

UDK 94 (477.83)
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.9.150364

Vitaliy MASNENKO,

orcid.org/0000-0002-7825-3871

*Ph D hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of History of Ukraine,
Bogdan Khmelnytsky National University at Cherkasy (Ukraine, Cherkasy)
masnenko@ukr.net*

THE TEXTBOOK OF N. POLONSKA-VASYLENKO «UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY» IN THE CONTEXT OF METHODOLOGICAL TRADITION OF THE STATEHOOD SCHOOL*

The aim of the paper is to elucidate the meaningful content of the textbook (lecture notes) written by N. Polonska-Vasylenko «Ukrainian Historiography» and its conformity to the conceptual foundations of the statehood direction in Ukrainian historiography of the post-war period. The research methodology is based on the basic principles of textual analysis and the use of historiographical cognitive methods, in particular historiographical analysis and synthesis, as well as biographical method. Scientific novelty consists in the fact that for the first time the indicated didactic text became the subject of historiographical examination, and a comparative analysis with other historiographical and historical texts of the researcher was conducted. This allowed to broaden the vision of the personality of N. Polonska-Vasylenko as a historian of Ukrainian historical science and a higher education tutor. Thus, the main methodological principles of the state direction of Ukrainian historiography within the emigration of the postwar period were clarified. Conclusions. N. Polonska-Vasylenko's text of «Ukrainian Historiography» is an interesting example of the Ukrainian didactic historical writing, which is based on the state methodological and scholarly traditions. It is characteristic that the author criticizes the previous developments on certain historiographical topics, in particular, the impartiality and objectivity of the chroniclers, ideological constructions of the continuity of the Kyivs'ka Rus' tradition by the Moscow princes, etc. Consideration of Ukrainian historical thought covers a significant chronological range: from the Kyivs'ka Rus' chronicles to scientific works of the early 1970's. To a certain extent, this is a brief essay on the development not only of Ukrainian historiography, but also of source study, especially concerning the medieval and early modern eras. The author also analyzes the intellectual genesis of the great-power Moscow tradition. The text of this manual also reflects the results of a significant part of the previous scientific achievements of the author.

Key words: *N. Polonska-Vasylenko, historiography, statehood school, source study, lecture notes, methodological tradition.*

Віталій МАСНЕНКО,

*доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри історії України
Черкаського національного університету
імені Богдана Хмельницького (Україна, Черкаси), masnenko@ukr.net*

ПОСІБНИК Н.ПОЛОНСЬКОЇ-ВАСИЛЕНКО «УКРАЇНСЬКА ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ» В КОНТЕКСТІ МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНОЇ ТРАДИЦІЇ ДЕРЖАВНИЦЬКОГО НАПРЯМУ

Мета дослідження полягає у з'ясуванні змістовного та сенсового наповнення конспекту лекцій Н. Полонської-Василенко «Українська історіографія», їхньої відповідності концепту-

* Publications are based on the research provided by the grant support of the State Fund For Fundamental Research (project № 77/42-2018)

альним засадам державницького напрямку в українській історіографії повоєнного періоду. Методологія дослідження спирається на основні принципи текстологічного аналізу та використання методів історіографічного пізнання, зокрема історіографічного аналізу та синтезу, а також біографічного методу. Наукова новизна полягає у тому, що вперше вказаний дидактичний текст став предметом історіографічного розгляду, також проведено порівняльний аналіз з іншими історіографічними й історичними текстами дослідниці. Це дозволило розширити уявлення про особу Н. Полонської-Василенко як історика української історичної науки та викладача вищої школи. Тим самим здійснено уточнення основних методологічних засад державницького напрямку української історіографії в еміграції повоєнного періоду. Висновки. Текст Н. Полонської-Василенко «Українська історіографія» – цікавий зразок українського дидактичного історіописання, який ґрунтується на державницькій методологічній і схоларній традиції. Характерно, що авторка критично оцінює попередні напрацювання щодо окремих історіографічних сюжетів. Зокрема, щодо неупередженості й об'єктивності літописців, щодо ідеологічних конструктів спадкоємності киеворуської традиції московськими князями тощо. Розгляд української історичної думки охоплює значний хронологічний проміжок: від киеворуського літописання до наукових праць початку 1970-х рр. Певною мірою, це короткий нарис розвитку не тільки української історіографії, але й джерелознавства, особливо стосовно середньовічної та ранньомодерної доби. Авторка також аналізує інтелектуальну тенеу великодержавницької московської традиції. У тексті цього посібника також відображені результати значної частини попередніх наукових здобутків авторки.

Ключові слова: Н. Полонська-Василенко, історіографія, державницький напрям, джерелознавство, конспект лекцій, методологічна традиція.

Formulation of the problem. At the end of her teaching practice, in 1965 – 1971 N. Polonska-Vasylenko lectured and held seminars of the course of «Ukrainian Historiography» for master and doctoral students of the Philosophy Faculty of the Ukrainian Free University in Munich. As Polonska-Vasylenko herself recalled, in 1965 «by the unanimous decision of the General Assembly of the professors, the UFU renewed its classes», and the lecture time was limited to two summer months (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971b: 25). From the memories of the UFU students, we can deduce a rather attractive image of our heroine as a professor who successfully combined the professionalism, goodwill and strictness. In particular, L. Vynar recalled: «Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko was popular among the students as a brilliant teacher, and at the same time she had a reputation as a strict professor who demanded a profound knowledge of historical sources and literature. Students adored and admired her and she sincerely took care of them» (Vynar, 1983: 58). Contemporaries also expressed admiration for her talent as a teacher. O. Pritsak recalled the unforgettable moments he experienced while visiting her lecture: «In a rather modest UFU building (on the ground floor of the German public school), in the crowded hall of the students, her powerful voice was clearly heard. She read from memory, and sometimes seeming to fall into the trance, closing her eyes. I remembered a pleasant tone of her voice for the rest of my life. She spoke in Ukrainian language, rich in vocabulary, grammatically correct, but orthoepy was often Russian» (Pritsak, 1993: 6).

The synopsis of her lecture course «Ukrainian Historiography» was published on the rights of the manuscript in the editions of the University (in the series «Scripts № 38»). On the cover of the book there is marked edition of 1971, although in fact the text was published after the death of the author, only in July 1973. As the authors of the publication noted: «The course of Ukrainian historiography» is like an overlay of her historical works – their final synthesis – of Ukrainian history, but also – simultaneously the synthesis of many of her previous works, studios, articles and reviews from the areas of historical science» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: VII). These notes are interesting not only as a definite result of the historiographical idea of the researcher, but also as an example of a clear general historio-

graphical tradition of the statehood school. It is rather indicative that the representatives of this trend in emigration D. Doroshenko (Doroshenko, 1996), O. Ogloblin (Ogloblin, 1957), B. Krupnytsky (Krupnytsky, 1959) were authors of historic texts that are significant for the Ukrainian historical thought.

Research analysis. N. Polonska–Vasylenko is generally accepted as a representative of statehood direction in Ukrainian historiography. O. Morgun stated in his memoirs: «In her writings, she perceives and unfolds the patriotic state ideology of V. Lypynsky, S. Tomashivsky, D. Doroshenko; in the writings of O. Ogloblyn, B. Krupnytsky, P. Kurinnyi and N. Polonska-Vasylenko was again «classified» as a statehood school representative» (Morgun, 1983: 52–53). And in her lectures, she presents «the heyday of the sovereign state of Ukraine». According to B. Krupnytsky, N. Polonska-Vasylenko was seen «as a supporter of V. Lypynsky and a representative of the new statehood direction of Ukrainian historiography. History is written in a light and brilliant style. It is no longer a history of battles, social «ruin», but rather a history of some outstanding personalities, in which the author does not forget to emphasize the evolutionary nature of Ukraine's development – where evolution took place» (Omelchenko, 1969: 92). V. I. Ulyanovsky believed that the loyalty to the statehood school allowed Polonska–Vasylenko to realize the conceptual coverage of the history of Ukraine (Ulyanovsky, 1992: XLIV–XLV). I.V. Verba also pointed out that in Polonska-Vasylenko's «History of Ukraine» in two volumes, the researcher «has shown herself as a supporter of the statehood direction in Ukrainian historiography, previously represented by V. Lypynsky» (Verba, 1993: 81). As for the last period of the life and work of the researcher, I. Monolaty and O. Vishavanyuk enrolled it in the Munich State School of Historians (Monolatii, Vishavanyuk, 2001).

The aim of the paper is to elucidate the content of the textbook (lecture notes) written by N. Polonska-Vasylenko «Ukrainian Historiography» and its conformity to the conceptual foundations of the statehood direction in Ukrainian historiography of the post-war period.

Presenting the main material. The synopsis of the lectures by N. Polonska-Vasylenko «Ukrainian Historiography» was copied and edited for publication by Volodymyr Didovych (who was obtaining his Master's degree at that time) (I–III sections) and Bogdan Kuz (IV–VIII sections and names and thematic indexes). At that time, the author, obviously, contacted her students. The evidence can be found in the Archive of the Ukrainian Free University (fund 1, Polonska-Vasylenko (Morgun) Natalia Dmitrievna (1884 – 1973) – historian, archaeologist) namely: three letters of V. Didovych to her are stored, dated 1973, in the last letter to L. Vynar 3 March, 1973 Polonska-Vasylenko also mentioned her cooperation with Didovych (Letters, 1983: 73).

In general, there were 500 copies published. The textbook consisted of: Preface, which included the speech of the rector of the UFU Volodymyr Janiv, which he gave on the fortieth day after the death of the researcher «Prof. Dr. Natalya Dmitriyivna Polonska-Vasylenko and the Ukrainian Free University»; Introduction, five (eight) chapters and four appendices (nominal, thematic and geographic indexes). The total volume of text is 104 + X pages.

A characteristic feature of the textbook is the uneven presentation of the material in different sections and the volume of each in particular. The «first part» of the textbook (chapters I–IV), which covers the development of historical thought of the IX–XVIII centuries, seems to be more detailed. As it was stated in Introduction, the author initially planned to give this chronological section in the form of a notebook, completing it with the review of «History of Ruthenians». Polonska-Vasylenko believed that the second part of historiography could

be used from her textbook «History of Ukraine» (vol. 1, pp. 17–32). Later it was decided to add to this course the «second part», however, in somewhat shortened form (the shortening mainly concerned quoted material), including the sections on historiography in emigration and in Ukraine after the Second World War (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: IX). Therefore, the historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries almost completely corresponds to the structure in the textbook «History of Ukraine».

Let us take a closer look at the structure and content of the textbook, comparing it with other historiographical texts of the author; «An Essay on the Historiography of Ukraine» (part of the textbook «History of Ukraine»), «Historical Science in Ukraine during the Soviet era and the fate of historians» (1962), «Two concepts of the history of Ukraine and Russia» (1964), etc.

The first chapter of the «The period of Principality» (20 pages) consists of six subchapters: «Chronicles», «Life of the Saints», «Sermons», «Legal Writings», «Graffiti», «Bylyny». It is much more detailed and structurally more complete than the corresponding chapter in «Essay on Historiography of Ukraine». Moreover, the latter contains only a rather brief description of the chronicles.

In our edition, the chronicle tradition of Ukraine-Rus is considered in more detail. Here the author suggests that the chronicle writing on the Ukrainian lands started, at least at the beginning of the tenth century. («Ivan's letter», an alleged chronicle of Askold, etc.). Then the view, which prevailed in the previous Russian and Ukrainian historiographies concerning the impartiality and objectivity of the chroniclers, is refuted. Referring to the innovative research of O. Shakhmatov (in the text – A. Shakhmatov), an attention is paid to the multilayer character of chronicles texts, which consisted of fragments written in different time and their sources i.e. stories and legends. The most famous Russian and Soviet chronicles researchers (T. Sushytsky, M. Prisolkov, A. Cherepnin, A. Nasonov, B. Rybakov, D. Likhachev) are mentioned.

Interestingly, Polonska-Vasylenko proposes to ancient Ukrainian chronicles within 8 consecutive stages of writing. The first of them is the chronicle of the second half of the 9th century, which was not preserved entirely, but some of its fragments are contained in the compilations of the sixteenth century, in particular in the Nikovsky chronicle. The second – the chronicle «The Legend of the Rus Princes» (as it was noted in text – V. M.) may have been written at the end of the X century. The third is the chronicle, which is attributed to Nikon (1039 – 1073). The fourth – the so-called «Initial» chronicle (1073 – 1093).

The fifth considers «The Tale of Bygone Years ...», composed by Nestor Chronicler and written until 1110. The author is quite sympathetic to characterize the figure of Nestor, and the very «Tale» is called the first attempt to present the history of Ukraine in its connection with world's history. The essential disadvantage of this work is that in its text, apart from the Rurik dynasty, the dynasties of Kyi and Askold were deprived of attention they deserved, which artificially restricted the state tradition (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 5).

The sixth period involves editing the text of Nestor by Abbot Sylvester in honor of Volodymyr Monomakh. The author is skeptical about the talents of the scribe, but agrees that this new version of the chronicle contains valuable materials. The seventh period began with the death of Sylvester in 1116. This includes the edition of the chronicle of Mstyslav written in 1118, which, according to Polonska-Vasylenko, laid the foundation for the Norman theory, since it contained a new concept of the voluntary vocation of the Varangians, their identity with Rus, the power of Rurik, etc. (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 6–7). And finally, the last

eight period is associated with the so-called Kyiv chronicle, which covers the time span until 1238. Probably the author of this text is the monk of the Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery – Moises. The author also devoted a special place to the Galician-Volyn chronicle (1201 – 1292), the circumstances of its writing and text descriptions were given in peculiarly detailed way.

The text of the lectures deals specifically with the life of the saints, as a valuable addition to the annals. The life of St. Stefan Sourozshsky, Yuri Amastridsky, Boris and Hlib, Theodosius of the Pechersk, Mstyslav the Grand Duke of Kyiv. According to N. Polonska-Vasylenko, «Kyievo-Pecherskyi Pateryk» had the greatest value for history.

Among the sermons, the particular attention is paid to the «Word of Law and Grace» by Metropolitan Hilarion, who is described as the first Metropolitan of Ukraine (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 14). The uniqueness of this writing is emphasized on, since it has come to us in its original state without any subsequent editing. As prominent preachers there are also mentioned: St. Theodosius of Pechersk, Bishop of Novgorod Luka Zhydyata, Bishop of Turovsky Cyril, Bishop Serapion and others.

The legal monuments of the prince's era are represented by the Rafelstet Customs Statute, the Treaty of Askold with the Byzantine Empire (874), and the subsequent treaties of Oleg and Igor. It is interesting that the author shares the idea of the existence of the system of «Ukrainian law» before «Rus' Justice». The last document is attributed a particularly significant place. In addition, the church decrees of Volodymyr and Yaroslav are also mentioned.

Polonska-Vasylenko draws attention to the new, for her time, interesting group of sources – graffiti on the walls of ancient cathedrals, primarily Kyiv Sofia. They can serve as a vivid correction to already known sources.

The last subchapter «Bylyna» refers to the productive method of the Soviet academician B. Rybakov, who sought to find parallels between the plots / images of the epic poems and the texts of the chronicles. In particular, it is argued: «Bylyny that can be divided into cycles, they serve as a reflexion of a certain time, sometimes illustrate the literary chronicle work, and even help to understand the obscure places of the chronicles» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 19). In addition, «The Tale of Igor's Campaign» is qualified as «the highest achievement of the poetic design of the psychology of the knight era of Ukrainian history».

The laconic second chapter «Grand Duchy of Lithuania» (8 pages) contains three subchapters: «Chronicles», «Legal monuments», «Polemic literature of the XVII – XVII centuries». Here is a combined version of the history of the state, which, according to the author, was a product of the activity of the Lithuanian princes and Lithuanian tribes, included expansion into the Belarusian and Ukrainian lands with their further incorporation (accession). But the heredity of the Ukrainian princes, the name of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Slavic language and the use of the «Rus' Justice» in the courts remained.

It is noteworthy that here the author, unlike in the «Essay of historiography of Ukraine» does not use the names «Lithuanian-Polish era». Although the chapter itself is about the manifestation of historical thought and after the Union of Lublin, especially it is emphasized in the chapter on polemical literature.

Among the chronicles of this era, the researcher once again mentions Galician-Volyn, which contains information about the Lithuanian princes, in particular, about Vojshelk. Apart from this there are mentioned and briefly described «Chronicle of Avarma» (1495), Supralsky Chronicle (1520), «Chronicle of Bykhovtsi», «Barkulabivsky Chronicle». The latter is described as «the only Lithuanian chronicle that has Muscovophile orientation». According to N. Polonska-Vasylenko, these texts were «expressions of ideology of the upper class of

society, princes, magnates» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 21). The main purpose of them was to prove that the aristocracy of Grand Duchy of Lithuania is no less superior or important than the Polish one.

Then the increase in the number of chronicles from the end of the seventeenth century is highlighted. The author mentions a compiled collection of «The Chronicles of Volyn and Ukraine» with the notes of B. Balyki, Mezhygirsky Chronicle, Khmelnytsky Chronicle, Lviv Chronicle. Separately, the significance of the Goustinian Chronicle, which is characterized as a «literary and scientific work», is considered. Unlike the «Essay on Historiography of Ukraine,» this group of texts is defined as «coming out of the narrow limits of the chronicles and acquiring the character of a pragmatic history, «warmed» by Ukrainian patriotism» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1992: 15).

A separate subchapter is devoted to the description of the legal writings of the three editions of the Lithuanian statute, the monuments of Magdeburg Law.

The polemical literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is also reviewed. The role of Orthodox brotherhoods, schools, printing houses is mentioned. The author draws attention to the most active participants in the polemics Yuri Rogatynsky, Christopher Filaret, Martin Bronevsky, Ipaty Potiy, Ivan Vyshensky, Meletiy Smotrytsky. Separately the scholar emphasizes at the significance of the Kyiv group among whom we can name Elisei Pletenetsky, Zakhariy Kopystensky, Pamvo Berinda, Lavrentiy Zizaniy, Iov Boretsky. It is noted that both sides in the controversy were looking for the roots in the past, historicizing them in their own way. The times of Petro Mohyla (1632 – 1648) is defined as the years of greatness of Ukraine. Among the defining memorials of that time there are mentioned «Sluzhebnyk», «Trebnik», «The Confession of the Orthodox Faith».

In the third chapter «Neighbors of Ukraine» (10 pp.) We have two subdivisions: «Novgorod» and «Rostov-Suzdal, Moscow principality». In the «Essay on Historiography of Ukraine», there is no such section. Instead, the second unit is echoed with another work of Polonska-Vasylenko «Two Concepts of the History of Ukraine and Russia» (1964).

It is noticeable that the author consistently distinguishes Novgorod, which, in her opinion, as well as Kyiv was oriented to the West, from Moscow. In the analysis of the Novgorod chronicles, attention was drawn to the connection of the local chronicle with the Kyiv, actually on the use of the Kyiv annals of 996 – 997 years when the first Novgorod (so-called Ostromyrvsky) chronicle was composed. The general leitmotif of this text is defined as «both anti-princely and anti-Varangian». Subsequently, the Novgorod chronicles, according to Polonska-Vasylenko, were marked by their democracy and special interest in the local features of the Novgorod republic. The championship competition with Kyiv was also typical. At the same time, «Novgorod did not forget the difference between Kyiv Rus and its independent status, and Novgorod never considered itself to be the part of «Rus» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 30).

Instead, the north-eastern lands were clearly lagging behind in their cultural and spiritual development. The author specifically emphasized this significant difference from Rus: «when a refined culture was being created in Novgorod and Ukraine, diplomatic, economic, cultural ties with the great cultures of Europe and Asia were established, the spread of Christianity, the building of temples were at their most intense development, the territory of the future Rostov-Suzdal principality was inhabited by small Finnish tribes» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 31). A special feature of these lands was the continued preservation of paganism. Separate political life of the Rostov principality, according to Polonska-Vasylenko, began only

from Yuriy Dovgoruky. The same view is present in the earlier work of the author – «Two concepts of the history of Ukraine and Russia» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1964: 6–7). Further separation of Suzdal from Kyiv Rus continues under the rule of Andriy Bogolyubsky. Moreover, according to Polonska-Vasylenko, the latter tried to organize his own general Rus annals, which would have been a continuation of the Kyiv one: «His main idea was that Volodymyr on Klyazma is the center of political life, and the Volodimir princes are the heirs of Kiev. This scheme subsequently moved to the Moscow chronicle and became one of the foundations of the state theory of imperial authority» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 32).

Accordingly, the first north-eastern chronicles – Lavrentievsky and Ipatievsky contained a borrowed «Tale of Bygone Years» with the addition of local texts. But from the end of the fourteenth century the Moscow chronicle tradition begins to dominate, with a claim of the primacy of the Moscow principality (Trinity Chronicle, Polychron of Photius 1418, Moscow «svod», etc.). In addition, Polonska-Vasylenko noted such a feature of the Moscow state tradition as forging: the construction of the legend of the Monomakh regalia and others (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 33).

Further, the author also briefly summarizes the genesis of the concept «Moscow is the third Rome» of Philotheus, that «became the main slogan of the Moscow principality and kingdom, became mystical and provided the basis for the pursuit of superiority and power of the state» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 34). Among those who developed this idea and turned it into a harmonious concept, a special place belongs to Metropolitan Macarius. In particular, composing «Chetji-Minei» he listed 40 specifically Great Russian saints. Among other works that formed the Great Russia historical scheme, the «Stepenna Knyha» is mentioned. Polonska-Vasylenko gives the following description: «This primitive, unscientific and false from the very beginning writing presented not the history of the people, but only the forged history of the princes and the transition of the prince's power» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 35). Moreover, all the princely families fell apart from the mentioned genealogical tree, except for the branch of the Suzdal princes. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, at the «Time of troubles», the interest in the past increased, but it stuck to the old ideology. The new Romanov dynasty took over the old myths of the «Monomakh tradition» of the Third Rome, the vivid examples of which are «Vremennyk» of I. Timofeev, «New Chronicle» and «History ...» of Fedor Griboyedov.

The fourth and largest section of the manual «The Cossack-Hetman's Age» (28 pages) consists of six subchapters: «Chronicles and Historical Works», «Memories, Memoirs, Diaries», «Life of Saints and Sermons», «Legal Writings», «Economic writings», «Results of the XVIII century».

The first subchapter, in fact, is an expanded and supplemented version of the relevant part of the «Essay on Historiography of Ukraine». At its beginning, the general tendency of the historical writing of that time was highlighted – «the chronicle approaches the historical narrative» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 39). These words concern the works of Leontii Bobylinsky, Panteleimon Kohanovsky, Theodosius Safonovich. The work of the latter, «The Chronicle of the Ancient Writings», was noted separately, as it promotes the idea of the unity of the whole Ukraine. The great significance of Synopsis in 1674 is also marked. Despite the general Moscow ideology of the work, the author observes that the Ukrainian people and Kyiv, as its capital, are still at the center of attention.

«Cossack chronicles» were analyzed in a more detailed way. As for the title itself of this group of works, it is stated that its content does not correspond to its nature completely.

The author of «The Chronicle of Samovydets» – Roman Rakushka-Rakovsky (as in the text R. Rakushka-Romanovsky) merited the particular author's attention. In particular, the ideological beliefs of the «chronicler» are depicted as follows: «He was the convinced monarchist, and equally treated an alliance with either Poland or Moscow. The main thing was that he was the spokesman of the prosperous class of Cossaks; his sympathies belonged to the wealthy Cossacks, not to the Cossacks of the Sich» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 40). Then the following chroniclers are described: Grygory Grabianka and Samilio Velichko. The first is attributed to the opposition of Ukrainian prosperous class of Cossacks. Chronicle of Velychko is defined as one of the most outstanding works on the history of Ukraine: «In fact, this was the first story of the Hetman's Age». In general, according to the author, these three works – «Chronicle of Samovydets» by G. Grabianka S. Velikecka began a new era in the history of Ukraine – the history of the Cossack–Hetman period.

XVIII century is considered as a period of propagation of two versions of historical writing: the Moscow one, focused on proving the heredity of power from Kyiv, and the Cossack version, that developed and deepened the history of Hetman Ukraine, and linked it with the prince's age. Among the representatives of the latter there are named: the anonymous «Short Description of Little Rus'» (1730's), works by Gregory Pokas, Petro Simonovsky, Stepan (Stefan) Lukomsky, Vasyl Ruban, Alexander Rigelman, Jacob Markovich, and Michael Antonovsky. In addition to the information contained in the «Essay on Historiography of Ukraine», there is also the work of Athanasius Shafonsky «Topographical Description of the Chernigov county» (1786).

The revival of interest in Ukraine and its history at the end of the eighteenth century. Is explained by the practical reasons namely the need to prove the origin of the Cossack prosperous class and a to provide a proof of being its descendant. Such archival searches led to the appearance of an entire cohort of «explorers of the past»: Gregory and Vasily Poletika, Fedor Tumansky, Andriy Chepy, Vasyl Lomikovsky, Mykola Bantysh–Kamensky, Bishop Yuri Konytsky. According to the author, an important motive for the search for archival materials was the feeling of patriotism, understanding of national dignity and separation of Ukraine and Great Russia. Moreover, «this feeling was not solely a sign of the spiritual elite, which sought in the archives evidence of their noble origin (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 44). In support of this rather controversial opinion, there is provided an example of the positions of deputies of the «Katerinovskaya Commission», Cossacks rebels (Dnipro Regiment), etc. Hatred for those who liquidated Zaporizhzhya and the Cossacks was also reflected in folk songs and dumas.

A separate subchapter briefly describes a new group of sources, important for the XVIII century – documents of personal origin: memoirs and diaries. The first memoirs of the Hetman's era were mentioned the pseudo-diaries of Samuel Zorka. There are also mentioned notes by Mykola Khanenko, Yakov Markovich, Petro Apostol, Pylyp Orlyk, Vasily Grigorovich-Barsky.

The subchapter «The Life of Saints and Sermons» deals with various editions of Kyiv-Pechersk «Paterik». Also referred to as «Teraturhim» by Athanasius Kallopoysky, Metropolitan Dmitro Tuptal's «Chetya Mineya», sermons by Ioanikii Galyatovsky, Lazar Baranovich, Anthony Radilovsky. These texts are interesting as monuments of the Baroque era, which at the same time equaled the level of European models, and were manifestations of original Ukrainian thought.

The «Legal Writings» section contains a description of the Hetman's agreements. Regarding the Pereyaslav Treaty, the author noted: «Despite all attempts of the Moscow government

to transform the agreement into the act of subjection, yet Moscow recognized the hetman and the Vijs'ko Zaporoz'ke as the only state representation of Ukraine, recognized its state independence and independence in external and internal affairs, rights and freedoms of Cossacks and other classes «(Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 51). However, all subsequent agreements with Moscow were based on a false version of the Treaty of Pereyaslav in 1659.

The content of the Hadiach Treaty in 1658 is briefly summarized. It is noted that this treaty, supported by the prosperous class of Cossacks, was not, however, appreciated among the Cossack and peasant masses. But it will remain in the history of Ukraine as one of the most prominent documents.

Among other important documents there is also mentioned the Constitution of 1710 (in the text it is dated 1709), as well as other works by Pylyp Orlyk, a note of the Ukrainian prosperous class of Cossacks in 1762, «The legislation of the Little Rus' people» in 1743, orders to Ukrainian deputies «Commission for the compilation of new laws» of 1767.

Separately, the author refers to the orders and legislative acts of Russian occupiers of Ukraine, in particular, the order to liquidate the Zaporozhian Sich, the enslavement of the peasants of the Dnieper Ukraine, etc.

In the subchapter «Economic Issues» N. Polonska-Vasylenko observes that the XVIII century was the era of the emergence of fundamentally new historical sources, which concerned the statistical accounting of land holdings, economy and population of Ukraine. She provides the rich data collected in the «General Investigations on the Assets of the Regiments» in 1729 and in the «Rumyantsev's Census» of 1765 – 1769 (the text states that the latter is the land registry and the population census in 1783 (?)). The author mentions that a significant part of these materials is still not published.

The last subchapter «The Conclusions of the XVIII Century» is devoted to the analysis of the meaning of «History of Ruthenians» for the development of Ukrainian historical thought and national awareness. In essence, this is a brief presentation of the corresponding article of the author of 1956 – 1957 (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1956) and a review on the second edition of this work edited by O. Ogloblyn (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1957). At the beginning of the subchapter the author states that: «Under the pressure of bloody wars, under the oppression of the invaders, this consciousness of a separate Ukrainian nation crystallized in the XVIII century» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 59). «History of Ruthenians» is qualified as an exceptional piece of Ukrainian historiography, which reflects the growth of national consciousness. A brief history of the study of this historiographical phenomenon, various versions of authorship and time of writing are characterized. At the same time, the author refers to the research of O. Ogloblyn, who attributed authorship to the Ukrainian patriotic circle from Novgorod-Siversk. In the end, Polonska-Vasylenko convinces the readers that: «The essence of the book is not a historical statement, and it was not a description of what happened; it was a book about what the history of Ukraine was supposed to be; it was not the history itself, but a brilliant historical treatise. The sincere belief in the moral power of Ukraine, its right for independence, freedom, hatred towards its oppressors, and respect for the people's sovereignty and the republican system – these are the main features why «History of Ukraine» (as it is in the text – V. M.) merited such an exceptional success» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 62).

The last four chapters of the course of lectures are not divided into subchapters. The text of the course of lectures is almost identical to the presentation of the material in the «Essay on Historiography of Ukraine». The difference lies in the allocation of separate chapters for the historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (in the Essay they constitute one

subchapter). In addition, as it was already indicated, there are some changes in the structure of material presentation and its reduction (gaps), however the text did not lose the main content.

The fifth chapter «Historiography of the XIX century» provides a brief overview of the Ukrainian historiographical process of that era. Among the prominent historians of the first half of the century there are mentioned D. Bantysh-Kamensky, M. Markevych. The great importance of ethnographic studios of G. Kalinovsky, M. Tseretelev, M. Maksimovych is emphasized. The latter is characterized as the founder of the the Narodniks movement in the history of Ukraine. Another key representative of this flow, according to the author, was M. Kostomarov. Alongside with his most important achievements, there are also mentioned some flaws, in particular, the underestimation of state figures, including Khmelnytsky.

Particular attention is paid to regional studies: especially by M. Zakrevsky, F. Gumilevsky, G. Kvitka, G. Danilevsky, A. Skalkovsky.

In the second half of the nineteenth century – the central place among the historians of Ukraine belongs to V. Antonovych. The author emphasizes that he created the so-called «Kyiv School of Historians», which is marked by solid documentary features (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 69). In the opinion of the researcher, Antonovich's methodological approaches were crucially important, as he was the first in that time to put knowledge of the pre-history (archeology) into the basis of history. Interestingly, the course of lectures, unlike the «Essay...», does not mention the Polish origin of Volodymyr Antonovych.

In another part there are mentioned achievements and importance of the Dnieper Ukraine historian O. Lazarevsky, one of the best connoisseurs of the Hetmanate. Among the important scientific institutions there are mentioned «Temporary Commission for the analysis of ancient acts», «Historical Society of the Nestor Chronicler», «Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society», «Scientific provincial archival committees».

The appointment of M. Hrushevsky as a head of the department at Lviv University is interpreted as an important event, since the scientist himself started a new era. He gave «the first systematic history of Ukraine». The author emphasizes at the special significance of the new «scheme of the history of Eastern Slavic people» created by him. Methodological approach of Hrushevsky was determined by Ukrainian nationalism.

In the chapter «The Historiography of the twentieth century» the author places herself among the students of the school of M. Dovnar-Zapolsky, who continued the traditions of V. Antonovych (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 74). Modern Ukrainian researchers also consider N. Polonska-Vasylenko to be one of the brightest representatives of the Kyiv historical and economic school of M. Dovnar-Zapolsky (Verba, Carpus, 2012: 127).

Among other regional centers of research of the history of Ukraine there are mentioned Kharkiv (D. Bagaliy), Odesa (I. Lynnychenko (in the test of lectures, as well as in the Essay, the initiators of Lynnychenko are confused with places – they are filed in the form of his father A.I. Lynnychenko – V. M.) and his student M. Slabchenko), Ekaterynoslav (D. Yavornytsky), Petersburg (O. Efimenko), Kazan (K. Kharlampovych), Moscow (M. Lyubavsky and his student V. Pičeta).

The author notes the significance of M. Hrushevsky's Lviv Historical School and the work of a scientist in the Dnieper Ukraine. The author's vision of the process of formation of the statehood direction in Ukrainian historiography is presented.

The first ten years of Soviet occupation, in the opinion of the researcher, despite the difficult conditions of the Soviet life, were quite fruitful for the development of Ukrainian

historical science. In the main focus of the work there is the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, founded in 1918, historical institutions of M. Hrushevsky, the department of D. Bagaliy, the commission for the study of the history of Ukrainian law of M. Vasylenko.

At the end of the chapter, the author gives a brief description of the defeat of All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1930 and its «reformation» into historical institution based on the party principles. More detailed disclosure of the problem in the author's work (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1955, 1958). Separately there is also mentioned the work of Galician historians in the interwar period.

The section «Ukrainian historiography on emigration» is almost identical to the text of «Essays...». There are distinguished two waves of emigration: during the interwar period and during the Second World War.

Within the limits of the first emigrational wave, the main centers of historical work are distinguished: Prague, Berlin, Warsaw, and partly Paris. Among the most prominent historians, D. Doroshenko merits the particular attention. There are also mentioned S. Tomashivsky, V. Lypynsky, V. Prokopovych, A. Shulgin, I. Borschak, V. Bidnov, S. Narizhny, A. Yakovlev, R. Laschenko, I. Lossky as well as historians of the younger generation – M. Antonovych, B. Krupnytsky, D. Olyanchyn (the latter two are described as students of D. Doroshenko).

During the Second World War, the refugees from the occupied territories joined the migrant communities. Among those historians who were forced to flee, the author mentions herself. Europe became the center of scientific work for a while. The Ukrainian Free University was transferred to Munich from Prague, and UFAN and SSS restored their activities. From the end of the 40s, Ukrainian emigration science moved to the United States and Canada. Summing up this chapter, the author observed the great productivity of the work of Ukrainian historians, the domination of the scheme of M. Hrushevsky and the spread of statehood ideology.

The last chapter, «Historical Science under the Soviets after the Second World War», is essentially a concise presentation of the wider work of the author «Historical Science in Ukraine for the Soviet era and the fate of historians» (1962) (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1962). The text of the lectures, with few exceptions, is identical to the corresponding paragraph of «Essays...». In the beginning, there is highlighted a question of the ideological pressure of the Communist Party on Ukrainian historical science (approved by the corresponding decree of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U in 1947). As a result, a new concept, as the researcher claimed, was not only a «step backwards», but «a leap into the past», a return to the times of Karamzin. Moreover, this unscientific ideological structure was propagated on the pages of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia.

The attention was also paid to the fact that Soviet Ukrainian historians were solidifying with this Moscow concept and united to prove its correctness. As an example, there are provided two academic publications – the two-volume «History of the Ukrainian SSR» (1953), «The development of science in the USSR for 40 years» and others. The ideological shortcuts noted by Soviet historiography on Ukrainian historians of previous generations: V. Antonovich, M. Hrushevsky, S. Tomashivsky, D. Doroshenko were noted. This biased historical scheme was also replicated in millions of textbooks in school textbooks on history.

Finally, the author draws the general conclusion that the Communist Party's interference violated the historiographical process and led to distortions in the achievements of not only Ukrainian but also Russian scholars. Thus, «...Soviet historiography returned to the old theories of Russian historiography» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 83).

In accordance with the functional purpose of the textbook, it specifies literature for independent study. It is noteworthy that the latest publications, both diasporic and Soviet, were dated 1971. Scientific literature is represented by several blocks: the main general literature is given after the Introduction (ten major synthetic works on the development of Ukrainian historical science), the specified literature is listed separately after each subchapter. Interestingly, these lists include works by both Ukrainian researchers (including diasporic ones) and the works of Soviet historians. Foreign researchers and historians of Russian emigration are somewhat less represented.

The supplements to the publication are of special interest. Some of them are not typical for historiographic editions. They contain a list of the rulers of the princely age and of government officials, clergy and secular figures of later times. The actual historiographical aspect is represented by the index of historians and scholars that are mentioned in the text. The geographic and thematic index have generally heuristic character.

At the end of the review let us dwell on the clarification of the methodological principles of the text. The loyalty to historiographical tradition of the statehood direction is shown, in particular, by the constant attention of Polonska-Vasylenko to any manifestations of the real or supposed political state life of the Ukrainian community and its reflection in historical thought.

The compilers of the publication already in the introduction noted: «The author ... pays special attention to the continuity of the historical process of Ukraine, the challenges of the Ukrainian people throughout its history ... Even from the division of the course, it is possible to deduce that the author approaches the Ukrainian history and historiography from the position of the historian of the statehood direction, but the at the same time being the adherent of the scientific historiographical concept of prof. M. Hrushevsky concerning the delineation of the history of Ukraine and Russia, which was adopted by the majority of Ukrainian historians at the turn of the XX century – which is maintained by our modern, as well as partly foreign, historiography. This division was carefully followed by the Author in her work» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: VIII).

Thus, the inattention to the Askold's baptism as revealed by Nestor in «The Tale of the Bygone Years ...» and the excessive belief in the objectivity of the chronicles resulted into the fact that «historians have been ignoring Askold for more than eight centuries and reducing the age of the Ukrainian state (!) for 100 years» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 5). Consequently, the Ukrainian state tradition started in the second half of the nineteenth century. The Cossack chronicles, in the opinion of the author, have begun a panegyric perception of Khmelnytsky era, «which flipped over for 8 years the whole of Ukraine, which gave new administrative forms, a new social system, and, most importantly, the consciousness that Ukraine is a state, and that this state is a direct heir of the great Kyiv era» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 42).

During the first half of the nineteenth century in Ukraine there were several prominent historians «who further interpret the state traditions of the Cossack-Hetman period and «The History of Ruthenians» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 67). Among them the author mentions: D. Bantysh-Kamensky, M. Markevich (in the text of the script he is mistakenly indicated as M. Maksymovych). Instead, Maksimovich himself was described as «the founder of the Narodniks flow in the history of Ukraine» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 67). Another bright representative of this trend was M. Kostomarov. Thus, the Narodniks ideology of these researchers was a kind of a step backwards from the previous statehood direction.

It is clear that M. Hrushevsky «was adherent of Ukrainian populism, which attached more importance to social and economic issues than to national-political» (Polonska-Vasylenko,

1971a: 71). But «from his rather large number of students a significant part of them joined another direction of Ukrainian historiography – the statehood ideology as S. Tomashivsky and others».

The emergence of the actual statehood direction is considered as a complex intellectual procedure, which combines, on the one hand, the negation of the populist trend, and on the other – the new direction «was nurtured on the basis of the scheme of M. Hrushevsky, on the brilliantly proved fact of the continuity of the historical process from the Principality era to the twentieth century...» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 75). Adherents of the new direction (statehood approach) are listed too: F. Umanets, D. Doroshenko, S. Tomashevsky, V. Lypynsky. Interestingly, N. Polonska-Vasylenko puts Lypynsky not in the first position in the process of formation of a new state direction (as demonstrated by the difference from the historiographic scheme of D. Doroshenko).

Summing up the work of Ukrainian historians in emigration, the author stated: «For the most part, Ukrainian historiography in exile made a step back from Populism, and historians adopted the state ideology, following D. Doroshenko, S. Tomashivsky and V. Lypynsky (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 80).

Considering the peculiarities of «women's writing» (on the methodological approaches to this historiographical phenomenon, see: Androsova-Bida, 2008), which can be found in this textbook on Ukrainian historiography, we will focus on the author's attention to the style of texts. It is not only about the analysis of authorship, the historical context of a document, its conceptual affiliation, but also about the poetic content of the material, its aesthetic value, the artistic features of historical writing. Ethos of this or that work, its psychological mood affected the peculiarities of its perception. It especially concerns the texts of the ancient chronicles and the Cossack chronicle. In particular, when characterizing such a monument as «The Tale of the Igor's Campaign» the author noted a special spirit of chivalry, which consisted in gaining the honor and the glory for prince. This, in the opinion of the author, proved the Ukrainian, not the northern authorship of «The Tale...» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 20).

Another remarkable feature is the mentioning of several little-known female historic characters that impressed the author (Here we mention the female studies of the author, which are most fully described in her popular work: Polonska-Vasylenko, 1969). In particular, Anna, the widow of Prince Roman, mother of princes Danylo and Vasylo, «who had great energy and diplomatic abilities and saved for her sons Volyn and Galicia» (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 8); Yelisava, the great princess, the wife of Izyaslav, the mother of Svyatopolk (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 18); Anastasia Romanova – wife of Ivan IV (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 36) etc.

The text is not devoid of certain flaws, which can be explained by not always thorough record of lectures or by neglect of the editors. In particular, in some chapters the logic of the presentation is violated, there are repetitions, discrepancies. Thus, in the subchapter «Sermons», on the adjacent pages (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a: 14–15), a quote from Metropolitan Ilarion's «Word of Law and Grace» is repeated. Sometimes, inaccuracy in the initials of certain historical characters and historians is observed. The names of some researchers, in contrast, from the text «Essays» were distorted (Dyachenko instead of Dyadychenko).

Conclusions. Despite the shortcomings mentioned, we have an interesting example of Ukrainian didactic history writing, which is based on the state methodological and scholarly traditions. To a certain extent, this is a brief essay on the development not only of Ukrainian historiography, but also of source study, especially concerning the medieval and early mod-

ern days. The content of this textbook shows the results of previous scientific achievements of N. Polonska-Vasylenko.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ogloblin, 1957 – Ogloblin O. *Ukrainian Historiography 1917 – 1956* // *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy in of Arts and Sciences in U.S.* New York, 1957. Vol. V–VI. №4-1/2. P. 305–435.

Андросова-Байда, 2008 – Андросова-Байда Д. «Жіноче письмо» в українському науковому просторі // *Ейдос*. Вип. 3. Київ, 2008. С. 354–370.

Верба, 1993 – Верба І. Н. Д. Полонська-Василенко: сторінки життєвого і творчого шляху // *Український історичний журнал*. 1993. №7–8. С. 70–84.

Верба, Карпусь, 2012 – Верба І., Карпусь Д. Київська історико-економічна школа М. В. Довнар-Запольського. Київ: Центр пам'яткознавства НАН України і УТОПІК, 2012. 148 с.

Винар, 1983 – Винар Л. Матеріали до біографії проф. Наталії Полонської-Василенко // *Український історик*. 1983. № 2–4. С. 55–61.

Дорошенко, 1996 – Дорошенко Д. Огляд української історіографії. Державна школа: Історія. Політологія. Право. Київ.: Вид-во «Українознавство», 1996. 256 с.

Крупницький, 1959 – Крупницький Б. Історіознавчі проблеми історії України (збірник статей). Мюнхен: УВУ, 1959. 230 с.

Листи, 1983 – Листи проф. Наталії Полонської-Василенко до проф. Любомира Винара // *Український історик*. 1983. № 2–4. С. 62–73.

Монолатій, 2000 – Монолатій І. Державницька школа української історіографії в Українському Вільному Університеті в Мюнхені (1946 – 1991) // *Український консерватизм і гетьманський рух: Історія, ідеологія, політика*. Вип. І. Київ, 2000. С. 409–441.

Монолатій, Вишаванюк, 2001 – Монолатій І., Вишаванюк О. Мюнхенська школа істориків (1946 – 1991): Історіографічне дослідження. Коломия, 2001. 132 с.

Моргун, 1983 – Моргун О. До життєпису Наталії Дмитрівни Полонської-Василенко-Моргун // *Український історик*. 1983. № 2–4. С. 50–54.

Омельченко, 1969 – Омельченко В. Наталія Полонська-Василенко (3 нагоди 85-ої річниці з дня народження і 60-ої річниці науково-академічної діяльності) // *Український історик*. 1969. № 1–3. С. 86–94.

Полонська-Василенко, 1964 – Полонська-Василенко Н. Дві концепції історії України і Росії. Мюнхен: УВУ, 1964. 52 с.

Полонська-Василенко, 1969 – Полонська-Василенко Н. Видатні жінки України. Вінніпег; Мюнхен, 1969. 160 с.

Полонська-Василенко, 1956 – Полонська-Василенко Н. До ідеології «Історії Русів» // *Вісник ООЧСУ*. Нью-Йорк, 1956. Ч. XII. С. 12–17; 1957. Ч. I. С. 14–22.

Полонська-Василенко, 1962 – Полонська-Василенко Н. Історична наука в Україні за совєтської доби та доля істориків // *Записки НТШ. Праці Історично-філософичної секції*. Збірник на пошану українських учених знищених більшовицькою Москвою. Париж; Чикаго, 1962. Т. CLXXIII. С. 7–110.

Полонська-Василенко, 1992 – Полонська-Василенко Н. *Історія України: У 2 т. Т. 1. До середини XVII століття*. Київ: Либідь, 1992. 640 с.

Полонська-Василенко, 1957 – Полонська-Василенко Н. Рец. на: *Історія Русів*. Переклад В. Давиденка / За ред. О. Оглоблина. Нью-Йорк, 1956. XXXI+346 с. // *Записки УВУ*. Мюнхен, 1957. Ч. I. С. 63–69.

Полонська-Василенко, 1955, 1958 – Полонська-Василенко Н. *Українська академія наук (Нарис історії)*. Частина I (1918 – 1930). Мюнхен, 1955. 152 с.; Частина II (1931 – 1941). Мюнхен, 1958. 216 с.

Полонська-Василенко, 1971а – Полонська-Василенко Н. *Українська історіографія*. Мюнхен: Український Вільний Університет (Скрипти: ч. 38), 1971. 104+X с.

Полонська-Василенко, 1971б – Полонська-Василенко Н. *Український Вільний Університет (1921 – 1971)* // *Український історик*. 1971. № 1–2. С. 17–27.

Пріцак, 1993 – Прицак О. Наталя Полонська-Василенко: жмут спогадів // Полонська-Василенко Н. Д. Українська академія наук (Нарис історії). Київ, 1993. С. 5–7.

Ульяновський, 1992 – Ульяновський В.І. Наталія Полонська-Василенко: штрихи до портрета // Полонська-Василенко Н. Історія України. У 2 т. Т.1. До середини XVII століття. Київ: Либідь, 1992. С. V–LIV.

REFERENCES

Ogloblin, 1957 – Ogloblin O. Ukrainian Historiography 1917 – 1956 // The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. New York, 1957. Vol. V-VI. №4-1/2. P. 305–435. [in English]

Androsova-Bida, 2008 – Androsova-Bida D. «Zhinoche pysmo» v ukrainskomu naukovomu prostori [«Woman's Writing» in the Ukrainian scientific space] // Eidos. № 3 Kyiv, 2008. S. 354–370. [in Ukrainian]

Verba, 1993 – Verba I. N.D. Polonska-Vasylenko: storinky zhyttievoho i tvorchoho shliakhu [N. D. Polonska-Vasylenko: the life and works] // Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal. Kyiv, 1993. № 7–8. S. 70–84 [in Ukrainian]

Verba, Carpus, 2012 – Verba I., Karpus D. Kyivska istoryko-ekonomichna shkola M. V. Dovnar-Zapolskoho [Kyiv Historical and Economic School MV Dovnar-Zapolski]. Kyiv: Tsentr pamiatkoznavstva NAN Ukrainy i UTOPIK, 2012. 148 s. [in Ukrainian]

Vynar, 1983 – Vynar L. Materialy do biohrafii prof. Natalii Polonskoi-Vasylenko [Materials to the biography of prof. Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko] // Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1983. No. 2–4. S. 55–61. [in Ukrainian]

Doroshenko, 1996 – Doroshenko D. Ohliad ukrainskoi istoriohrafii. Derzhavna shkola: Istoriiia. Politolohiia. Pravo [Review of Ukrainian historiography. Statehood School: History. Political Studies. Law]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo «Ukrainoznavstvo», 1996. 256 s. [in Ukrainian]

Krupnytsky, 1959 – Krupnytsky B. Istoriioznavchi problemy istorii Ukrainy (zbirnyk statei) [Historical problems of the history of Ukraine (collection of articles)] Miunkhen: UVU, 1959. 230 s. [in Ukrainian]

Letters, 1983 – Lysty prof. Natalii Polonskoi-Vasylenko do prof. Liubomyra Vynara [Letters of Prof. Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko to prof. Lubomyr Vynar] // Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1983. No. 2–4. S. 62–73. [in Ukrainian]

Monolatiy, 2000 – Monolatiy I. Derzhavnytska shkola ukrainskoi istoriohrafii v Ukrainskomu Vilnomu Universyteti v Miunkheni (1946 – 1991) [Statehood School of Ukrainian Historiography at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich (1946 – 1991)] // Ukrainskyi konservatyzm i hetmanskyi rukh: Istoriiia, ideolohiia, polityka. № I. Kyiv, 2000. S. 409–441. [in Ukrainian]

Monolatii, Vishivanyuk, 2001 – Monolatiy I., Vishivanyuk O. Miunkhenska shkola istorykiv (1946 – 1991): Istoriiohrafichne doslidzhennia [Munich School of Historians (1946 – 1991): Historiographical study]. Kolomiya, 2001. 132 s. [in Ukrainian]

Morgun, 1983 – Morgun O. Do zhyttiepysu Natalii Dmytrivny Polonskoi-Vasylenko-Morghun [To the biography of Natalia Dmitrievna Polonska-Vasylenko-Morghun] // Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1983. No. 2–4. S. 50–54. [in Ukrainian]

Omelchenko, 1969 – Omelchenko V. Nataliia Polonska-Vasylenko (Z nahody 85-oi richnytsi z dnia narodzhennia i 60-oi richnytsi naukovo-akademichnoi diialnosti) [Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko (On the occasion of the 85th anniversary of the birth and the 60th anniversary of scientific and academic activity)] // Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1969. No. 1–3. S. 86–94. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1964 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Dvi kontseptsii istorii Ukrainy i Rosii [Two concepts of the history of Ukraine and Russia]. Miunkhen: UVU, 1964. 52 s. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1969 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Vydatni zhinky Ukrainy. [Famous women of Ukraine]. Vinnipeh; Miunkhen, 1969. 160 s. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1956 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Do ideolohii «Istorii Rusiv» [To the ideology of «History of Ruthenians»] // Visnyk OOChSU. New-York, 1956. Ch. XII. S. 12–17; 1957. Ch. 1. S. 14–22. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1962 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Istorychna nauka v Ukraini za sovietskoi doby ta dolia istorykiv // [Historical science in Ukraine during the Soviet era and the fate of historians] //

Zapysky NTSh. Pratsi Istorychno-filosofichnoi sekti. Zbirnyk na poshanu ukrainskykh uchenykh znyschennykh bilshovytskoiu Moskvoiu. Paryzh; Chikaho, 1962. T.CLXXIII. S. 7–110. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1992 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Istoriiia Ukrainy: U 2 t. T.1. Do seredyiny XVII stolittia [History of Ukraine: 2 t. T.1. By the middle of the XVII century]. Kyiv: Lybid, 1992. 640 s. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1957 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Rets. na: Istoriiia Rusiv. Pereklad V. Davydenka / Za red. O. Ohloblyna. Niu-York [Rec. on: History of Ruthenians. Translation by V. Davydenko / Ed. O. Ohloblyn New York, 1956 XXXI + 346 p.] // Zapysky UVU. Miunkhen, 1957. Ch. 1. S. 63–69. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1955, 1958 – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Ukrainska akademiia nauk (Narys istorii). [Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (Essay on History)]. Chastyna I (1918-1930). Miunkhen, 1955. 152 s.; Chastyna II (1931 – 1941). Miunkhen, 1958. 216 s. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971a – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Ukrainska istoriografiiia [Ukrainian historiography]. Miunkhen: Ukrainskyi Vilnyi Universytet (Skrypty: ch. 38), 1971. 104 + X s. [in Ukrainian]

Polonska-Vasylenko, 1971b – Polonska-Vasylenko N. Ukrainskyi Vilnyi Universytet (1921 – 1971) [Ukrainian Free University (1921 – 1971)] // Ukrainskyi istoryk, 1971. № 1–2. S. 17–27. [in Ukrainian]

Pritsak, 1993 – Pritsak O. Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko: zhmut spohadiv // [Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko: a cluster of memoirs] // Polonska-Vasylenko N. D. Ukrainska akademiia nauk (Narys istorii). Kyiv, 1993. S. 5–7. [in Ukrainian]

Ulyanovsky, 1992 – Ulyanovsky V. Nataliia Polonska-Vasylenko: shtrykhy do portreta [Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko: strokes to the portrait] // Polonska-Vasylenko N. Istoriiia Ukrainy: U 2 t. T. 1. Do seredyiny XVII stolittia. Kyiv: Lybid, 1992. S. V–LIV. [in Ukrainian]

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.10.2018 р.
Стаття рекомендована до друку 1.12.2018 р.*