

UDC : 930.477

**EASTERN-EUROPEAN CHRONICLE AND UKRAINIAN
HISTORIOGRAPHY: INFLUENCE AND ADOPTION IN THE
PROCESS OF DESIGNING HISTORICAL PAST**

Надіслано:
14.06.2020

Lastovskyi Valerii

*Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor,
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts,
Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0001-8900-5569
ID: V-2549-2018
lastov@ukr.net*

Рецензовано:
30.06.2020

Прийнято:
10.07.2020

The aim of the research is to show the East European historical research influence on the development of historical representations on Ukrainian lands, their perception of their information by Ukrainian historians and the spread of Ukrainian historiography. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, systemicity, science, interdisciplinary. The following general-historical methods have been used: historiographical analysis, historical-genetic and comparative. The author adhere to the civilizational approach and principles of cultural and intellectual history. The scientific novelty lies in the basis of the Ukrainian historiographical process analysis, certain gaps that exist in historical science and possible ways of their filling have been outlined. Conclusions. Modern Ukrainian academic science is very weak in the research and publications of historical sources, including chronicles and annals. The absence of scientific publications of a number of works, primarily Polish chroniclers, creates an unfortunate situation for modern Ukrainian historical science. As a consequence of this situation with the sources and their interpretation in scientific historical works, we can state the presence of a fairly significant mythologization of historical information, especially at everyday level. A progressive way out of it can be considered only a more intense introduction to circulation of the Ukrainian historical science of a wide range of sources, including the author's origin.

Key words: historiography; historiographical process; chronicle; Eastern Europe; Ukraine.

Ластовський Валерій Васильович, доктор історичних наук, професор, Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв, м. Київ, Україна

Східноєвропейське літописання та українська історіографія: вплив та запозичення у процесі конструювання історичного минулого

Мета дослідження: показати вплив східно-європейських історичних розвідок на розвиток історичних уявлень на українських землях, сприйняття їх інформації українськими істориками та поширення в українській історіографії. Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, міждисциплінарності. Використано такі загальноісторичні методи: історіографічний аналіз, історико-генетичний і порівняльний. Автор дотримуються цивілізаційного підходу та засад культурно-інтелектуальної історії. Наукова новизна: на основі аналізу українського історіографічного процесу окреслено окремі прогалини, що існують в історичній науці та можливі шляхи їх заповнення. Висновки. Сучасна українська академічна наука дуже повільно просувається у дослідженні та публікаціях історичних джерел, у т. ч. й хронік, анналів, літописів. Відсутність наукових видань цілого ряду творів передовсім польських хроністів створює «патову» ситуацію для сучасної української історичної науки. Як наслідок цієї ситуації із джерелами та їх тлумаченням у наукових історичних творах, можна констатувати наявність досить значної міфологізації історичної інформації, передовсім на побутовому рівні. Прогресивним виходом із неї можна вважати лише більш інтенсивне введення до обігу в українську історичну науку широкого кола джерел, у т. ч. авторського походження.

Ключові слова: історіографія; історіографічний процес; хроніка; літопис; Східна Європа; Україна.

Ластовский Валерий Васильевич, доктор исторических наук, профессор, Киевский национальный университет культуры и искусств, г. Киев, Украина

Восточноевропейское летописание и украинская историография: влияние и заимствование в процессе конструирования исторического прошлого

Цель: показать влияние восточно-европейских исторических исследований на развитие исторических представлений на украинских землях, восприятие этой информации украинскими историками и распространение в украинской историографии. Методология исследования основывается на принципах историзма, системности, научности, междисциплинарности. Используются такие общеоисторические методы: историографический анализ, историко-генетический и сравнительный. Автор придерживается цивилизационного подхода и принципов культурно-интеллектуальной истории. Научная новизна:

на основе анализа украинского историографического процесса обозначены отдельные пробелы, существующие в исторической науке и возможные пути их заполнения. Выводы. Современная украинская академическая наука очень слабо продвигается в исследовании и публикациях исторических источников, в т. ч. хроник, анналов, летописей. Отсутствие научных изданий целого ряда произведений прежде всего польских хронистов создает «патовую» ситуацию для современной украинской исторической науки. В результате всей этой ситуации с источниками и их толкованием в научных исторических произведениях, можно констатировать наличие довольно значительной мифологизации исторической информации, прежде всего на бытовом уровне. Прогрессивным выходом из нее можно считать лишь более интенсивное введение в обращение в украинскую историческую науку широкого круга источников, в т. ч. авторского происхождения.

Ключевые слова: историография; историографический процесс; хроника; летопись; Восточная Европа; Украина.

Introduction

The process of development of historical knowledge has a quite complicated nature that is connected to a number of factors, which influenced it – political, ideological, psychological etc. Because of their influence, the historical narrative was formed, that would be defining the coordinates of the nation's development in the future.

Above all, some explanation is needed: what Ukrainian historiography and Eastern-European chronicle mean and what connection can exist between these words according to the author. Of course, both terms are quite broad. Eastern-European chronicle is the whole complex of authorial by origin, historical sources of the XII–XVI centuries, that appeared on a quite wide European area of Eastern Europe, first of all on the territory of modern Poland, the Czech Republic, the Baltic States, Belarus, Ukraine and Russia. In addition, Ukrainian historiography is a set of scientific studies of Ukrainian historians from the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, the early limit of Ukrainian historiography remains a certain issue. Is it possible to recognize it only in church writings and Cossack chronicles from the middle of the seventeenth century, or even earlier? However, it is a controversial question for today, that won't be considered below. At the same time, it is important to note that the content of those problems that are considered in each case and in the general historical context affects the solution to the question; and in any case, first of all, it is necessary to focus on the subject of scientific research.

Problem statement

When considering the mentioned topic, it must be noticed from the point of view of the author that Ukrainian historical process was closely connected to pan-European

from the time of Ruthenia. According to this, Ukrainian historical opinion and Ukrainian scientists' historical ideas were evolving further. The prominent consolidating feature of these processes is, firstly, the unity in the illumination and interpretation of certain historical events on the European territory, and secondly, necessary historical information transfer or borrowing. At the same time, it is necessary to note the fact that it was happening not in a one-sided order. Ukrainian historiography in many aspects had been forming for many centuries under the influence of European historical writings, above of all, from Eastern Europe.

The analysis of sources and recent researches

There have not been any general and special studies on this topic yet. However, a number of authors drew attention to some aspects of the use and influence of the Eastern European chronicles on Ukrainian historiography. In particular, among them the works of Yaroslav Kalakura, Yuriy Mytsyk, Natalia Yakovenko, Valerii Lastovskyi and others can be mentioned.

Specifying the purpose of research

The purpose of the article is to find out the connection of the East European historiographical process with the Ukrainian way of borrowing information, the creation of historical myths and ways to improve the scientific search in Ukraine and correcting gaps.

Presenting the research material

Ukrainian historiographical tradition has its roots from the beginning of creating the first chronicles of Ruthenia, in which not only national historical information was represented, but also the pan-European one. It can be seen, even when comparing the texts of Nestor – Kozma of Prague – Gallus Anonymus, in which the same events are taking place, but presented from the different points of view. But already based on this, we can construct the European history, that was true. From the discourse of these authors, constructing history had been being continued already in other chronicles of Polish, Czech and Ukrainian historians. In fact, in the XII century, when these writings were being created, the only discourse of the historical science of Eastern Europe was initiated, that influenced the development of both scientific concepts and national constructions formation.

Already in the Modern Period the new Ukrainian process of writing history was evolving intensively, consuming the ideas and information from the ancient chronicles and historical works from the nearest Slavic territories. At the early stage of development of Ukrainian historical science, the ordinary borrowing historical information, sometimes without critical perception, was characteristic of it.

Nevertheless, these borrowings can be called ideological rather than mechanical. After all, the Ukrainian chroniclers (and they were representatives of the higher clergy and the Ukrainian Cossacks) were quite selective in retrieval of information, including

in their works only the information that met their own ideological schemes and concepts.

This is how the idea of sarmatism penetrated into the early Ukrainian historiography. Created in the fifteenth century by Jan Długosz and developed by other Polish chroniclers (Miechowita, Bielski, Kromer, etc.), it falls into the work of Stanisław Orzechowski (1513–1566), into the *Gustyn Chronicle*, and then even in the *History of Rus'*, an anonymous work that was already written in the early nineteenth century (Istoriya rusov, 1846).

In the development of the Ukrainian historical science of the Modern era, we have several quite significant historiographical sources that have influenced, above all, the conceptual development of scientific historical narratives. Among them – Theodosius Sofonovich's chronicles, the *Synopsis* by Innokenty Gizel, the annals of Grigory Grabianka and Samiilo Velychko, etc. Each of these works more or less, but yet was based on a rather significant historiographic framework – Old Russian, Polish, Belarusian, and Russian ones. For example, the main sources in the work for the *Chronicles of Sofonovich* were *The Tale of Bygone Years* (according to The Hypatian and Khlebnikov lists) and Strykowski's chronicle, although other works were also used. And the annals of Grigory Grabianka seem even more presentable about sources; he had already added German 'sources to Polish ones – Samuel Pufendorf's and Johann Hübner's.

A significant part of the Ukrainian chroniclers were written under the influence of the old Polish historical school. Moreover, we can say that Ukrainian chroniclers have used the Polish paradigm already for their own concept. In Ukrainian history the Cossack chronicle has a special place in its scientific as well as social and political significance. It is perceived not only as a source of a certain information, but also as a historical thought remembrance reflecting the mood and position of a whole stratum of the Ukrainian population of the XVII–XIXth centuries. These were the centuries when the question of the entire Ukrainian nation's survival altogether with its aspiration to unite and create the state was rather sharp. Since XIXth century a large number of scientific studies have already been devoted to the Cossack chronicles, and these studies continue up till now, with the Cossack chronicles being a considerable potential for scientists even nowadays.

A number of examples can be provided, when the Ukrainian historical science was being influenced by individual positions in Eastern-European historical works, resulting in mythologization or distortion of historical events and personalities. Of course, the reason for this phenomenon was, first and foremost, in the Ukrainian historians' teaching, in their perception of historical information and their ideological positions.

Example 1. As already noted, Cossack chroniclers selectively approached one or another information, promulgated in the Eastern-European annals. This can be seen at

least in the representation of the image of Eustachy Daszkiewicz, starosta in Cherkasy, famous for his military campaigns and battles with Moscow and the Crimean Khanate at the beginning of the sixteenth century. This historical figure was known to many historical works of the New Age, first of all Polish. Bernard Wapowski and Marcin Bielski wrote about him. Besides, he was also known to other works of European authors – for example, to the Austrian diplomat Siegmund Herberstein or to Alexander Guagnini, Italian.

The information about Eustachy Daszkiewicz ended up in the Ukrainian literature, first of all, from Polish historical works. Then it spread to the Cossack and European literature of the eighteenth century. With the beginning of the Romantic era, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a very peculiar work of historical and political nature – *The History of Ruthenians* – appeared, in which this image of Eustachy Daszkiewicz was mixed with the historical images of previous works. As a result, it was united with the figures of Ruzhinsky Princes. This happened owing to the fact that the statesman was not of the royal line, and the Cossack elite, first of all, needed to justify their existence by an elite political concept, that the identity of an uncertain origin did not match. That's how the collective image of Prince Eustathius Ruzhinsky appeared instead of Eustachy Daszkiewicz. Obviously, this is also a reflection of the same concept of sarmatism.

Example 2. Another situation is associated with Dmytro Vyshnevetsky – a character for Ukrainian history and historiography, not only colorful, but also iconic. In fact, he is recognized as a frontier character in the organization of Ukrainian Cossacks and the appearance of Zaporozhian Sich. For many people he is both Hetman and founder of the Khortytska Sich. The legend of this person is so significant, that myths were formed around it which continue to live not only in the mind of ordinary people, but also in scientific literature. It just so happens that long after the death of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, his life has been tightly intertwined with Cherkasy.

According to the Russian Nikon Chronicle, in 1558 Dmytro Vyshnevetsky captured Cherkasy and Kaniv, and offered Ivan, the Tsar of Moscow, these cities, then there was already a record about the moving of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky to serve the Tsar. This information was accepted unquestioningly both in Russian and in Ukrainian historiography. This is exactly the approach we have from Nikolai Karamzin, Dmitri Bantysh-Kamensky, Sergei Solovyov, Mykhaylo Maksymovych, Dmitro Yavornytsky and many others.

However, the analysis of historical events and a documentary source base showed that there was, in fact, no capture of Cherkasy and Kaniv. It was a falsification, created in the mid-1560s by Moscow authors of the chronicles. The question arises: Why did this historical falsification be needed? The answer may be as follows: it may have pursued two goals: first, to secure Prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's title as the traitor (not only of the Moscow king, but also the Polish king), and, secondly, to

incorporate into the documents the geopolitical claims of the Moscow authorities on the territory of the Middle Dnieper, where the main centres at that time were Kaniv and Cherkasy. However, in the context of this topic, it is more important for us, that the story of the fictitious capture of two cities has gotten a steady position in the historical science from the nineteenth century and to this time.

Example 3. The idea that the Polish king Stephen Báthory in 1578 gave the town of Trakhtemyriv on the banks of the Dnieper together with a local monastery to Ukrainian Cossacks has long been established in the Ukrainian historical science. However, this generally accepted information was only partially true. The king really gave the town of Trakhtemyriv to Cossacks, but he did not give them the right to have a monastery. And it turns out only because there was no monastery at that time in this place.

In fact, all the information on Stephen Báthory's reform was initially published in Polish historical literature by Bishop Pavel Pyasetsky (1579–1649), the information of which was used later in the work "Wojna Domowa" (1660) by another Polish author – Samuel Twardovsky (1595/1600–1661), and he simply creatively rewrote the chronicle of another Polish author. However, after that, Ukrainian author Grigory Grabianka in his "Chronicle" using all their information, creatively rewriting it, created a legend about the Cossack monastery. Later, this fantasy was adopted by the Ukrainian historiography of the nineteenth century (Lastovskyi, 2017).

From the nineteenth century, during the spread of scientific works of positivism, neo-Kantianism and modernism, the approach to studying the Eastern European chronicles has changed significantly due to the critical attitude towards these sources, the application of scientific analysis of works and the formation of the concept of purely national history. Of course, this is evident from the work of many scholars such as Mikhail Maksimovich, Vladimir Antonovich, Mykhailo Hrushevsky and others.

However, since the beginning of the nineteenth century there has been a considerable recession from the Eastern European source base. This is evident primarily in the works of Dmitry Bantysh-Kamensky (1820's) (the appearance of his book Dmitry Doroshenko called "an epoch-making phenomenon") and Nikolai Markevich (1840's). There was a reorientation to Russian historical literature, first of all – on the materials and concept of Nikolai Karamzin. And as an addition French, German and individual Polish works of XVII–XVIII centuries are being used.

It is clear that such a shift occurred from the end of the eighteenth century in the conditions of the formation of a new concept of state history, the crown of which was at that time the work of Nikolai Karamzin.

The interest in the Eastern European chronicles was revived in the 1860s, thanks to the research of Mikhail Maksymovych and Volodymyr Antonovich.

Undoubtedly, this is influenced by the reform of public relations, the conduct of liberal reforms, especially in the field of education.

A special role in this process should be given to Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi (1866–1934). In general, his scientific merit is in having created a holistic concept of the Ukrainian people's history, contradicting the official Russian imperial ideology. This historian scientific research result was the creation of a multi-volume "History of Ukraine-Rus", been published during 1898–1936. As we may note this precise work was the first one to have addressed to the medieval East European chronicles and records (not taking into account the significant use of works originating from the Byzantine and Western European lands).

Only at the end of the XXth century Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi's scientific heritage came into notice of modern Ukrainian researchers. His researches and surveys turned out to be of a significant scientific value both as a source of information and as a historiographical development result of the Ukrainian historical thought. We cannot but agree with the opinion of Liubomyr Vynar, who said the influence of Hrushevskiyi's historiographical concepts on the modern development of state life in Ukraine, as well as on the revival of Ukrainian scientific historiography, to be direct and exceptionally strong. This immutability of the historical and state process was, in particular, emphasized by Ukrainian historians and statesmen (Vynar, 1995). Indeed, nowadays, only a small part of the scientific researches held by Ukrainian historical scientists not to have referred to the works or ideas of Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi. It can be argued, of course, that modern Ukrainian historical science, having already accumulated a rather significant methodological and historiosophical experience, has a huge potential for studying the problems of the past. However, it should be noted that Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi's scientific heritage is still of considerable interest to modern scholars.

To justify his own concept Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi used to address to the works of such scientists as Gallus Anonimus, Cosmas Pragensis, Vincentius Cadlubkonis, Jan Długosz, Jan Blahoslav, Iodocus Ludovicus Decius, Marcin Kromer, Marcin Bielski, Jan Brożek, Joachim Jerlicz, Samuel Grødzki, and others.

Using them, the historian applied comparative and critical methods to study the information contained therein. This methodology allowed him to affirm or deny certain postulates related to the description of historical events and processes. An example of this approach is seen in the case of considering some of the chronicler Wincenty Kadłubek's provisions concerning XIIth century Rus'-Polish relations in his work "Chronica Polonorum". In particular, in his analysis, Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi also took into account the provisions of the "Chronica magna seu longa polonorum seu lechitarum" and the Hypatian Codex, as well as the works of Jan Długosz, Marcin Bielski, Marcin Kromer, and Latopis *Hustyński*. As a result, the researcher came to the idea that Kadłubek was often confused and mistaken (Hrushevskiyi, 1992).

As for Ukrainian historiography in case of the European chronicles study, the main significance of Mykhailo Hrushevskyy's scholarly work is the introduction of them into a scientific circulation and a critical approach application to the information contained therein. In the following decades, the very publications of this historian have become the basis for the medieval world of the Ukrainian and East European lands study.

However, further on, due to Soviet reign and domination in the historical science of the "Marxist-Leninist" methodology, the introduction and use of the Eastern European chronicles was rather limited. In addition, it was also conditioned by the obligatory critical interpretation from the standpoint of class struggle. The only exception is the publication of *The Chronicles of Gallus Anonymus* (1961) and *The Chronicles of Kozma of Prague* (1962) (Anonim, 1961; Prazhskiy, 1962). However, here it is worth paying attention to the fact that their translation into the Russian language and publication took place at the national level of the entire USSR, although with a fairly small number – only 1,500 copies. Moreover, the publication of Ukrainian translations of these works was not even foreseen.

Only the process of decline and collapse of the USSR allowed Ukrainian historians to pay more attention and to involve European historical works in the scientific process. The first among them was the famous "Description of Ukraine" by the French military engineer Guillaume Levasser de Boplan in the seventeenth century (Boplan, 1990).

Only at the end of the twentieth century the use of annals and chronicles in the Ukrainian historical period has become quite frequent, which has provided a broad information field for researchers and new opportunities for investigating historical processes in Eastern Europe. There were new sources, previously unknown and not available to Ukrainian historians. Some of them were translated and published in Ukrainian.

Today we have quite interesting and detailed historiographic studies of Polish chroniclers in the writings of Dmitry Nalyvaik (1992), Dmitry Virsky, Natalia Yakovenko (partly), Inna Tarasenko (on the work of Samuel Tvardovsky "Wojna Domowa"), Yuriy Mytsyk and others. The latter, in particular, is known for his work of Alexander Gwanini "The Chronicle of European Sarmatia" (2007, 2009) with a detailed introduction and comments on the work.

The work of Jan Dlugosz actually only forms part of the Ukrainian historical science. Of course, this work was known. But it remained beyond the attention of many researchers. Its publication in the Polish language in 2012 and widespread access to the electronic version of the publication made it possible to use the historian's material much more intensely using modern Ukrainian researchers (Lastovska, 2017). The international conference, which was held in Czestochowa (Poland) in 2015, contributed to this.

Unfortunately, modern Ukrainian academic science is very weak in the research and publications of historical sources, including chronicles and annals. At the time when the Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies (as it was decided in 1989) was created, a rather large-scale project was announced, which was supposed to include the preparation and publication of a number of sources – including the “Chronicles” of Martin Bielsky. However, it is still absent.

The absence of scientific publications of a number of works, primarily Polish chronicles, creates an unfortunate situation for modern Ukrainian historical science. After all, many researchers are forced to return to the question of a textological or source analysis of a particular work, revealing the reliability of some of their facts. This would be a much simpler process if the program for the publication of these annals and chronicles was carried out. And so, scholars have to use the works that were issued in Soviet times with the corresponding commentary – “The Chronicle and Acts of the Princes or Polish Governors” by Galla Anonym (1961) or the Czech Chronicle of Cosmic Prague (1962). At the same time, we note again – most of the sources remain unseen.

It is clear that the general state of modern Ukrainian historical science influences the whole situation. The fact is, after the collapse of the USSR, it continued to be largely influenced by both the old Soviet historical science and modern Russian (its influence is felt even today, including among young scientists). As a result, new sources of scientific circulation were slowly introduced (with the exception of archeology).

At the same time there was another trend. Part of the scientific community, trying to distance itself from the influences of Soviet and Russian historiography, tried to do it through a new reading of well-known and sufficiently long-recognized facts. This, in particular, can be seen from the example of the well-known discussion around the 1000th anniversary of St. Sophia Cathedral and the Golden Gates (Nadezhda Nikitenko). During it, as steadfast evidence, information was drawn from the chronicles of Titmar Merseburg and Galla Anonym. Moreover, the authors of the new concepts expressed such interpretation using the actual ancient chronicles, whose information was automatically recognized as false.

The same situation can be seen in the case with another well-known book in the scientific environment – “Essays of the primary Rus” by Aleksey Tolochka (2015). Trying to attempt a new interpretation of sources on the history of Rus (including archaeological ones and chronicles), the researcher in general questioned any sources of author’s origin of the Middle Ages.

In fact, his conclusions concerned not only ancient Russian chronicles, but, by analogy, also Polish, Czech, and others. I quote: “The value of similar “origines” for the reconstruction of the past of the peoples is low, and science has long learned to treat them as cultural artifacts, recognizing the importance of monuments of the historical

imagination of their epoch, but seeking authentic knowledge, referring to evidence of another kind” (Tolochko, 2015, p. 17).

Today for Ukrainian historiography the potential of the Eastern European chronicles and records as a source of information is extremely powerful. For example, we can concentrate at least on the image of the famous XVIth century state military figure – Eustachy Daszkiewicz, mentioned above. He is quite popular in many scientific works touching upon the Ukrainian Cossacks history. However, the most of these works contains a lot of unconfirmed and false information. In fact, the problem is that Eustachy Daszkiewicz's activity was not thoroughly looked into by scientists, as well as a significant number of historical sources of that period were not analysed. The first who began to write about Eustachy Daszkiewicz were his contemporaries. They knew about him more than wrote and some were acquainted with him and even talked to him. Bernard Wapowski (died 1535), a polish chronicler, was one among the first such historians. It was his “Chronicle” that provided a lot of information for future historians, including Marcin Bielski. It should be noted that Bernard Wapowski used to refer to a headman as a “warlord”, “the fortress chief”. Also Eustachy Daszkiewicz is often recalled in the notes of his other contemporary named Sigismund von Herberstein (1486–1566). He was the Holy Roman Empire Emperor’s ambassador, describing Eustachy Daszkiewicz as an extremely experienced man in “military affairs with an exceptional cunning”. The importance of the information provided by this politician is emphasized by his personal acquaintance with Eustachy Daszkiewicz. But it was Marcin Bielski (1495–1575) who named Eustachy Daszkiewicz to be a “glorious Cossack”, further this nickname entered into historical works and survived until our time. Among the historians of that time there also was Italian researcher Alexander Guagnini (1534–1614), who paid great attention to the person of Eustachy Daszkiewicz.

In the European historical literature of the following generations, the works of Bernard Wapowski, Marcin Bielsky, Alexander Guagnini and other chroniclers made undoubtedly a significant and great influence upon not only Ukrainian and Russian, but also Western European historiography in describing Eustachy Daszkiewicz’ activity. A vivid example are the works of such German scholars as Gerhard Friedrich Müller (1705–1789) and Johann Christian von Engel (1770–1814). In their works the information about the headman was provided in accordance with all previous chroniclers, but with some digressions and additions.

This situation in Ukrainian historical science was facilitated by the lack of cooperation with Polish scholars. It can be noted that only in recent years it has gained a real meaning, resulting in joint projects and researches (Morawiec, Lastovskyi, 2019).

Conclusions

As a consequence of this situation with the sources and their interpretation in scientific historical works, we can state the presence of a fairly significant mythologization of historical information, especially at everyday level. A progressive way out of it can be considered only a more intense introduction to circulation of the Ukrainian historical science of a wide range of sources, including the author's origin.

References:

1. Anonim, G. (1961). *Khronika i deyaniya knyazey ili praviteley polskikh* [Chronicle and deeds of Polish princes or rulers]. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences (AN SSSR) Publishing.
2. Boplan, H. L. (1990). *Opys Ukrainy* [Description of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
3. Hrushevskiy, M. (1992). *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* [History of Ukraine-Rus'], Vol. 2. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
4. *Istoriya rusov ili Maloy Rossii* [The Story of rus or Little Russia]. (1846). Moscow: V universitetskoy tipografii. IV. 262.
5. Lastovska, O. (2017). Informatsiia polskoho khronista Yana Dluhosha yak dzherelo do rannoi istorii Zolotykh vorit u Kyievi [Information of the Polish chronicler Jan Dlugosz as a source for the early history of the Golden Gate in Kyiv]. *Materialy Kruhloho stolu, prysviachenoho Khreshchenniu Kyivskoi Rusy-Ukrainy ta 1000-littiu pershoi litopysnoi zghadky pro Sofiiu Kyivsku (1017–2017)*. Kyiv, pp. 64–70.
6. Lastovskiy, V. (2017). 'Trakhtemyrivskiy ta Zarubskiy monastyri: pytannia chasu funktsionuvannia ta status' [Trakhtemirovsky and Zarubsky monasteries: questions of time of functioning and status]. *Tserkva-nauka-suspilstvo: pytannia vzaiemodii*. Kyiv, pp. 28–29.
7. Morawiec, N., Lastovskiy, V. (2019). 'Fortyfikatsiini obiekty kintsia XVII–XVIII st. na terenakh Ukrainy v konteksti mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn: istoriografichni aspekty (Chastyna I)' [Fortification objects of the end of the XVII–XVIII centuries on the Ukrainian territories in the context of international relations: historiographical aspects (part I)]. *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny: teoretyko-praktychni aspekty* [International Relations: Theory and Practical Aspects], issue 3, pp.178–192. DOI:10.31866/2616-745x.3.2019.159119.
8. Prazhskiy, K. (1962). *Cheshskaya khronika* [Czech chronicle]. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences (AN SSSR) Publishing.
9. Tolochko, O. (2015). *Ocherki nachalnoi rusi* [Essays of primary rus], Kyiv: Laurus.
10. Vynar, L. (1995). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: istoryk i budivnychy natsii* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian and builder of the nation]. Kyiv: Olena Teliha Publishing House.