration “Southern Russian Economic Castles”, were twice noted in the review section of the magazine. It should be noted that until now a solid layer of Polish Hrushevsky’s scientific publications have not been properly covered in the literature. Already the first steps in the science of V. Antonovych students won extremely high favor from Polish specialists. Already the first steps in the science of V. Antonovych students won extremely high favor from Polish specialists. In the review of the work mentioned above, it was noted that it was

written "...critically, with knowledge of the matter" (Czolowski, 1893: 706). The first monographic study of the beginning historian, dedicated to the history of the Kyiv region, was extremely thoroughly analyzed on the pages of the publication. The reviewer of the work, A. Sharlovski, along with minor remarks of a factual nature, noted the extraordinary solidity of the source and historiographical base of the research, the depth of the analysis of political and socio-economic relations. Concluding the review, he noted: "Although Mr. Hrushevsky's scientific activity does not extend beyond our decade, he has already earned an honorable place among Kyiv historians." (Szarlovski, 1893: 140). Along with high evaluations of the professional level of M. Hrushevsky's early works, we also not infrequently encounter criticism of some concepts proposed by the scientist. Thus, the hypothesis of a novice scientist about the mass voluntary citizenship of Ukrainian communities in the 13th century did not find support among Polish researchers in Tatar government. "KH" commentators, like many Ukrainian scientists, rightly noted the weakness of the source grounds for such an assumption, the imperfection of its evidence base. Polish historians also did not accept M. Hrushevsky's thesis about the causes and ways of denationalization of the Ukrainian nobility in the XVI–XVII centuries, which he presented in his master's thesis, devoted to the past of the Barsky Starostvo.

After his arrival in Lviv, M. Hrushevsky was extremely warmly and optimistically welcomed by the Polish scientific center. To a certain extent, this is explained, perhaps, not so much by the fact of the scientist's scientific achievements, which at that time were not yet so significant, but by the fact that M. Hrushevsky came to Galicia as a supporter of the "new era" policy, a continuation of the political initiatives of O. Konytskyi and V. Antonovych. The reaction of Polish scientists to M. Hrushevsky's first lecture at Lviv University can be called symbolic. "This is the content of this exciting performance," wrote A. Levytskyi in his review. – We welcome in its author a new worker in the field of our common past; we know him from his previous works as a talented and hard-working researcher, possessing an exquisite historiographical method, and above all passionate about a sincere desire to understand the truth, whatever it may be; We also send him a hearty congratulations from the branch of the Jagiellonian University on his new position in our region: God bless you!" (Lewicki, 1895: 565). Polish critics of M. Hrushevsky's works, often disagreeing with the conceptual foundations of the scientist's works, highly praised the professional level of his works,

extraordinary erudition and research talent. It should be noted that somewhat later, when the policy of the "new era" was curtailed, and M. Hrushevsky himself took a principled position on the issues of Polish-Ukrainian relations, the tone of reviews of his works, as well as Ukrainian scientific literature in general, became somewhat sharper and more critical.

In general, the entire range of evaluation interpretations of the younger generation of Ukrainian Clio presented on the pages of "KH" falls into several problematic blocks. The most critical remarks of Polish reviewers of Ukrainian scientific literature, and this is understandable, were caused by works devoted to the coexistence of two peoples as part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thus, Polish historians did not agree with the use of the ethnonym "Ukraine" by domestic scholars in relation to the events of the Eastern European Middle Ages, rejected their negative assessments of the policy of the Polish kings on the Ukrainian Right Bank and in Galicia, denied its expansionist character. It should be noted that the arguments of Polish historians, in terms of evidence, were often much weaker than those of their Ukrainian colleagues. Reviewers were repeatedly forced to refute the given hypotheses with non-scientific ethical arguments. Thus, L. Kolyankovski, reviewing the fourth, fifth and sixth volumes of "History of Ukraine-Rus" by M. Hrushevsky, accused the latter of an excess of negativity regarding Polish policy on Ukrainian lands. Without refuting the testimony of the Ukrainian scientist with any significant factual information, he followed the maxim of the moral plan: "The work of M. Hrushevsky is tendentious, arouses Polish-Ukrainian hatred, which is not suitable for scientific work" (Kolankowski, 1913: 357). Explorations dedicated to the Cossack period caused no less criticism. Polish scientists did not agree with the positive vision of the events of Khmelnytskyi region by their Ukrainian colleagues, the heroization of its leaders, considering the latter to be "violators of public peace." In their opinion, there were no objective grounds for dissatisfaction with the state policy, numerous facts of socio-economic and religious oppression, which Ukrainian researchers cited in their works, were considered exaggerated and insignificant. From similar positions, for example, V. Havlik criticized V. Gerasymchuk's work "Vygovshchyna i Gadyatsky treatise". He noted the author's politicization of the research subject, his excessive admiration for the figure of Hetman Khmelnytskyi and concluded that the work was written "cum ira et studio" (Gawlik, 1912: 353–354). Similar were the views of "KH"

commentators on works devoted to other difficult pages of Ukrainian-Polish relations, for example, Koliiv region. It should be noted that in the Polish-Ukrainian theoretical discussion, the Ukrainian side also often used metascientific vocabulary and various kinds of emotional affects, which can be traced by analyzing the review block in “Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society” (Тельвак, Тельвак, 2005: 87–145; Тельвак, 2008: 40–157).

Polish historians highly rated the methodological level of the works of the younger generation of Ukrainian historians, the detailed treatment of the problem by them, the depth of historiographical and source analysis. In the context of the investigated problem, it is extremely interesting to trace the common understanding of scientific theoretical and methodological standards by representatives of the Polish and Ukrainian scientific environment. Young Ukrainian historiography also faced the task of defending the priority of objectivity and scientific correctness of historical research, fighting dilettantism and national chauvinism. This similarity is especially noticeable when comparing the review texts of the same editions posted on the pages of “Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society” and “KH”. Let us give a characteristic example – two reviews – the Polish one by A. Cholovskyi and the Ukrainian one by M. Hrushevsky on the work of A. Petrushevich. A comparison of the critical remarks expressed by these researchers reveals the commonality of criteria applied by the reviewers to the work of the famous Galician historian – both write about the lack of systematization and professionalism of A. Petrushevich’s work, criticize the specific language of the author. Another example can be the Polish and Ukrainian reviews of K. Kharlampovich’s work “Western Russian Orthodox schools of the

16th and early 17th centuries” or the work of the German historian Piesker about the innate propensity of Slavs to slavery.

Conclusions. Summarizing the collective image of Ukrainian historiography presented on the pages of “KH”, we can make several conclusions. Firstly, it should be noted that Polish scientists, being under the powerful assimilation influences of the German and Russian states, were quite sympathetic to the efforts of their Ukrainian colleagues to resist the official Russian historical ideology, which did not recognize the independence and originality of the Ukrainian people and their culture. Secondly, the general tone of scientific criticism was rather benevolent and positive than negative, which is explained both by the similarity of the tasks that faced our historiographies on the eve of the war, and by the commonality of theoretical and methodological priorities that were at the heart of the positivist paradigm. Thirdly, the sharpness of the Ukrainian-Polish theoretical debate, which increased significantly at the beginning of the 20th century, never went beyond the academic tone. It should be noted that even at the time of the greatest tension in Ukrainian-Polish relations, associated with the activation of national-democratic forces on both sides, the editorial staff of the magazine did not allow frank politicking and chauvinism to enter its columns. All this confirms the thesis, repeatedly noted in the literature, about the national correctness and tolerance of the “KH” editorial policy. The experience of solving international scientific disputes from the standpoint of universal human values, offered by Polish authors on the pages of the pre-war “KH”, was laid as a basis for the subsequent periods of the periodical existence, which allowed it to take an honorable place in a number of the most respected world historical publications.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Лазурко Л. *Часопис «Kwartalnik Historyczny» і розвиток польської історіографії останньої чверті XIX – першої половини XX ст.* Дрогобич, 2010. 282 с.
2. Руда О.В. Українська тема на сторінках львівського часопису «Kwartalnik Historyczny» («Історичний кварталник») в 1887–1914 рр. *Міжнародні зв'язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки.* 2004. Вип. 13. С. 308–321.
3. Тельвак В. «Kwartalnik Historyczny» – феномен інституції (кінець XIX – початок XX ст.). *Ейдос: альманах теорії та історії історичної науки.* Київ, 2005. Вип. 1. С. 317–332.
4. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. *Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії.* Київ–Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
5. Тельвак Віталій. *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття).* Київ–Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.
6. A. L.: *Kaczala. Korotka historia Rusy.* (Ruska historyczna biblioteka...). *Kwartalnik Historyczny.* 1887. S. 120.
7. A. S.: *Petruszewicz. Swodnaja halyczsko-russkaja litopys.* Lwów, 1887 i 1889. *Kwartalnik Historyczny.* 1890. S. 184–187.
8. Czolowski A.: *Gruszewski M. Juznorusskije gosподarskije zamki w polowyni XVI wieka.* Moskwa, 1890. *Kwartalnik Historyczny.* 1893. S. 706.
9. *Dziedzicki L.: Istorija Skitu Maniawskoho... Napisaw i ułoziw Dr. Julian Celewicz.* *Kwartalnik Historyczny.* 1887. S. 627.
10. *Gawlik M.: Герасимчук В. Виговщина і гадацький трактат.* *Kwartalnik Historyczny.* 1912. S. 353–354.
11. *Kalina A.: Franko I. Iwan Wyszenskij I jeho utwory.* *Kwartalnik Historyczny.* 1895. S. 714.

12. Kocowski W.: Partycki O. Starynna istorija Hałyczyny. Tom I. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1896. S. 682–685.
13. Kolankowski L.: Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1913. S. 357.
14. Korzon T. O Chmielnickim sądy pp. Kulisza i Karpowa. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1892. S. 34–39.
15. Kwiatkowski S.: Dr. Izydor Szaraniewicz. O rezultatach poszukiwań archeologicznych w okolicy Halicza w roku 1884 i 1885. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1887. S. 422.
16. Lazurko L., Dikhtiiivskiy P. From ancient times to Rzeczpospolita: history of the Polish state in the reception of the journal «Kwartalnik Historyczny» (1887–1939). *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. 2021. № 19. С. 77–86.
17. Lewicki A.: Hruszewskij M. Wstępnyj wykład z dawnoji istoriji Rusy. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1895. S. 565–567.
18. Lewicki A.: Ruska istoryczna biblioteka pod redakcyjeju Oleksandra Barwińskiego. Tom VI. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1888. S. 133–134.
19. Maternicki J. Miejsce i rola “Kwartalnika Historycznego” w dziejach historiografii polskiej. *Historia jako dialog*. Rzeszów, 1996. S. 273–290.
20. Statut Towarzystwa Historycznego. Lwów, 1886. 14 c.
21. Szarlowski A.: Gruszewski M. Oczerk istorii Kijowskiej ziemi ot śmierci Jarosława do końca XIV wieku. Kijów, 1891; Gruszewski M. Wołyński wopros 1097–1102. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1893. S. 140–145.
22. Śreniowska K. Uwagi o nauce historycznej polskiej w latach 1887–1900 w świetle “Kwartalnika Historycznego”. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne. Seria I*. 1960. Z. 15. S. 153–163.
23. Telwak W., Łazurko L. Ukrainika na łamach «Kwartalnika Historycznego» w okresie międzywojennym. *Rocznik Biblioteki Naukowej PAU i PAN w Krakowie*. Kraków: wyd. Secesja, 2013. R. LVIII. S. 239–255.
24. Tretiak J. Historia literatury ruskiej Emila Ogonowskiego. Część II. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1890. S. 314–325.

REFERENCES

1. Lazurko, L. (2010). *Chasopys «Kwartalnik Historyczny» i rozvytok polskoi istoriografii ostannoï chverti XIX – pershoï polovyny XX st.* [«Kwartalnik Historyczny» Journal and the Development of Polish Historiography in the Last Quarter of the 19th and the First Half of the 20th Century]. Drohobych. 280 s. [in Ukrainian].
2. Ruda, O. (2004). Ukrainka tema na storinkakh lvivskoho chasopysu «Kwartalnik Historyczny» («Istorychnyi kvartalnik») v 1887–1914 rr. [Ukrainian theme in the pages of the Lviv journal «Kwartalnik Historyczny» in 1887–1914]. *Mizhnarodni zviyazky Ukrainy: naukovi poshuky i znakhidky*. Kyiv. Vyp. 13. S. 308–321 [in Ukrainian].
3. Telvak, V. (2005). «Kwartalnik Historyczny» – fenomen instytuttsii (kinets XIX – pochatok XX st.) [«Kwartalnik Historyczny» – a phenomenon of the institution (late 19th – early 20th Century)]. *Eidos: almanakh teorii ta istorii istorychnoi nauky*. Kyiv. Vyp. 1. S. 317–332 [in Ukrainian].
4. Telvak, Viktoriia, & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy yak doslidnyk ukrainskoi istoriografii* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 334 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Telvak, V. (2008). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia)* [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 494 s. [in Ukrainian].
6. A. L. (1887). [Review]. Kaczała. Korotka istoriya Rusy [A Brief History of Rus]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 120. [in Polish].
7. A. S. (1890). [Review]. Petruszewicz. Swodnaja hałyczsko-russkaja litopys [Consolidated Galician-Volhynian Chronicle]. Lwów, 1887 i 1889. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 184–187. [in Polish].
8. Czolowski, A. (1890). [Review]. Gruszewski M. Južnorusskije gospodarskije zamki w połowyni XVI wieku [South Russian manor castles in the half of the 16th century]. Moskwa, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1893. S. 706. [in Polish].
9. Dziedzicki, L. (1887). [Review]. Istorija Skitu Maniawskoho... Napisaw i ułožiw Dr. Julian Celewicz [The History of the Manyavsky Skete... Written and edited by Yulian Tselevich]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 627. [in Polish].
10. Gawlik, M. (1912). [Review]. Herasymchuk V. Vyhovshchyna i hadiatskyi traktat [Wygowszczyna i traktat of Hadiach]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 353–354. [in Polish].
11. Kalina, A. (1895). [Review]. Franko I. Iwan Wyszenskij i jeho utwory [Ivan Vyshensky and his works]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 714. [in Polish].
12. Kocowski, W. (1896). [Review]. Partycki O. Starynna istorija Hałyczyny. Tom I [Ancient history of Galicia. P.1]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 682–685. [in Polish].
13. Kolankowski, L. (1913). [Review]. Hrushevskiy M. Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy [Historia Ukrainy-Rusy]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 357. [in Polish].
14. Korzon, T. (1892). O Chmielnickim sądy pp. Kulisza i Karpowa [Kulish and Karpov's judgment about Khmelnytsky]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 34–39. [in Polish].
15. Kwiatkowski, S. (1887). [Review]. Dr. Izydor Szaraniewicz. O rezultatach poszukiwań archeologicznych w okolicy Halicza w roku 1884 i 1885 [About the results of archaeological searches in the vicinity of Halych in 1884 and 1885]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 422. [in Polish].
16. Lazurko, L. & Dikhtiiivskiy, P. (2021) From ancient times to Rzeczpospolita: history of the Polish state in the reception of the journal «Kwartalnik Historyczny» (1887–1939). *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. Vyp. 19. Pp. 77–86.
17. Lewicki, A. (1895). [Review]. Hruszewskij M. Wstępnyj wykład z dawnoji istoriji Rusy [Introductory lecture on the ancient history of Russia]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 565–567. [in Polish].
18. Lewicki, A. (1888). [Review]. Ruska istoryczna biblioteka pod redakcyjeju Oleksandra Barwińskiego. Tom VI [Russian Historical Library under the editorship of Oleksandr Barvinsky Volume 6.]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 133–134. [in Polish].

19. Maternicki, J. (1996). Miejsce i rola «Kwartalnika Historycznego» w dziejach historiografii polskiej [The place and role of the “Historical Quarterly” in the history of Polish historiography]. *Historia jako dialog*. Rzeszów. S. 273–290. [in Polish].

20. *Statut Towarzystwa Historycznego [Statutes of the Historical Society]*. Lwów, 1886. 14 c. [in Polish].

21. Szarlowski, A. (1893). [Review]. Gruszeński M. Oczerk istorii Kijowskiej ziemi ot śmierci Jaroslawa do końca XIV wieku [Essay on the history of the Kyiv land from the death of Yaroslav to the end of the 14th century]. Kijów, 1891; Gruszeński M. Wołyński wopros 1097–1102 [Volyn Question 1097–1102]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 140–145. [in Polish].

22. Śreniowska, K. (1960). Uwagi o nauce historycznej polskiej w latach 1887-1900 w świetle «Kwartalnika Historycznego» [Remarks on Polish historical science in the years 1887-1900 in the light of “Kwartalnik Historyczny”]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne. Seria I. Z. 15*. S. 153–163. [in Polish].

23. Telwak, W. & Łazurko, L. (2013). Ukrainika na łamach «Kwartalnika Historycznego» w okresie międzywojennym [Ukrainian theme in the “Historical Quarterly” in the interwar period]. *Rocznik Biblioteki Naukowej PAU i PAN w Krakowie*. R. LVIII. Kraków: wyd. Secesja, 239–255 [in Polish].

24. Tretiak, J. (1890). *Historia literatury ruskiej Emila Ogonowskiego. Część II* [History of Russian literature by Emil Ogonowski. Part II.]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 314–325. [in Polish].