

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY AND NICOLAE IORGA
SCHOLARS' STRUGGLE OVER THE NATIONAL HISTORY

Vitalii TELVAK, Vasyl ILNYTSKYI

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University

e-mail: telvak1@yahoo.com, vilnickiy@gmail.com

Abstract: *The article is devoted to the reconstruction of the first Ukrainian-Romanian historiographical polemic represented by leaders of the national movement Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Nicolae Iorga. It has been proved that the discussion was triggered by the dynamic processes of nation-building in the Central-Eastern European region, which pushed historians to justify the „exclusive” rights of their peoples for one territory or another, and prompted interpretation of events common to their neighbours in the past, based solely on their own national interest. The conclusion has been made on the need for further comprehension of the phenomenon of historiographical discussions in Central and Eastern Europe and of their impact on the dynamics of interethnic relations in the region.*

Keywords: *Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Nicolae Iorga, historiographical polemics, nation building, Central-Eastern Europe.*

Rezumat: *Mykhailo Hrushevsky și Nicolae Iorga. Înfruntarea cercetătorilor pe tema istoriei naționale.* Articolul este dedicat reconstrucției primei polemici istoriografice ucraineano-române purtate de liderii mișcărilor naționale Mykhailo Hrushevsky și Nicolae Iorga. S-a demonstrat faptul că discuția a fost declanșată de procesele dinamice ale construcției națiunii în regiunea central-est-europeană, care i-au determinat pe istorici să motiveze drepturile „exclusive” ale popoarelor lor asupra unui teritoriu sau altul și să interpreteze evenimentele comune din trecut, luând în calcul doar propriul interes național. S-a ajuns la concluzia că este necesară o viitoare înțelegere a fenomenului discuțiilor istoriografice din Europa Centrală și de Est și a impactului acestora asupra dinamicii relațiilor interetnice din regiune.

Résumé: *Mykhailo Hrushevsky et Nicolae Iorga. La confrontation des chercheurs sur le thème de l'histoire nationale.* On dédia l'article ci-joint à la reconstruction de la première polémique ukrainienne-roumaine portée par les leaders des mouvements nationaux Mykhailo Hrushevsky et Nicolae Iorga. On y démontra que les processus dynamiques de la construction de la nation dans la région centrale-est-européenne, qui déterminèrent les historiens à motiver les droits „exclusifs” de leurs peuples sur un certain territoire ou un autre et à interpréter les événements communs du passé, prenant en calcul seulement leur propre

intérêt national, déclenchèrent la discussion. On arriva à la conclusion qu'une future compréhension du phénomène des discussions historiographiques en Europe Centrale et d'Est et de leur impact sur la dynamique des relations interethniques de la région est nécessaire.

INTRODUCTION

The second half of the nineteenth and the beginning of twentieth centuries is a special period in the cultural history of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, as at that time the generalized grand national narratives, performed according to methodological requirements of Rankean and positivist schools, widely spread across this part of the continent. This phenomenon has become a reaction to the increasing pace of national self-awareness in the region, encompassing wider social strata. The creators of these grand narratives were representatives of the latest generation of encyclopaedists-humanitarians actively engaged in national reconstruction processes, often trying on the role of leaders of social movements or practical politicians (for example, Pavel Milyukov from Russia or Michal Bobzhynsky from Poland). In the Ukrainian case, it was Mykhailo Hrushevsky, in Romanian – his slightly younger colleague, Nicolae Iorga.

The fate of Ukrainian and Romanian historians was more or less similar. Both gained a brilliant historical education under the guidance of prominent teachers: in M. Hrushevsky's case, it was Volodymyr Antonovych, and in N. Iorga's one it was Alexandru Xenopol. Moreover, even in the same year (1894) they became professors of university departments of world history: the Ukrainian scholar in the centre of national life in Lviv, and his Romanian counterpart in the metropolitan Bucharest. Responding courageously to the challenges of the epoch both actively plunged into public and political life and significantly influenced the evolution of national movements. Both were the founders of the first modern parties, which carried the same name: National-Democratic. Both were destined for the political Olympus: the Ukrainian scientist became the head of the Central Rada – the parliament of the revived Ukrainian state; for some time, the Romanian historian was the head of the parliament and even the prime minister of his country.

It is noteworthy that approximately at the same time – at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries – both M. Hrushevsky and N. Iorga began to create national grand narratives. In accordance with the canons of that time, the construction of the „ideal” history of the people in such narratives provided the deepest possible, as far as only sources allowed, immersion of the past in seeking the roots of their own ethnic group. More importantly, historians attributed to their people the widest

range of resettlement. Such a reconstruction was made possible by medieval sources with their often-confusing ethnic nomenclature. Obviously, the willingness of the historians to attribute the largest possible area of settlement to their compatriots inevitably triggered disputes with historians of neighbouring nations that have implemented similar social objectives and claimed their territorial ambitions. The mentioned historiographical situation is now fully researched in the Ukrainian-Polish¹, Ukrainian-Russian² and Ukrainian-Belarusian³ cases. Instead, the Romanian aspect of the problem, as ultimately the broader issue of Ukrainian-Romanian historiographical visions, is virtually unclear today.⁴ Eduard Baidaus approached the study of this problem most thoroughly, reconstructing the image of Ukrainian-Romanian relations on the pages of the fundamental *History of Ukraine-Rus* by M. Hrushevsky. His interesting works⁵, which discuss the establishment of a professional dialogue between Iorga and Hrushevsky, proved the need for a special analysis of Ukrainian-Romanian

¹ Віталій Тельвак, *Між історією та політикою: польські та українські історики у боротьбі за східноєвропейську спадщину (кінець XIX – початок XX століття)* [Between history and politics: Polish and Ukrainian historians in the struggle for the Eastern European heritage (end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries)], in *Історичні образи «сусідів» на українсько-польсько-білоруському прикордонні: міфи – студії – пам'ять. Колективна монографія / Керів. автор. кол. та редактор В. В. Масненко* [Historical images of „neighbors” on the Ukrainian-Polish-Byelorussian border: myths – studios – memory. Collective monograph / Head of author committee and editor V. V. Masnenko], Черкаси, 2017, с. 84-124.

² Леонід Зашкільняк, *Україна між Польщею й Росією: історіографія та суспільна свідомість* [Ukraine between Poland and Russia: historiography and public consciousness], in „Український історичний журнал”, Київ, 2005, no. 5, с. 93–113; Іван Куций, *Цивілізаційні ідентичності в українській історіографії кінця XVIII – початку XX ст.: між Слов'янщиною та Європою* [Civilizational identities in Ukrainian historiography of the late XVIII – early XX centuries: between Slavic and Europe], Тернопіль, 2016, 480 с.

³ Віталій Масненко, *У полоні національних міфів. Конструювання образів добрих/поганих сусідів (випадок України, Польщі, Білорусі)* [In the captivity of national myths. Designing images of good / bad neighbours (case of Ukraine, Poland, Belarus)], in *Історичні образи «сусідів»...*, с. 11-44.

⁴ Сергій Добжанський, *Николае Йорга та Буковина* [Nicolae Iorga and Bukovina], in „Питання історії України” [Questions on the history of Ukraine], Чернівці, 2014. Вип. 17, с. 138-141.

⁵ Eduard Baidaus, *Mihail Hruşevski și Istoria Ucrainei-Rusi* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky and History of Ukraine-Rus], in „Revista istorică” [Historical Review], t. XX, 2009, no. 3–4, p. 309–328; Idem, *Relațiile româno-ucrainene în Istoria Ucrainei-Rusi. Considerente istoriografice (I)* [Romanian-ukrainian relations in the History of Ukraine-Rus'. Historiographic considerations (I)], in „Revista istorică”, 2010, Vol. XXI, no. 1–2, p. 167–182.

intellectual relations during the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The purpose of the article is an attempt to reconstruct the first historiographical polemic between Romanian and Ukrainian intellectuals represented by the leaders of their humanities. A wide range of sources serve for the realization of this goal: historiographical works, review texts, documents of that time (epistolary and diaries), etc.

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY AND THE NEED TO POPULARIZE THE UKRAINIAN HISTORY

Both historians made their first attempts to integrate the past of their peoples in their native languages, which did not belong to the general knowledge of the European scientific world. Therefore, the reception of these works, despite the utter novelty of ideas and concepts presented in them, was mostly limited to the internal readership circle. Pondering this problem, M. Hrushevsky was inclined to seek influence of hostile to Ukrainians forces: „In scientific circles, whether Russian or Polish the book [the first volume of *History of Ukraine-Rus*] is thoroughly concealed as the whole history of [...] in general”.⁶

However, analysing the reasons for the indifference of European colleagues, the Ukrainian scholar came to a logical conclusion about the need to present the historical hypotheses in the language of contemporary (for that time) science – German. In a diary, dated March 13, 1904, he noted: „During the last months, I contemplated a lot over the system of silencing us and on the urgent needs of popularization of our work. I made many mistakes, turning aside and relying on our work to pave its way. No, it may not break through because there are too many adversaries”.⁷

The aforementioned conviction that there is no alternative to the distribution of translated projects for professional audience to the achievements of historians of Central and Eastern Europe M. Hrushevsky expressed in 1904, in his first

⁶ Михайло Грушевський, *Автобіографія, 1926* [Autobiography, 1926], in *Великий Українець: Матеріали з життя та діяльності М. С. Грушевського / Упоряд. та підгот. текстів та фотоматеріалів, комент. та приміт. А. П. Демиденка*. [Great Ukrainian: Materials from the life and work of M. S. Hrushevsky / Sorting and preparation of texts and photographs, comments, remarks by A. P. Demidenko], Київ, 1992, с. 230.

⁷ Михайло Грушевський, *Щоденник/підгот. до друку І. Гирича, О. Тодійчук* [Diary/Preparation to the publication by I. Girich, O. Todiychuk], in „Український історик” [Ukrainian historian], 2006–2007, ч. 4/1–2, с. 24. See about this: С. М. Панькова, *Творча майстерня вченого: до історії написання 3-го тому „Історії України-Руси” М. Грушевського* [The creative workshop of the scientist: to the history of writing of the 3rd volume of „History of Ukraine-Rus” M. Hrushevsky], in „Український історичний журнал”, Київ, 2016, no. 3, с. 32–38.

review of the work of N. Iorga, devoted to the trade relations of Romania (in the author's vocabulary „Voloshchiny”) with Lviv, in the XVII century. The reviewer praised his Romanian counterpart for a thoroughly written archaeological work, which attracted the attention of Ukrainian scholars to the need for a closer study of the collections of the Lviv archive. At the same time, he pointed out that the Romanian language of the peer-reviewed text (as well as the obscure periodical, on the pages of which it appeared), naturally narrowed the circle of readers: „Due to the small area of knowledge of the Romanian language, for the majority researchers the publication [source] became a dead capital (for the record, it came out in the journal „Economia națională”, and there are no imprints on its sales)”.⁸

Being led by his growing belief in the need to popularize the Ukrainian history and the history of the past of Central and Eastern Europe in a practical aspect, M. Hrushevsky decided to translate the first volume of his *History of Ukraine-Rus* into German, by refining its content in accordance with the progress of scientific knowledge in the time elapsed from the first the publication of the book in 1898. The implementation of this plan has encountered unexpected obstacles. After all, if the professional aspect of M. Hrushevsky's question was solved rather quickly, thoroughly redefining the first volume taking into account the novelties of historiographical literature and the evolution of its own conceptual views on the questions of the initial period of Ukrainian history, then the real problem was the search for an interpreter.

It turned out that despite the fact that German was one of the languages studied in the educational institutions of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, however, to find a translator for the historiographical text was a rather problematic issue. Either people who could handle such a responsible job were overworked, or, as the correspondents of the Ukrainian scholar say, did not want to take on a truly responsible task. For example, refusing M. Hrushevsky's proposal, his student Zenon Kuzelia (a future outstanding linguist) frankly stated: „Your *History* is the first venerable work on the history of Ukraine-Rus that appears in German; the translated history will become inextricable and probably a frequently used textbook

⁸ Михайло Грушевський, *Рецензія: Relațiile comerciale ale țărilor noastre cu Lembergul, registre și documente din Archivele Orașului Lemberg publicate de N. Iorga. Partea I, Букарешт, 1900, см. 113. Studii istorice asupra Chiliei și Cetății-Albe, de Nicolae Iorga, Букарешт, 1900, см. 419* [Review: The commercial relations of our countries with Lemberg, registers and documents from the Archive of the City of Lemberg, published by N. Iorga. Part I, Bucharest, 1900, 113 p.; Historical Studies of Chilia and Cetatea Alba, by Nicolae Iorga, Bucharest, 1900, 419 p.], in „Записки НТШ”, 1904, Vol. 61, с. 18.

for Western European scholars or those Slavic writers who were not more familiar with Ukrainian editions. Therefore, it must be translated completely by a very good, smooth and perfect German. The translation that does not correspond to the German standards will damage the *History's* popularity. For that reason, I would not dare taking on this translation. I am not good at it enough and the responsibility is great".⁹ After a long quest, Hrushevsky found Felicia Nossig. Although she had the experience of translating professional works of Ukrainian writers into German, she was little acquainted with the special features of the works of M. Hrushevsky. That is why the translated text was edited numerous times, in particular, by Ivan Franko, who was already overloaded by other projects.¹⁰ Despite all the efforts made, the quality of the translation turned out to be unsatisfactory.

These circumstances led to a significant delay of the book; it was published only in 1906 (two years after the Ukrainian version 1904) in Leipzig by „B. G. Teubner-Verlag”. However, the historiographical resonance caused by the book surpassed all, even the most daring expectations. It was predicted by Ukrainian intellectuals like Ivan Kopach who stated: „This is – without doubts – one of the most important events for Ukrainians. For the first time, our nation was represented to the Europe by the works of the most significant scholar and it was represented in such a way, that we cannot fear European condemnation”.¹¹ One of the translators, Ivan Franko on the pages of „Literary and Scientific Bulletin” wrote: „This edition is the first decisive step of our scientific works to the larger audience, the first attempt to introduce to the widest circles of Western European specialists the achievements of Ukrainian historiography. The first volume of *History of Ukrainian People* of prof. Hrushevsky impresses by its great scope, thoroughness of accomplishment and critical presentation of the material covered. All the remains of Rus original are present and they make the reading more pleasant for those who are not specialists in the field”.¹²

Indeed, *History of the Ukrainian People* was the most discussed scientific

⁹ Листи Зенона Кузеля до Михайла Грушевського / Упорядники: В. Наулко, В. Старков [Letters of Zenon Kuzelia to Mykhailo Hrushevsky / Compilers: V. Naulko, V. Starkov], Запоріжжя, 2005, с. 11.

¹⁰ Михайло Грушевський, *Щоденник*, с. 31.

¹¹ Іван Копач, *Рецензія: Hruševskýj Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906* [Review: Mykhailo Hrushevsky, History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people], in „Діло”, 1906, ч. 34, no. 15 (28) лютого.

¹² І. Франко, *Рецензія: Hruševskýj M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906* [Review: Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people], in „Літературно-науковий вісник”, 1906, Vol. XXXIII, с. 595.

book ever written by a Ukrainian scientist. Letters addressed to the author by Western European historians with the words of recognition, as well as numerous reviews evidence this.¹³ On the pages of Polish, Czech, and German periodicals, the author's decision to share his ideas with colleagues from other countries by means of commonly known language was unanimously approved.

The encyclopaedic education of the author and the courage of his historiographical reconstruction were also noted with enthusiasm. For example, the quote of Alexander Brikner's assessment: „The work of Mr. H[rushevsky] is a clear testimony to the scholarship and universality of the Rus [Ukrainian] author. He fully mastered the enormous literature of the subject – archaeological, historical, philological, especially Russian, before closed to Europe; he simply surprises us with knowledge of the most special, insignificant, even forgotten Russian and German works. With that fantastic knowledge combined with a speed of thought, the originality of judgments, the perfect method...”.¹⁴

At the same time, the most fundamental criticisms concerned exactly the interpretation of a certain complex of problems (territorial, terminological, event) differentiating the historical interests of Ukrainians with their neighbours. In interpreting author's statements reviewers were inclined to see the ideological motivation of the author's historiographical work as an attempt to attribute as large as possible range of resettlement to Ukrainians. As Otto Getch correctly noted, the concepts of M. Hrushevsky once again proved that „national historiography goes hand in hand with national awakening, which accelerate and affect one another productively”.¹⁵

The active appeal of colleagues to the *History of the Ukrainian People* persuaded M. Hrushevsky in the worthiness of the efforts and time spent on the project. Moreover, the critical remarks convinced the Lviv professor in the need to continue translating his works into German for further explanation of the logic of arguments in defence of the proposed model of the Eastern European historical process. The elevated mood of the scientist, caused by the scrupulous attention to his work, was reflected in a letter to his Russian counterpart Alexander Lappo-Danilevsky: „My

¹³ See about this Віталій Тельвак, *Німецькомовна «Історія українського народу» Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників»* [German-language „History of the Ukrainian people” by Mykhailo Hrushevsky in his contemporaries' perspective views], in „Український історичний журнал”, Київ, 2007, no. 3, с. 175-189.

¹⁴ Aleksandr Brückner, *Dogmat normański* [Norman Dogmat], in „Kwartalnik Historyczny”, Lwów, 1906, Vol. XX, p. 665.

¹⁵ Otto Höttsch, *Рецензія: Hruševskij M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. Leipzig, 1906* [Review: Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people. I Vol. Leipzig, Teubner 1906], in „Historische Vierteljahrshrift”, Leipzig, 1907, Vol. X, p. 223.

first vol. of *History...* was released last year in German and now it is undergoing the fiery baptism. Alongside with more or less sharp criticism, dictated by the reluctance to my „innovations” or personal and political accounts, I was pleased to see that even the most severe critics did not point at any real flaws in my conclusions or methodology; on the other hand, this criticism, perhaps, should be valued even more than loud compliments. It motivates me for the new book review”.¹⁶ However, the chronic financial insecurity of Ukrainian science and scholars became a hindrance to many conceived, and even partially implemented, translation projects.

IORGA AND HRUSHEVSKY. THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL CONTROVERSY

Among the reviewers of the *History of the Ukrainian People* was N. Iorga, whose review appeared on pages of Leipzig’s „Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland”. Like other observers, the Romanian historian linked the emergence of work with the general activation of the Ukrainian national movement and the desire of its leaders to promote Ukrainian national postulates in the European intellectual and political environment: „In general, we are dealing with a product that serves as a national aspiration for Rusyns, who want to represent themselves as a people with 34 million population, their own culture and state formation”.¹⁷ The reviewer emphasized that the peer-reviewed book is only a small part of the multi-volume publication, on which M. Hrushevsky continued to work tirelessly. Therefore, according to N. Iorga, it was quite timely that the German translation of the first volume that presented the early history of Ukrainians was published. The reviewer summarizes the content of the *History of the Ukrainian People*, pointing out its strengths and weaknesses. He underlined the outstanding erudition of M. Hrushevsky, the profoundness of the work, the solidity of the used source and historiographical material. According to N. Iorga, the special scientific value marked the last section of the book, devoted to the beginnings of the Old Rus statehood and the reign of Volodymyr the Great. „Hrushevsky – emphasizes the reviewer – is an educated, critical, and inventive mind; he has a perfect knowledge

¹⁶ Віталій Тельвак, *Листи Михайла Грушевського до Олександра Лаппо-Данілевського* [Letters of Mykhailo Hrushevsky to Oleksandr Lappo-Danilevsky], in „Записки НТШ”, Львів, 2016, т. 270, с. 330.

¹⁷ Nicolae Iorga, *Рецензія: Hruševskij M. Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. I Bd. Leipzig, Teubner 1906* [Review: Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people. I Vol. Leipzig, Teubner 1906], in „Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland”, Leipzig, 1907, no. 17, p. 534.

of his material".¹⁸

At the same time, like his Czech and Polish colleagues, N. Iorga particularly focused on the moments that directly affected the interests of Romanian historiography. It should be noted that these were the first reflections of Romanian intellectuals regarding the modern version of the Ukrainian past. N. Iorga criticized the proposed size of the area of resettlement of Ukrainian ancestors in the prehistoric age and the exaggeration of the Ukrainian contribution to the ancient cultural and political heritage; he criticized Hrushevsky's Ancient theory as well as his „anti-românism” attitude, pointed at the idealization of the psychology and customs of his people. The reviewer was rather sceptical about the terminology of *History of the Ukrainian people*. He doubted the correctness of the toponym „Ukraine” instead of the usual „Rus”. In addition, the observer reproached a cumbersome structure of the book, the overload of its contents by numerous excursions that distracted the reader from the main plot line. However, this defect, as N. Iorga noted, is inherent in the Russian historiographical tradition.

Addressing the views of M. Hrushevsky, the special criticism concerned the Slavic colonization of the Carpathian region. Pointing to the unlikelihood of the territory attributed to „his Rusyns”, the Romanian scientist frankly mocks at such „gifts” in the form of the Danube lands and „Semigorod”. Besides, it was unclear why Ukrainian scientist carefully avoided the use of ethnonym „Romanian”, giving preference to the old „Vlachs”, and even concludes that his colleague „hates the name of the Romanians”. It should be noted that, at the same time, the observer did not feel a certain irony of the situation, of the „Little Russians”, and not – as M. Hrushevsky does – of „Ukrainians”. Finally, despite the rather harsh tone of the review, the critic pointed out: „A smart and voluminous, even enormous book will be useful for a lot of historians, but it will not satisfy everyone, although it indicates a high level of knowledge, and partly the author's insight”.¹⁹

The reproaches of N. Iorga were not left unanswered; the reason was the publication by the Romanian scientist at the same time of several parts of the *History of the Romanian people* in German. One of the closest students of M. Hrushevsky and a representative of the „Galician school”, Myron Korduba responded to the generalizing study of the founder of modern Romanian historiography. His review, published at the pages of „Notes of the SSS” which were edited by Hrushevsky, contained arguments, which, undoubtedly, correlated with ones of his teacher. Moreover, the letter of M. Korduba to Hrushevsky testified that the logic

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 533.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 534.

of construction and the critical tone of the review were largely provoked by N. Iorga's criticism of M. Hrushevsky: „Via Tomashivsky, I sent a review on Iorga's *Geschichte Rumänen*. Recently I read in the «Litterarisches Centralblatt» his criticism on the 1st volume of your *History*, which is similar to feuilleton criticism from our «Dilo» or «Ruslan». Since my review has been not printed yet, would you have time to send me some remarks? I think I should add something”.²⁰ The last phrase explains the structural similarity of the reviews of N. Iorga and M. Korduba, who challenged the Romanian scholar with the same criticism.

First, the observer introduced N. Iorga to Ukrainian audience, which had been already more or less acquainted with the name of an outstanding Romanian scholar. He acknowledges that his colleague is „undoubtedly the best methodologically trained from among Romanian historians”, who „laid the foundation of insights into the knowledge of the past of his people, the basis on which one can draw a solid image of the development of the Romanian powers in accordance with the requirements of present science”.²¹ The undisputed merit of N. Iorga was a consistent criticism in working with sources that removed from Romanian historiography many myths rooted over centuries (for example, the Roman origin of Romanians).

However, M. Korduba pointed at the author's insufficient source argumentation of many hypotheses he put forward. In addition, in the opinion of the columnist, N. Iorga underestimated the existing literature on the issue. More vividly it concerned Ukrainian historiography, achievements of which, as it was criticized repeatedly by the reviewer, were completely out of the attention of the Romanian author. The results of such neglect were significant mistakes of the peer-reviewed work, in which numerous aspects of the past of Ukrainian-Romanian relations were illusory or false. Among such mistakes, there was an interpretation of Cossacks' relationship with the Moldavian principality. Apart from this, M. Korduba argued with N. Iorga about the nature of the initial colonization of the Ukrainian-Romanian ethnic bor-

²⁰ *Взаємне листування Михайла Грушевського та Мирона Кордуби/Упорядник, автор вступних розділів і наукового коментаря Олег Купчинський [Mutual correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Myron Korduba / Compiler, author of introductory sections and scientific commentary Oleg Kupchinsky]*, Львів, 2016, с. 181.

²¹ Мирон Кордуба, *Рецензія: N. Iorga – Geschichte des rumänischen Volkes im Rahmen seiner Staatsbildungen, Гома, 1905, т. I і II, XIV, 402-f-XV, 541 см.* (Geschichte der europäischen Staaten, hrg. von A. H. L. Heeren, F. A. Uckert, W. v. Giesebrecht u. K. Lamprecht. 34 Werk) [Review: N. Iorga – History of the Romanian people as part of their state formations, Gotha, 1905, Vol. I and II, XIV, 402-f-XV, 541 ст.], in „Записки НТШ”, 1907, т. 76, с. 202.

der, indicating the methodological weakness of the attempts to support his hypotheses evidence from toponymic sources. The Ukrainian columnist pointed out to numerous mistakes in the transfer of Ukrainian ethnonyms and toponyms caused by the Romanianization of their pronunciation. M. Korduba did not appreciate the literary style of N. Iorga as well, in particular, he considered irrelevant the belles letters style of describing historical personalities. The Ukrainian scientist was not satisfied with the attempts of a peer-reviewed author to recreate the life of his people at the beginning of the twentieth century: „Here N. Iorga from objective historian turns into a politician who condemns everything that is not Romanian”.²²

In spite of the rather critical tone of the entire review, the Ukrainian historian ultimately pays tribute to the diligence and talent of his Romanian counterpart: „[...] We must admit that despite some flaws I consider this book to be the best work of this volume. The mistakes and shortcomings were the result of the author’s contest to reject all the current acquisitions of science and to be original to the *tout prix*, partly again at the cost of ignoring Slavic scientific literature, which is impermissible for the Romanian historian”.²³

Since the publication of M. Korduba’s critical review, the works of the Romanian scientist, especially those that at least somewhat concerned the Ukrainian past, were noticed by the employees of the „Notes of the SSS”. It is noteworthy that the students of M. Hrushevsky, who always stayed in close contact with the teacher, always reviewed them.²⁴ At the same time, the reviewers, like M. Korduba, admitted N. Iorga’s professional skills, as they constantly pointed out to him the ignorance of Ukrainian historiography. To their mind, the last was the reason for misinterpretation of Ukrainian-Romanian relations during many centuries of neighbourhood.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 212.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 212-213.

²⁴ See, for example: С. Т. [Томашівський С.], *Рецензія: Alessandro Amira – Storia del soggiorno di Carlo XII in Turchia, scritta dal suo primo interpršte... e pubblicata da N. Iorga, professore all’ universita di Bucarest. Букареум 1905, см. 98* [Review: Alessandro Amira – History of the stay of Charles XII in Turkey, written by his first interpreter ... and published by N. Iorga, professor at the University of Bucharest. Bucharest, 1905, p. 98], in „Записки НТШ”, 1910, т. 93, с. 185-186; З. К. [З. Кузеля], *Рецензія: Scierile lui N. Iorga. (Junimea literară, 1911, VIII, – ст. 146-154)* [Review: Writings of N. Iorga (Junimea literary, 1911, VIII, p. 146-154)], in „Записки НТШ”, 1912, т. 107, с. 178; Андрій Ключ, *Нова історія Османів. N. Iorga – Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches nach den Quellen dargestellt*, Gotha 1908 – 11, тт. I-IV: ст. VIII-486, VI+453, VIII+479 i 512 [A new story of the Ottomans. N. Iorga – History of the Ottoman Empire depicted after the sources, Gotha 1908 – 11, vol. I-IV: p. VIII-486, VI+453, VIII+479 i 512], in „Записки НТШ”, 1912, т. 110, с. 183-192.

Both N. Iorga and M. Hrushevsky themselves no longer reviewed the works of each other. Instead, at the beginning of twentieth century, the controversy moved to the pages of their general works, where the issues of reconstruction of the events of the Eastern European past in general and the Ukrainian-Romanian relations in particular, were raised. At the same time, M. Hrushevsky treated the works of a Romanian colleague with indisputable respect, especially appreciating his archaeological publications.²⁵ Traditionally, the Lviv professor disagreed with N. Iorga's opinions on the problems of common history solely through the prism of Romanian interest.

CONCLUSIONS

The historiographical controversy reconstructed above can be regarded as typical for the intellectual situation of that time: the dynamic processes of nation-building in the Central and Eastern European region pushed historians to justify the „exclusive” rights of their peoples for one or another territory and prompted interpretation of events common to their neighbours of the past, based solely on their own national interest. The results of this controversy were numerous discussions that emerged in the professional environment, often spread on the pages of massive periodicals, pushing for self-reflection the representatives of the broad circles of intellectuals. Unfortunately, this discussion was mostly „hermetic” in nature, since the parties a priori rejected the very possibility of the suitability of the arguments of the opponents. Therefore, the potential benefit of these discussions, which was the possibility of a kind of „immunization” of interethnic conflicts in the region through the correction of inter-neighbourly misunderstandings with intellectual tools, was actually wasted up. It was shown by the events of the First World War, when the empire's disintegration brought about its greater effectiveness in resolving territorial disputes. A good example here was the Ukrainian-Romanian confrontation in Bukovina. All this updates the comprehension of the phenomenon of historiographical discussions in Central and Eastern Europe and finds out their influence on the dynamics of interethnic relations in the region.

²⁵ М. С. Грушевський, *Історія України-Руси*: в 11 томах, 12 книгах [History of Ukraine-Rus: in 11 volumes, 12 books], т. I, Київ, 1991, с. 135; т. VI, Київ, 1995, с. 47, 63, 66, 67, 72, 602, 606; т. VII, Київ, 1995, с. 161; т. IX-1, Київ, 1996, с. 83, 90, 140, 477, 478, 485, 523, 524, 530; т. IX-2, Київ, 1997, с. 904, 905, 1546.