Віталій МУДРАКОВ

МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНЕ ТА ТЕМАТИЧНЕ ОКРЕСЛЕННЯ ДОСЛІДНИЦЬКИХ ПЕРСПЕКТИВ МЕТАФОР НІЦШЕ

Анотація. Стаття присвячена дослідженню філософії Ніцше, а саме специфіці її метафоричної трансляції. Дослідження розгортається як систематизація метафор Ніцше. Систематизація метафор постає із головного інтересу філософа – релігійної сфери, а точніше християнства. Принципом систематизації слугують основні актори християнської релігії: Бог, людина, церква. Продовжує методологічну основу статті підхід функціональної типології метафор. Це дозволило сформулювати дослідницьку схему метафор як продуктивний механізм класифікації: «аналіз-критика-візія». Наголошується на важливості контекстуальної (стратегічної та тактичної) інтерпретації метафор Ніцше як на засобі уникнення спекуляцій на його філософії. Особливістю статті є доволі обширний матеріал дорадчої літератури як певна методологічна настанова для розвитку дослідницького проєкту метафор. Автор готує матеріал (тематизації та методологічні формули) для обґрунтування тези про метафорику й стиль письма загалом як форму й спосіб релігійної критики. Запропонований матеріал відображає теоретичний конструкт дослідження, яке реалізується як науковий проєкт *«NIETZSCHES METAPHERN. Ein philosophischer Leseversuch»*.

Ключові слова: *філософія Ніцше, методологія, тематика, метафора, перспектива, нове.*

Submitted: 02.01.2023
Revised: 15.03.2023
Accepted: 22.03.2023

UDC 94(477) (092) : 314.151.3-054.72
DOI 10.31733/2786-491X-2023-1-24-30

Artem KOKOSH©
Ph.D. (Philosophy),
Associate Professor
(Lviv Polytechnic National University),
Ukraine

UKRAINIAN EXILE STUDIES OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY

Abstract. The article is an attempt to describe Ukrainian exile studies about M. Hrushevsky. Based on chronological principle, the article shows the historian's scientific work, political steps and formation of Ukrainian Academy of Science. The purpose of the article is to explain the main ideas of the historian in works of the scientists. This is an attempt to study the objective researchers of Hrushevsky by his contemporaries.

The works of scientists about M. Hrushevsky are considered as a part of exile historiography and constitute an important group of sources for study. The research period specified in the topic is represented by works of Dmytro Doroshenko, Borys Krupnytsky, Vadym Shcherbakivsky, Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, Oleksandr Dombrovsky and Oleksandr Ogloblin. Lack of publications about M. Hrushevsky from the first part of 20th century is explained by several reasons. First of all, Ukrainian scientists realized lack of funds for publishing. In addition, Hrushevsky was a contemporary historian of persons, who have

© Kokosh A., 2023
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4785-2190
akokosh22@gmail.com

collaborated with him within the framework of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and wrote about his scientific and political work during his lifetime, when his contribution to the development of science or politics was not yet sufficiently noticed. In the end, the historian was written about only in the context of 20th century in Ukrainian history. Study of life of the historian in the society of Ukrainian scholars abroad began in the post-war period. Then the scholars began to write scientific papers and chapters in monographs.

Today only a few works of the 1920s and 1960s are known as written abroad, mainly in Prague and Munich. Dedicated to the scientific work of M. Hrushevsky, they enlightened the archeographic activity of the historian, his views on the ancient history of Ukraine, organizational work in the National Academy of Sciences and his historical works. At the very beginning of the scholars'activity in Prague, professors took participation in the celebration of the historian's anniversaries in the form of greetings. Particular works about M. Hrushevsky were not written that time. This is explained by problems with the publishing house, which due to lack of funds was concentrated on thorough scientific monographs.

Keywords: *M. Hrushevsky, historical works, views, Prague, Munich.*

Introduction. The student of Volodymyr Antonovych, graduate of Kyiv University of St. Volodymyr, representative of the Narodnik school of historians M. Hrushevsky is a famous historian, writer, literary critic, publicist and statesman. There are many ideas about his scientific and political activity, as well as about his personality. He is the author of many historical papers, such as History of Ukraine-Rus in ten volumes (1898-1937), History of Ukrainian Literature (1923-1927), Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People (1906), Illustrated History of Ukraine (1913). In addition, M. Hrushevsky is the author of many literary and socio-political works. Archaeological work in Kyiv and later in Lviv, the development of the Scientific Society of Shevchenko, publishing, leading the Central Council, contribution to development of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences is one of those stages of the historian which are often mentioned by scientists.

Today, the historian's contribution to organizational formation and development of Ukrainian educational centers abroad is not studied enough. M. Hrushevsky is one of the ideologues of the creation of the university for Ukrainians in exile. Being among the scientist in exile, Hrushevsky was described in works by his contemporeries.

Lack of studying the ideas of Ukrainian historians abroad in 20th century makes us take into consideration the papers that contrast the Soviet ideology and proved Ukrainian state life and history. Studying the ideas of Hrushevsky's contemporaries one can realise his attempts to prove Ukrainian nation and state experience in scientific and political work. The novelty of the paper **is** in the field of objective explanation of the historian's place in science and politics.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The purpose of the study is based on the sources of contemporary historiography of M. Hrushevsky from the scientific groups of scholars in émigré. In general, the historiography about M. Hrushevsky can be divided into several periods, highlighting its characteristic features. The first block of historiography covers the first third of 20th century and is represented by reviews of his works by contemporaries or some articles about life and scientific as well as political work. Soviet historiography is represented ideologically by works about the historian in light of Soviet science. Other was the Ukrainian *émigré historiography* of the 20th century. It is represented by dozens of articles and monographs that revealed the historical and sociological studies of the scholar, his policy as the head of the Central Council. The next period, the newest

Ukrainian historiogy, began with the end of Soviet ideology and censorship in the late 1980s.

The research of Hrushevsky in Prague and Munich. First works about Hrushevsky in Prague were written not only by contemporaries but by those who personally knew the historian as a scientist and a politic.

The first work beginning the study of scientific development and contribution of M. Hrushevsky into Ukrainian science was a work of professor D. Doroshenko *Overview of Ukrainian Historiography* (1923). Studying Ukrainian issues of historiography, D. Doroshenko took into consideration the general essay of M. Hrushevsky *Development of Ukrainian Studies*, which he wrote in the first volume of the encyclopedia *Ukrainian People* (1914) (Doroshenko, 1923). The author agreed with historical theories of Hrushevsky and emphasized his study of Ukrainian history as a long process of the Ukrainian people on the territories Ukraine appeared as a state. Having proved the state history of Ukrainians and finding different state periods in the history Hrushevsky was the first who could separate the Ukrainian nation and state in history.

Doroshenko supported the historical conception of Hrushevsky and moreover his political ideas. He considered them to be a unique introduction to the Ukrainian state. The issue of M. Hrushevsky's political course was reflected in the work of professor D. Doroshenko, dedicated to Ukrainian struggle of 1917-1923. The professor was personally acquainted with Hrushevsky. In 1913, being invited, D. Doroshenko became the secretary of the Ukrainian Scientific Society, and in March, 1917 he was elected as a member of the Central Council. D. Doroshenko appreciated him as the politician, seeing the "recognized leader of the Ukrainian movement": in 1906, the future head of the Central Council came to St. Petersburg, where immediately took control of the political life of Ukrainians (Doroshenko, 1998). The political course, his ideology and steps as the head of the Central Council were considered by the professor in his work *History of Ukraine* (1930).

With the figure of the head of the Central Council, the historian compared the situation in Ukraine at the beginning of 20th century. Hence, the arrest of M. Hrushevsky on charges of "Mazepinstvo" and his exile to Simbirsk in November, 1914 were explained by D. Doroshenko by the persecution of Ukrainians, and his return to Kyiv on March 27, 1917 – by the development of the Ukrainian political movement. The head of the Central Council was supposed by Doroshenko a "national leader", and no one could match either in authority or experience with Hrushevsky.

However, the course of M. Hrushevsky on the autonomy of Ukraine and his calls to "keep hands on the pulse of the people's life and follow the rhythm of its beating" did not quite impress D. Doroshenko: that's why he condemned M. Hrushevsky's next policy. In his view, Hrushevsky did not take into account, as a historian, destructive elements; and the further he went along the political path, the more often he emphasized the idea of "subordinating oneself to the "people's" aspirations" (Doroshenko, 2002).

Analyzing the political progress of the Central Council, D. Doroshenko made the conclusion that the idea of an autonomous structure of Ukraine was not enough. And really, Ukrainian politicians, led by M. Hrushevsky, managed to lay out the main ideas of autonomy in the constitution "Statute of the Higher

Administration of Ukraine", however their mistake was short-sightedness. D. Doroshenko criticized voluntary rapprochement with russia, which "oppressed Ukraine for 250 years and suffocated Ukrainian national movement". In his opinion, M. Hrushevsky, as the political leader of the state, could not develop the idea of self-reliance and only focused on the russian federation with the autonomous status of Ukraine. In such a political course the Central Council wasted "national enthusiasm": the appeal of M. Hrushevsky's "let's save the russian federation" led to the fact that the proclaimed third universal about the Ukrainian People's Republic was not met of great interest among the Ukrainian people (Doroshenko, 2002).

Personality of Hrushevsky was also mentioned in an article by professor Borys Krupnytsky. *Die Archäographische Tätigkeit M. Hruševśkyjs* is dedicated to the anniversary of the death of M. Hrushevsky in the yearbook of Wroclaw "Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven" in 1935. Supporting historical studies of M. Hrushevsky, B. Krupnytsky summarized the historian work in the field of archeography. As D. Doroshenko, B. Krupnytsky distinguished the scientific work of the historian in Lviv, considering it the main period of his archeographic activity. In particular, the professor paid attention to M. Hrushevsky's comprehensive approach to work, by grouping young scientists. First of all, under the leadership of the historian, active archeographic research was organized, young students were involved, and the reorganization and revival of the Scientific Society of Shevchenko and the foundation of the Archaeological Commission as part of the Historical philosophical section were provided.

Unlike Doroshenko, who considered the political work of Hrushevsky, B. Krupnytsky found his main achievement in publishing of historical sources. In particular, for collection and publication of *Materials for the History of Socio-Political and Economic Relations of Western Ukraine* (1905), the historian used materials from Lviv, Kyiv, Warsaw and moscow archives. Active work of M. Hrushevsky led to the organization of scientific school, which published a number of authoritative studies, for example – Vatican Materials for History of Ukraine by Stepan Tomashivsky (Krupnytsky, 1935).

Another well-known work about M. Hrushevsky was the article of the professor V. Shcherbakivsky – Hrushevsky's Concept of Ukrainian Origins in the Light of Paleontology (1940). Despite the fact V. Scherbakivsky had the other views on the ancient history of Ukrainians and in historical studies supported the ideas of V. Antonovych, a representative of the Narodnik school, he never argued the role of Hrushevsky in Ukrainian history. In his article, V. Scherbakivsky analyzed the ideas of the historian in a prism of linguistic, ethnological, archaeological and historical components. Reviewing *History of Ukrainian Literature* and *Genetic Sociology* of M. Hrushevsky, the professor reduced them to the main ideas about Ukrainians, such as representatives of the "Indo-European white-skinned race" (Shcherbakivsky, 1940).

The first known post-war work on M. Hrushevsky was O. Ogloblin's article published in Ukrainian Tribune. Written in an attempt of synthesis of the historian's life and work, the article *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi* was the beginning of the Munich studies about him. The greatest historian of the Ukrainian folk, as O. Ogloblin called him, also mentioned as a historian of Ukrainian literature, ethnographer, folklorist, archaeologist, sociologist, publicist and political activist.

Having proved two main ideas of the historian's activity, the national and federal, O. Ogloblin supposed M. Hrushevsky's contribution to development of Ukrainian science and state. The scientist took into consideraiton political opinion of the Head of the Central Council and supported his socio-political ideology. Advantage of social interests but not national ones were the principles of his political program. The main problem for M. Hrushevsky was described by O. Ogloblin to be the contradiction of his ideas with Soviet reality (Ogloblin, 1947).

The purpose of the article is to investigate Ukrainian exile studies about M. Hrushevsky.

Formulation of the main material. Articles about M. Hrushevsky in newspapers in the second part of 20th century were written for the date of the historian's life or work. Their common feature was the characteristic of M. Hrushevsky as "the real father of our history": this definition was first proposed by Volodymyr Doroshenko. That is why a lot of articles and scientific papers considered the scientific achievements of Hrushevsky as a step to Ukrainian state.

"Perhaps the biggest event in the history of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences" considered N. Polonska-Vasylenko the return of M. Hrushevsky to Kyiv. Since 1924, she worked at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, so she knew Hrushevsky personally. In her work *Ukrainian Academy of Sciences* she studied the influence of the historian on the course of development of a scientific institution and his position in the Soviet environment. The initially good position of the historian in the Academy, in 1923-1926, the author explained by friendly relations with some political figures, such as – Commissar of Education Oleksandr Shumsky, or Secretary of the Central Committee Opanas Butsenko. A certain political support of the historian allowed him to begin institutional development of the Academy: in 1927 in its newly created commissions there were 50 full-time and 100 part-time employees. The advantage of scientists, who worked in the sections of the historian was printing in the State Publishing House of Ukraine, which paid a fee for each work.

Studying the position of Hrushevsky, the historian proved M. Hrushevsky did not take into account the Soviet reality: considering himself an authority for Soviet politicians, he traveled to Kharkiv and moscow, maintained contact with People's Commissar of Justice Vasyl Porayk, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs Oleksandr Shlichter and a representative of the Central Committee of the USSR Grigory Petrovsky. Despite this, N. Polonska-Vasylenko noted his independence (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1955).

According to N. Polonska-Vasylenko, M. Hrushevsky became "the greatest victim of criticism and harassment" in 1930s. The historian was criticized everywhere: on pages of magazines and journals, at scientific meetings of commissions. At the beginning of 1931 M. Hrushevsky was ordered to leave for moscow, where he settled in a building belonging to Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, on Pogodynska street. And although the historian could work in moscow libraries and archives, the persecution continued, and scientific institutions in Kyiv were being closed (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1958).

In general, N. Polonska-Vasylenko highly appreciated the contribution of Hrushevsky to Ukrainian historical science. A representative of the state school, Polonska-Vasylenko always called him a great historian who proved

that the Kyiv-Rus state is a "creation of the Ukrainian people" and an achievemnet of the Ukrainian historian considered his elevation of "higher than the usual "national study", which works, especially "History of Ukraine-Rus", provide "huge material for a historian-statesman" (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1964).

The last work that described Hrushevsky was an article by O. Dombrovsky Breicherung der Forschungen über die Frühgeschichte der Ukraine durch Mychajlo Serhijovyć Hruśevs'kyj published in 1959. The main focus of the work is devoted to early history of Ukraine in the study of M. Hrushevsky, his historical concept and confrontation with russian historiography. Pursuing the idea M. Hrushevsky about the identity of the Ukrainian people in the historical European context, O. Dombrovsky revealed his main thoughts on influence of Iranian and Germanic tribes on the course of historical development. He considered M. Hrushevsky to be the founder of study of ancient history of Ukraine, and his scientific studies are the basis for the development of historical science.

In general, the study of of M. Hrushevsky represented by scientific papers in Prague and Munich shows the main aspects of state theory of the historian in ideas of his contemporaries. Scientists wrote works about his scientific studies, of course emphasizing the importance concepts of the history of Ukraine, political ideology and influence of M. Hrushevsky on scientific development of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

Conclusions. Study of the life and activities of M. Hrushevsky in a scientific centres passed several stages of development. First, mentioning of him in monographs, or articles, scientists studied separate aspects of his scientific activity. Except D. Doroshenko, political steps of M. Hrushevsky were not studied. A new stage of studying the figure of M. Hrushevsky began already in Munich after the end of World War II. Due to problems the scientific studies did not take place until the 1950s.

The earliest known work in Munich was printed article by O. Ogloblyn. Written in an attempt to synthesize life and activity of historian, article Mykhailo Hrushevsky (on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the History of Ukraine-Rus) was the beginning of the Munich studies about him. Articles about the historian was written in the newspapers in the second part of the 20th century under the banner of his life or scientific work. Their common feature was a characteristic of "the real father of our history", and the figure of the historian was more meaningful than in the works of the first part of the 20th century. Scientists studied not only certain aspects of the historian's scientific activity, they revealed his organizational abilities in the development of scientific institutions and political ideology.

Particular topic for the research of scientists in Munich was a contribution of M. Hrushevsky to the development of historical studies in Soviet Ukraine. Calling M. Hrushevsky the "leader" of Kyiv school, and his return to Kyiv "perhaps the biggest event in the history of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences", they highly appreciated his contribution to the development of Ukrainian studies, grouping Ukrainian scientists and publishing activities of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

Conflict of Interest and other Ethics Statements
The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

Dombrovsky, O. (1959). Berecherung der Forschungen über die Frühgeschichte der Ukraine durch Mychajlo Serhijovyć Hruśevs'kyj. In: Scientific Notes. Munich, part 3.

Doroshenko, D. (1923). Overview of Ukrainian historiography. Prague.

Doroshenko, D. (1998). From my meetings with Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *Ukrainian historian*, no. 1-4. New York-Toronto-Kyiv-Lviv-Munich.

Doroshenko, D. (2002). History of Ukraine: in II vols., vol. I. Kyiv.

Krupnyćkyj, B. (1935). Die Archäographische Tätigkeit M. Hruševśkyjs. In: Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven. XI, 3-4. Breslaw.

Ogloblin, O. (1948). Mykhailo Hrushevsky (On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the History of Ukraine-russians). In: Ukrainian Tribune. Munich, part 21.

Polonska-Vasylenko, N. (1955). Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (history outline): in 2 parts, part I. Munich.

Polonska-Vasylenko, N. (1958). Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (history outline): in 2 parts, part II. Munich.

Polonska-Vasylenko, N. (1964). Two concepts of the history of Ukraine and russia. Munich.

Shcherbakivsky, V. (1940). Hrushevsky's concept of origin of Ukrainian people in the light of paleontology. In: Works of Ukrainian Historical and Philological Society in Prague, vol. 3.

Артем КОКОШ

УКРАЇНСЬКІ ЕМІГРАЦІЙНІ СТУДІЇ ПРО МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО

Анотація. Стаття представляє основну історіографію про Михайла Грушевського у першій половині XX століття з оглядом ідей українських науковців про внесок історика. Написана за хронологічним принципом, праця є спробою охарактеризувати ідеї сучасників за проблемним підходом і вивчити історичні праці дослідника, його політичну діяльність і внесок у формування ВУАН. Для написання праці було використано дослідження українських істориків з середовища еміграції в Чехословачинні і Баварії. Сьогодні відомо всього кілька праць 1920-1960-х років з середовища української еміграції про спадщину Грушевського. Присвячені науковій і політичній праці М. Грушевського, вони проливають світло на археографічну діяльність історика, його погляди щодо давньої історії України, організаційну роботу в НТШ та його політичні ідеї.

Згадані дослідження належать авторству Дмитра Дорошенка, Бориса Крупницького, Вадима Щербаківського, Наталії Полонської-Василенко, Олександра Домбровського та Олександра Оглоблина. Наукові статті та монографії українських науковців друкувалися як у періодичних виданнях, так і в іноземній періодиці. Вивчення життя і творчості історика в середовищі емігрантів розвинулося у повоєнний час. Тоді про М. Грушевського почали писати у газетах, наукових виданнях та окремі розділи в монографіях. Новизна статті полягає у спробі обєктивного вивчення внеску Грушевського до наукового життя українців, що представленні в оцінці українських науковців в еміграції.

Ключові слова: *Михайло Грушевський, історичні праці, погляди, Прага, Мюнхен.*

Submitted: 27.01.2023
Revised: 14.02.2023
Accepted: 01.03.2023