

Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi's Historical Methodology

Paul Pirie

Abstract: Long suppressed in the Soviet Union, the works of Ukraine's most noted historian, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, have recently become the object of great interest in Ukraine. It is therefore necessary for the scholarly world to begin the process of re-examining Hrushevs'kyi's writing of history. This paper rejects the common interpretation that Hrushevs'kyi's work was a product of the nineteenth century Ukrainian populist tradition and was therefore indifferent to the idea of Ukrainian statehood or nationhood. By demonstrating the continuity of Ukraine's historical development, Hrushevs'kyi sought to modify the traditional Russocentric interpretation and to show that Ukraine was a distinct nation with a tradition of statehood. This paper illustrates how Hrushevs'kyi's methodology, periodization scheme, and interpretive framework for East-Slavic history were all adjusted to support this "national idea;" this willingness to adapt his methods is the outstanding characteristic of Hrushevs'kyi's historical methodology. His highly controversial interpretation of the origin of the East-Slavic peoples is also examined in this paper. Finally, Hrushevs'kyi's historical bias as well as his contribution to the scholarly world are considered.

In the years leading up to the break up of the Soviet Union, and even more dramatically following its collapse, historians and journalists in Ukraine began to re-examine their nation's history. This process brought forth a new wave of interest in the writings of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, who is generally regarded by Western historians as the greatest Ukrainian historian. The historian's interest is demonstrated by the numerous tributes dedicated to him in influential newspapers such as *Literaturna Ukraina* (Literary Ukraine) and by the reproduction of his works in journals such as *Ukrainskyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal* (The Ukrainian Historical Journal).¹ Just as Hrushevs'kyi, the first president of an independent Ukraine, believed that his interpretation of history legitimized Ukraine's aspirations for statehood, the Ukrainian intelligentsia since Glasnost has revived his interpretation to promote national consciousness and to legitimize the independence movement. As statues have been erected and festivals organized to honour Hrushevs'kyi, his writings have been surveyed, usually with overwhelming approval, by numerous scholars and journalists. Hence, Hrushevs'kyi's interpretation has become something akin to the "official" interpretation of Ukrainian

nationalists and of the new Ukrainian state. But, more importantly, Hrushevs'kyi's importance rests in his revolutionary historical framework which asserts Ukraine as the primary historical successor to the medieval Kievan Rus' state and consequently demolishes the conventional — and still predominant — historical scheme which presents Great Russia as the main successor to this state. Thus, his historical framework at once firmly grounds Ukrainian history while pulling the foundations from beneath traditional Russian historiography.

In the near future the western scholarly world will finally have the opportunity to read an English translation of Hrushevs'kyi's magnum opus. His nine volume *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rus'* in English is presently being prepared under the supervision of Dr. Frank Sysyn of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.² Now seems a particularly opportune time to reconsider the writings of Ukraine's most widely respected historian.

Several notable Ukrainian scholars have thoroughly examined Hrushevs'kyi's works,³ but most of those who did so were representative of the so-called "state-building" school of Ukrainian historians, and their interpretation of Hrushevs'kyi was heavily coloured by this fact.⁴ Such historians tended to dismiss Hrushevs'kyi as the last major representative of the "populist" tradition in Ukrainian historiography and contend that his work was guided primarily by populist principles. Populism, as applied to the writing of history, is the practice of examining the socio-economic and cultural development of the masses; it also implies a tendency to take a sympathetic stand towards the masses, while taking a critical stand towards other classes. Nineteenth-century Ukrainian historiography was heavily guided by this principle. Hrushevs'kyi's critics contended that, because of his populism, he was uninterested in the development of Ukrainian statehood and figures who contributed to the national idea.⁵ In particular, in the view of historians such as Doroshenko and Krupnyts'kyi, Hrushevs'kyi's critical estimation of Khmel'nyts'kyi provided proof that Hrushevs'kyi was a steadfast populist who overlooked the importance of the idea of statehood as a force in Ukrainian history.⁶

It is inappropriate, however, to dismiss Hrushevs'kyi — as such historians tend to — as nothing more than an erudite and prolific representative of the populist tradition in Ukrainian historical writing. In truth, Hrushevs'kyi's was deeply concerned with the development of the "national idea" in Ukrainian history.

Hrushevs'kyi's primary aim in writing his major work, the *Istoriia*, was to demonstrate that Ukrainians were a distinct nationality, and that they possessed a unique and uninterrupted historical development. To fulfil this goal, Hrushevs'kyi was forced to adapt his methodology to suit the demands of his tasks. This paper will demonstrate that it was to a great extent the nature of his historical undertaking which determined his method: his historical agenda made it necessary for him to utilize a flexible approach to the writing of history. Thus, the outstanding characteristics of Hrushevs'kyi's historical methodology are his flexibility and his ability to use a wide array of methodological devices while adhering to a single task.

In the 1890s, when Hrushevs'kyi began to write a history of the Ukrainian nation, most historians of Eastern Europe would have thought it an absurd or impossible task. Since Ukraine had never had a state (or at least so it was thought), one could not examine Ukraine's political development, which, in the view of historians such as Ranke, was of fundamental importance. The Ukrainian people, moreover, were not considered to be a distinct nationality, but rather a collection of peasants who spoke a variety of rustic dialects. Constructing a history of such a nation would take a great deal of imagination and ingenuity. In the introduction to his *Istoriia*, Hrushevs'kyi clearly states his disdain for the then current practice of attaching the history of the Ukrainian people to the political histories of the Polish or Russian peoples. This practice, Hrushevs'kyi argued, presented Ukrainian history as a series of disjointed episodes without connection or continuity.⁷ Hrushevs'kyi makes it quite clear that his primary ambition in writing his *Istoriia* was to give Ukraine a continuous history from pre-historic times to the present.⁸

In 1920 Hrushevs'kyi noted that he was educated in the traditions of Ukrainian radical populism; a major part in this educational process was played by his academic mentor, Antonovych, a renowned populist.⁹ This populist tradition's ideology was derived from that of the Saints Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood which, in Hrushevs'kyi's words,

stood firmly on the precept that in the conflict between people and authority, guilt was on the side of authority; the interest of the labouring people is the highest law of all social organization.¹⁰

The people, Hrushevs'kyi observed in 1894, should be the "Alpha and Omega of any historical treatise."¹¹ In keeping with these statements Hrushevs'kyi devoted much of his *Istoriia* to tracing the social and cultural development of the general population; volume one of the *Istoriia* paid particularly close attention to such development.

Also in keeping with his apparent populism, Hrushevs'kyi frequently presented the Ukrainian masses in a much more favourable light than the ruling classes, particularly foreign ruling classes. In volume two of his *Istoriia* he attempted to demonstrate that the fall of the Kieven-Rus' state was related to the internal conflict between the ruling classes (i.e., the Grand Prince [Kniaz']: his troops: and the boyars) and the popular masses.¹² Similarly, in his account of the political and social organization of the Hetman State in the eighteenth century, Hrushevs'kyi deplored the development of a Cossack aristocratic class and lamented that the "old Cossack tradition of democracy disappeared almost completely" under their rule.¹³

Yet while Hrushevs'kyi may have declared in the 1890s that he was a populist, he moved beyond this in later years. Hrushevs'kyi's adherence to populism was, on the one hand, a phase in his career which he gradually abandoned, and, on the other, a device he used to demonstrate Ukraine's historical continuity, when no other devices were open to him. In this connection Hrushevs'kyi concluded that because the Ukrainian people had not enjoyed continuous independent statehood, their uninterrupted history could be traced only by looking at socio-economic and cultural development. "If political history would be considered only," he wrote, "its organic unity would be incomplete."¹⁴ Hence, Hrushevs'kyi admits that Ukraine's lack of continuous statehood left him no choice but to focus on the socio-economic and cultural development of the Ukrainian people at certain periods in their development.

While populism provided a means of constructing a Ukrainian history during certain "state-less" periods of Ukrainian history (i.e. when Ukraine was under Tatar, Lithuanian, Polish, or Russian domination), Hrushevs'kyi used various other approaches for other periods of Ukrainian history, such as his examination of Kieven Rus', or the uprisings of Khmel'nyts'kyi and Mazepa. Indeed, Hrushevs'kyi was even criticized by the historian Michael Karpovich, in a review of Hrushevs'kyi's *A History of Ukraine*, for paying "relatively little attention to the economic and social development" of the Ukrainian

people during certain periods in their history and for focusing too much attention on political developments.¹⁵ Contrary to what Hrushevs'kyi's critics, such as Doroshenko, have argued, Hrushevs'kyi did not overlook the role of figures such as Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and their attempts to create Ukrainian statehood.¹⁶ While Hrushevs'kyi no doubt examined Khmel'nyts'kyi with a healthy degree of scepticism, he concluded that his contribution to Ukrainian history was, in the final analysis, beneficial and that he was an undeniable hero of Ukrainian history.¹⁷

Hrushevs'kyi constantly searched for events and persons which contributed to social, political, and, most importantly, national consciousness in the minds of various classes of society. This search for national consciousness, as Vitanovych correctly observes, was one of Hrushevs'kyi's principal objectives.¹⁸ Since Hrushevs'kyi's "national idea" became synonymous with Hetman Ivan Mazepa's "state idea," he also took a highly favourable approach towards Mazepa.¹⁹

Hence, contrary to what his critics have suggested, Hrushevs'kyi took a positive view of events and people which contributed to the development of national consciousness, and of Ukrainian statehood, both of which were seen as fundamentally connected in Hrushevs'kyi's mind. Hrushevs'kyi's positive estimation of the Ukrainian ruling classes — and in particular the leadership of Khmel'nyts'kyi and Mazepa — directly contradicts the argument that he was limited by his adherence to the ideology of populism and opposed to nationalist and state-building trends in Ukrainian history. Thus, it is perhaps more accurate to see Hrushevs'kyi's populism as a device he relied on exclusively only when other avenues of examination appeared closed. For Hrushevs'kyi, nationalism and populism were not mutually exclusive, as his critics seem to suggest. As the platform of the National Democratic Party, which was founded by Hrushevs'kyi among others, read, "our nationalism must be democratic through and through."²⁰

Far from being in ideological opposition to nationalism, Hrushevs'kyi provided an historical framework and periodization scheme which laid an essential foundation for a nationalist interpretation of Ukrainian history. And, as Thomas Prymak observes of Hrushevs'kyi, "[f]rom the time of his youth ... [to] his last exile in Moscow when he penned his final contributions to Ukrainian historiography, Hrushevs'kyi had devoted himself to the Ukrainian national cause."²¹ His historical framework and periodization scheme

grew out of his national programme. Because of his desire to prove the continuity and integrity of Ukraine's historical process, Hrushevs'kyi created a new terminology and periodization scheme and constructed a new historical organization of the East-Slavic peoples.

To give a sense of continuity to Ukrainian history, Hrushevs'kyi had to utilize terminology which would clearly separate Ukrainian from Great Russian history and, in his words, "underline the connection between modern Ukrainian life and its old traditions."²² Hence, Hrushevs'kyi used the terms "Ukraine-Rus'" and "Ukrainian-Rus'" to describe medieval Ukraine and its populace. Also, he dispensed with the term "Kievan-Russia" to describe the period of the "Kievan State," as he called it, because the former term strongly suggested that this period was merely an early phase of (Great) Russian history. Similarly, he rejected the terms "Little Russia" and "Little Russians," using instead the terms "Ukraine" and "Ukrainians." His most obvious contribution to historical terminology is the now widely used term "East-Slavs" to describe collectively the Great Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian peoples.

Periodization for Hrushevs'kyi had to reflect the various phases of the social and cultural development of the Ukrainian people, which would also have to be distinguished clearly from the history of Great Russia (i.e., Vladimir-Suzdal-Muscovy). Hence, rather than following the traditional periodization scheme for East-Slavic history which followed the Rurik dynasty from Kiev to Muscovy, he constructed one which charted Ukraine's development from the Kievan State to the modern era.²³

One of Hrushevs'kyi's greatest contributions to Ukrainian and East-Slavic history was his ground-breaking re-organization of the history of the Eastern Slavs.²⁴ Without such a re-organization, it would have been impossible for Hrushevs'kyi to succeed in presenting Ukrainian history as a distinct and continuous phenomenon. The traditional scheme of Great Russian history, as propounded by such notable Russian historians as N.M. Karamzin (1766-1829),²⁵ held that "Kievan Russia" was the first Russian state, and that, after its collapse, the centre of Russian political life shifted to the principality of Vladimir the Great. In the fourteenth century it again shifted to the Principality of Muscovy, which grew into the Tsarist Russian Empire, whose political centre was Moscow and ultimately St. Petersburg. In the view of the American historian James Cracraft,

this interpretation is in essence "old-fashioned imperial history" such as used to be written by British historians with reference to peoples who at one time or another came under their rule.²⁶ Nonetheless, the interpretation is still the dominant one accepted by scholars in North American universities.²⁷

Hrushevs'kyi rejected the notion that the centre of Russian political life shifted from Kiev to Muscovy. In his view the Vladimir-Muscovy State was "neither the successor nor the inheritor of the Kievan State."²⁸ For him, the Kievan State was the creation of the Ukrainian-Rus' nationality, while the Vladimir-Muscovy State was the creation of the Great Russian people. The traditional scheme, Hrushevs'kyi argued, deprives the histories of the Great Russian as well as the Ukrainian people of beginnings. The Vladimir-Muscovy State

grew out of its own roots and the relations of the Kievan State toward it may more accurately be compared to the relations that existed between Rome and the Gaul provinces, described as two successive periods in the political and cultural life of France.²⁹

Although the Kievan government transplanted its political system onto Muscovy, this does not mean that the Kievan State should be included in the history of the Great Russian nationality. Rather than being transplanted to Muscovy, the Kiev period passed into the Galician-Volhynian period of the thirteenth century and later into the Lithuanian-Polish of the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries. From there it continued through the rise of the Ukrainian Cossack State and its collapse.

Hrushevs'kyi's scheme was a decisive challenge to the traditional interpretation of the East-Slavic peoples because it not only shifted the early period of Great Russian history from Kiev to the Principality of Vladimir, but also gave the Ukrainian people a much more significant historical inheritance, rather than presenting them as a relatively new occurrence. The scheme was immediately adopted by Ukrainian historians in Russian (Eastern) and Austrian (Western) Ukraine. It also favourably influenced many German and Eastern European historians, including Otto Hoetzsch and Hans von Rimscha.³⁰ The Russian historian A.E. Presniakov (1870-1929) accepted Hrushevs'kyi's scheme and accordingly began his history of Great Russia with the Principality of Vladimir.³¹ As Edward Wynot

Jr. observes, Hrushevs'kyi's scheme was "one of the most impressive challenges to accepted historiographical schemes witnessed in modern times."³² Anatole Mazour, an expert on Russian historiography, argues that, if Russian history is to be seen as more than a series of episodic stages loosely revolving around the Muscovite state, then Hrushevs'kyi's interpretation of East-Slavic history must be considered by students of Great Russian history.³³ This reorganization of East-Slavic history provided the framework upon which Hrushevs'kyi built his works; without it he could never have successfully presented Ukraine's history as a continuous phenomenon distinct from Great Russian History.

In 1918, Hrushevs'kyi became the first president of an independent Ukrainian state in the twentieth-century. After its collapse, and the establishment of Soviet power in Ukraine, Hrushevs'kyi returned in 1924 and founded the first Scientific Research Chair of Ukrainian history in Kiev. This Chair attracted a great number of talented Ukrainian historians and produced a series of valuable publications, although it was designed primarily to train new historians.³⁴

With the coming of the Stalinist orthodoxy of the 1930s, however, scholarly freedom was terminated, and Hrushevs'kyi's interpretation of Ukrainian history was proscribed. An approach which posited a common historical origin in Kievan Rus' of the three 'fraternal' East-Slavic peoples became the only accepted scheme in the Soviet Union.³⁵ This was standard in Soviet historiography up until the Gorbachev era, when Hrushevs'kyi was gradually rehabilitated.³⁶

In some ways, Hrushevs'kyi's approach was not entirely unlike that of a Soviet historian. While Soviet historians moulded their subject matter to suit their Marxist-Leninist historical bias and adopted frameworks and periodization schemes accordingly, Hrushevs'kyi began with a national idea and created a methodology to suit it. For Hrushevs'kyi, the distinctness of Ukrainian history and of the Ukrainian people, was a point of faith from which all else emanated, just as dialectical materialism was a point of faith for Soviet historians.

Although Hrushevs'kyi did not glorify Ukrainian history, as some Ukrainian nationalist historians are prone to, and although he never considered himself a nationalist (indeed, he generally used the term in the negative sense),³⁷ he did still possess something akin to a nationalist bias. This bias manifested itself in a propensity to reject

offhand any positive Russian influences upon Ukraine's historical development. As the historian Michael Karpovich (1888-1959) observes, a weakness of Hrushevs'kyi's *A History of Ukraine* was that the author dealt with Great Russia's influence upon Ukraine "only in its purely negative aspect — that of Russian oppression."³⁸ Hrushevs'kyi neglected to consider the influence of Russian thought upon the Ukrainian national movement. This influence was no doubt of some importance, considering that most Ukrainian scholars in the nineteenth century taught in Russian universities, collaborated with Russian intellectuals, and spoke Russian.³⁹ Hrushevs'kyi's rejection of the Normanist school of historiography⁴⁰ — like Soviet historians — suggests that he was inclined to reject foreign influences on Ukrainian culture; instead he preferred to look to internal sources for understanding Ukraine's historical development.

Nonetheless, Hrushevs'kyi's *Istoriia* is a major contribution to scholarship if for no other reason than its sheer comprehensiveness. Another of Ukraine's great historians, Dmytro Doroshenko, wrote that the "tremendous importance of [Hrushevs'kyi's *Istoriia*] lies in the systematic summation of information, its scholarly examination and analysis."⁴¹ It was, Doroshenko continued, a huge encyclopedia of all previous studies of Ukrainian history, as well as of his own research on the subject.⁴² In it, Hrushevs'kyi brought together a breathtaking variety of sources in over a dozen languages and surveyed a wide variety of then recent scholarly research, such as journal articles concerning sociology, archaeology, and other such branches of the social sciences. In the first volume of his *Istoriia*, which is illustrative of his method in the other volumes, he not only utilized and discussed a wide variety of sources in his footnotes, but produced a forty page appendix which discussed all of the important archival and secondary sources related to the subject matter of the volume.⁴³

As the Polish historian Aleksander Brückner observed, Hrushevs'kyi demonstrated "complete mastery of the vast literature of his subject — archaeological as well as philological and historical." Furthermore, Brückner continued, Hrushevs'kyi's thorough examination of Russian and German archives presented a great deal of new information to the scholarly community. Hrushevs'kyi's immense familiarity with his sources was in part a result of his strong belief in the necessity of travel; as a supervisor of graduate students, he always stressed the importance of travel.⁴⁴ Thus, as well as providing

Ukrainian and East-Slavic history with a new terminology, a new periodization scheme, and a new 'rational organization' of the history of the East-Slavs, Hrushevs'kyi produced a valuable and exhaustive collection and analysis of Ukrainian historical sources, both primary and secondary.

Hrushevs'kyi's main aim in the writing of Ukrainian history was to construct an history of Ukraine which was "organically complete" and which supported the Ukrainian national idea; this nationalist objective — rather than his affiliation to the ideology of populism — was the basis of Hrushevs'kyi's works. To achieve this goal, Hrushevs'kyi was willing to follow the thread of Ukrainian development wherever it seemed to lead him. At times he recognized that there was only one path to follow — a populist approach, because the socio-economic and the cultural history of the Ukrainian people was, in some epochs, "their only history," as he put it.⁴⁵ During other periods in their development, when political development was more obvious, Hrushevs'kyi paid full attention to such processes. At no time did Hrushevs'kyi accept a monocausal or dogmatic approach to the study of history. Hence, the basic feature of Hrushevs'kyi's historical writings was not populism, as some have argued, but flexibility — a willingness to use whatever tools were necessary to construct his continuous, uninterrupted history of Ukraine. This flexibility, as with many other aspects of his methodology such as his periodization and terminology, was defined by the limitations of Ukraine's historical development.

NOTES

¹ See, for example, Ruslan Pyrih, "Z rodu Hrushevs'kykh," *Literatuna Ukraina* 43 (4504) (29 October, 1992), 6.; Hrushevs'kyi's "Velyka, Mala i Bila Rus" was reprinted in *Ukrains'kyi istorichnyi zhurnal* 2 (February, 1991), 77-85; Hrushevs'kyi's *Pro Ukraïnsku movu i ukraïnsku shkolu* (Kiev, 1991) and his *Iliustrovana istoria ukraïny* (Kiev, 1991) were also reprinted.

² Although Hrushevs'kyi's brief *A History of Ukraine*, O.J. Frederiksen, ed., (Hamden, Connecticut, 1970) is his most popular work in the west, his greatest achievement, and his life's work, is his eleven volume *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* (An History of Ukraine-Rus') (Kiev, 1913). Hrushevs'kyi also produced a five volume *History of Ukrainian Literature*, as well as a great number of monographs and articles. This paper, however, will refer mainly to the first two works, as well as his important essay "The Traditional Scheme of Russian History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the East Slavs," trans. Andrew Gregorovich (Winnipeg, 1965), in Lubomyr Wynar, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Ukrainian Russian Confrontation in Historiography* (Toronto, 1988), 36-42.

³ The best study of Hrushevs'kyi's work is the excellent 1938 work by Dr. Illia Vitanovych, "Uvahy do metodolohii i istoriosofii Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho" *Ukrains'kyi Istoryk* 3 1-2, (1966), 32-51.

⁴ These historians, of whom Viachelav Lypynsky is the greatest representative, focused on the development of statehood in Ukraine and sought to demonstrate the continuity of statehood between the various states that existed in Ukrainian history, such as Kieven Rus' and the Cossack State.

⁵ The following historians have characterized Hrushevs'kyi as a populist and have criticized him for his interpretation of Ukrainian history on this basis: Dmytro Doroshenko, Alexander Ohloblyn, and Borys Krupnyts'kyi. See, for example, Dmytro Doroshenko, *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography* (New York, 1957), 270. Alexander Ohloblyn: "Michael Hrushevsky - Foremost Ukrainian Historian," *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 22 No. 4 (1966), 328; Borys Krupnyts'kyi, "M. Hrushevs'kyi i ioho istorychna pratsia," (M. Hrushevs'kyi and his Historical Work), xxiv

⁶ Krupnyts'kyi, "M. Hrushevs'kyi," in *Istoriia*, I, xxv

⁷ Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia*, I, 3-4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 3

⁹ Vitanovych, "Uvahy do metodolohii i istoriosofii Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho," 44

¹⁰ M. Hrushevs'kyi, (*Ukrainska Partia sotsialistiv-revolutsioneriv ta ii zavdannia* [n.p., 1920], 12) as quoted in Ohloblyn, "Michael Hrushevsky — Foremost Ukrainian Historian," 322

¹¹ Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, ("Inauguration Lecture on the Ancient History of the Rus'," lecture, [L'viv, 1894]), as cited in Ohloblyn, "Michael Hrushevsky — Foremost Ukrainian Historian," 328

¹² Lubomyr Wynar, "Ranni Istorychni Pratsi Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho" *Ukrains'kyi Istoryk* 3 (1966), 29

¹³ Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *A History of Ukraine*, trans. Wasyl Halich et al. (New Haven CT., 1941), 406

¹⁴ Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia*, 1, 16-20

¹⁵ Karpovich, review of *A History of Ukraine*, in Wynar, *Confrontation*, 46.

¹⁶ Doroshenko, *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*, 273. See also Krupnyts'kyi, "M. Hrushevs'kyi" xxv

¹⁷ Wynar, *Naivydatnishyi Istoryk*, (Suchasnist', 1985) 44-45; see also Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Pro Bat'ka Kozats'koho Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho* (Kiev, 1912), 42

¹⁸ Vitanovych, "Uvahy do metodolohii i istoriosofii Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho," 51

¹⁹ Hrushevs'kyi, *A History of Ukraine*, 354; Wynar, *Naivydatnishyi Istoryk*, 48

²⁰ Thomas Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto, 1987), 57

²¹ Ibid., 263

²² *Istoriia*, 1, 2

²³ Hrushevs'kyi constructed the following scheme:

- I. Ancient History (4th to 7th centuries)
- II. Medieval History of Ukraine-Rus'
 - i) Kievan Rus' State
 - ii) Galician-Volhynian State (13th century)
- III. The Ukraine under Lithuania and Poland
- IV. Modern: The Ukraine under Poland; Rise of the Cossacks
- V. Establishment and development of Ukrainian Hetman State
- VI. The Ukraine under Russia and Poland

- ²⁴ See Hrushevs'kyi, "The Traditional Scheme of Russian History"
- ²⁵ Wynar, *Confrontation*, 5
- ²⁶ Cracraft in Edward Wynot, Jr., "The Impact of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi on the History of Russia, Poland, and the Eastern Slavs," *The History Teacher* 20 (1987), 351
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Hrushevs'kyi, "The Traditional Scheme"
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Stephan Horak, "Portrait of an Historian," 353
- ³¹ Wynar, *Confrontation*, 17-18
- ³² Wynot, "The Impact of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi," 349
- ³³ Anatole Mazour, *Russian Historiography* (Westport CT, 1958), 174-5
- ³⁴ See Alexander Ohloblyn, *Ukrainian Historiography 1917-1918* (New York, 1957), 309
- ³⁵ See, for example, Boris Rybakov, *Early Centuries of Russian History* (Moscow, 1965), 8; Natalia Polon'ka-Vasylenko, *Two Conceptions of the History of Ukraine and Russia*, (London, 1968), 67-73
- ³⁶ Horak, "Portrait of an Historian," 354; Roman Solchanyk, "Hrushevs'kyi to be rehabilitated?," *Radio Liberty Research Bulletin* 70 (18 February 1988)
- ³⁷ Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: The Politics of National Culture*, 6
- ³⁸ Karpovich, review of *A History of Ukraine* 46
- ³⁹ Ibid., 45-47
- ⁴⁰ Hrushevs'kyi, *Ukraine: A History*, 22
- ⁴¹ Doroshenko, *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*, 273
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ *Istoriia*, 1, 539-578
- ⁴⁴ Brückner in Wynot, 356
- ⁴⁵ Hrushevs'kyi, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, 1, 34