The article analyzes issues of democratic reorganizations in the city of Mariupol in the beginning of the Revolution of 1917 which are insufficiently studied in historiography. The work used the newspaper "Mariupol'skaya zhizn'" entries previously non-involved in the scientific usage. It enabled to examine various aspects of the mentioned above subject matter more completely.

During the period of the First World War Mariupol was a sufficiently large industrial, port city and uyezd center of Katerynoslavska gubernia in its South-East. Mariupol community gladly welcomed the revolutionary events late in February – early in March of 1917 in the Russian capital. On the first days of the Revolution there reigned euphoria of revolutionary enthusiasm and hopes for renewal in all spheres of life. It manifested itself especially vividly during the mass actions taking place in the city on the 10th of March, 1917.

The democratic revolutionary reorganizations in the city were endorsed by the workers of the iron and steel works, soldiers of Mariupol garrison, pupils, students, entrepreneurs, intellectuals, office workers, representatives of different city communities. That fact proved the creation of a broad-based democratic coalition.

The majority of Mariupol community and the city's political powers at the same time declared its belonging to the Russian political space that corresponded to the certain realia of that time. But soon enough the first manifestations of Ukrainian liberation movement appeared in Mariupol. It was a sign of social and political changes taking place during Ukrainian revolution in the country and in the city.

As early as the first days of the Revolution Mariupol public executive committee and Mariupol council of labourer delegates were founded on the basis of the democratic principles. The old police and gendarmerie which discredited themselves were abolished. The police was substituted for newly founded militia. The new democratic power acted dynamically and actively. The majority of the social problems of that time in Mariupol were solved without confrontations.

Key words: *Mariupol, Revolution, democratic reorganizations, social processes, "Mariupol'skaya zhizn'".*

РЕЦЕНЗЕНТИ: Лисак В.Ф., д.і.н., проф.; ***Молчанов В.Б.,*** к.і.н., с.н.с.

УДК 930.2(477)Гру«1907/1914»

N. Romantsova

M. GRUSHEVSKYI'S SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES (1907 -- 1914): HIGHLIGHT OF THE PROBLEM IN THE WORKS BY HISTORIANS IN THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY

The article examines the issues of covering the problems of M. Hrushevsky scientific and publicistic activity in 1907-1914 and its impact on the scientific and social and political life of Naddnipryansky region of Ukraine made by the historians of the first third of the XXth century. The historiographic analysis of the prominent scientist's works enabled to define the scale of his work during the period when he became one of the most outstanding personalities of the Ukrainian Historical science and of the social and political life.

Historiographic analysis revealed the contemporary researchers' interest in studying scientific activity of M. Hrushevsky who examnied the problems of the Ukrainian nation's past as well as topical contemporary subjects. There appeared polarization of ideas as to the appraisal of the researcher's scientific work mainly on the political basis. On the one hand V.

Doroshenko, V. Herasymchuk, I. Kryp'yakevych, V. Picheta, I. Franko positively defined the scientific activity and creative achievements of M. Hrushevsky stressing their importance for the development of Historical science in Ukraine. On the other hand chauvinistic Russian and some Ukrainian researchers O. Volkonsky, I. Lynnychenko, Yu. Romanovsky, A. Savenko, T. Florynsky, A. Tsarynny took M. Hrushevsky's historical views and scientific works explicitly negatively. They rejected his scientific concept which refuted the conventional arrangement of the All-Russian historical development. The contemporaries' works had a very personal nature and revealed their certain political bias.

The study proved that historiographic aspects of scientific and publicistic activity of M. Hrushevsky at the point of World War I (1907-1914) have been insufficiently examined by the researchers. In the further studies it's worthwhile to compare the appraisals of Mychailo Serhiyovych's scientific and publicistic works on the part of his contemporaries and the representatives of the next historiographic periods.

Key words: *M. Hrushevsky, scientific and publicistic activity, historiographic appraisals, contemporary historians.*

M. Grushevskyi's scientific and publicist activities carried out prior to World War I (1907–1914) is insufficiently investigated by historians specializing in Grushevskyi studies, though the study of this problem presents appreciable scientific interest. That was a complicated and controversial period in the history of Ukraine and in the development of Ukrainian historiography. It was at that time when M. Grushevskyi became one of the most prominent figures in the Ukrainian historical science and socio-political life.

Contemporaries have already started active research of various aspects of M. Grushevskyi's scientific and publicist activities of the aforementioned epoch. They have paid attention to the circumstances due to which Scientist Grushevskyi was revealing the opportunities of Publicist Grushevskyi, using theoretical aspects for more profound research of the related vital issues. Analysis of historiographical literature has revealed multilateral activities carried out by the outstanding scientist who acted both as an incomparable researcher and as a talented publicist. This was revealed especially in the second Kyiv period of M. Grushevskyi's activities when he was carrying out active research alongside publicist activities, considering them to be more useful for the Ukrainian nation of those times, which undoubtedly did not go beyond the attention of M. Grushevskyi's contemporary scientists.

L. Vinar emphasized that by 1914 M. Grushevskiy had become the symbol of the Ukrainian unity and a true disseminator of the Ukrainian spirit. That was also emphasized by D. Doroshenko, his ideological opponent. In his view, M. Grushevskyi was considered to be "the disseminator of the Ukrainian national movement of Russia" and "his word was the law for us in those times" [1, p. 84].

R. Novatskyi and V. Telvak ascertained that in D. Doroshenko's words, the popular scientific features of that period ("About the olden times in Ukraine", "About Bogdan Khmelnitsky, the father of the Cossacks") "present a powerful weapon for national self-consciousness and self-cognition of various groups of our population" [21, p. 262].

The article's objective is to analyze to what extent scientific and publicist activities carried out by M. Grushevskyi in the second Kyiv period are already researched by his contemporaries.

During 1907 – 1914 M. Grushevskyi was combining active activities in various fields of social life. He appeared to be a well-reputed scientist well-known in Ukraine and abroad. He reputed himself as a fighter for Ukrainian national revival. M. Grushevskyi was incessantly working as a researcher and was doing active scientific and administrative work in Lviv and Kyiv.

On the one hand, at the aforementioned time M. Grushevskyi published his fundamental scientific and popular scientific works in history ("History of Ukraine-Rus" – vol. 6,7,8 (Part 1) [7;8;9], "Illustrative history of Ukraine" [6], "About the olden times in Ukraine (a popular story with drawings)") [13], dozens of historical studios, historiographical, archeographical, popular scientific and socio-political articles as well as reviews of other scientists' scientific works, necrologies, critical literary and other works) and culture studies studios "Cultural and national movement in Ukraine in the 16th – 17th centuries" [10], "About the Ukrainian language and the Ukrainian school" [14].

In this context, the analysis of the outstanding historian's achievements carried out by representatives of Ukrainian historiography makes the number of blank pages in Grushevskyi studies smaller. It also arouses new questions which boost further development of the Ukrainian historical science in general.

I. Franko, an outstanding Ukrainian scientist and writer, was carefully tracing M. Grushevskyi's works and took them with a grain of salt. I. Franko carried out profound analysis of "History of Ukraine-Rus", "Essay on the history of the Ukrainian nation" and "Illustrative history of Ukraine". In characterizing "History of Ukraine-Rus", he ascertained that it reflected "the fundamental work done by Professor M. Grushevskyi aimed at giving the Ukrainian society a complete and self-reliant image of historical development of our land, an image based on purely scientific principles". He also emphasized that since 1907 the scientist had transferred the publication of "History of Ukraine-Rus" to Kyiv where during 1907 – 1909 the second edition of the 4th volume and the first edition of the 6th and the 7th volumes of that work were published. [33, p. 417 – 418].

I. Franko also paid attention to M. Grushevskyi's popular scientific works in the history of Ukraine. He stated that "with the advent of the constitutional era in Russia, Professor Grushevskyi felt the necessity of familiarizing the Russian society with the achievements of his scientific work". In this respect, I. Franko commented upon the publication of "Essay on the history of the Ukrainian nation" in Russian which "was a great success with the Russian readers" and was awarded a prize from Count Uvarov Foundation by St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. I. Franko also emphasized that almost at the same time M. Grushevskyi had published "Illustrative history of Ukraine" in order to "present to the Ukrainian society a purposely written overview of the history of Ukraine with illustrations". In considering those works, I. Franko appreciated "the richness and the miscellany of the material collected and processed". However he also saw "the moral necessity of understanding the significance of that, I daresay, great scientific work based on the Ukrainian spirit before explaining it to the whole society". [33, p. 418 – 419].

Paying his highest compliments to M. Grushevskyi's scientific works in the history of Ukraine and incessant multilateral activities, I. Franko also addressed some certain objections to the scientist, ascertaining that "we cannot diminish Professor M. Grushevskyi's merits; he did it to meet the interests of the historical truth and science". He says that the historian "lays the main emphasis on analysis of historical phenomena but does not have the gift of classifying historical facts: although the historian's plan is very efficient, very important historical events and even more important historical leaders drown in the sea of details and observations". [33, p. 453 – 454].

Professor V. Picheta positively evaluated M. Grushevskyi as a researcher of the history of the Ukrainian nation. He stated that M. Grushevskyi's main work presents "the encyclopedia of the Ukrainian history". In V. Picheta's view, the author worked at it "with every grain of salt", which is evidenced by a great number of used sources, "brilliant excurses of impartial methodological character, the infinite number of articles in many Ukrainian

journals". The scientist emphasized that "History of Ukraine-Rus" was "the bible" for researchers of Belorussia and Ukraine [24, p. 198].

In the researcher's words, M. Grushevskyi's works were "determined in the national and political sense of the word and had a great influence on the political mood of the Ukrainian intelligentsia". The researcher especially appreciated "Essay on the history of the Ukrainian nation", where "all the observations of the Ukrainian nation's fates" were described. Besides, in his work published in Russian, M. Grushevskyi "for the first time gave the Russian reader the concept of the history of the Ukrainian nation" [24, p. 198].

The most profound analysis of M. Grushevskyi's scientific activities was carried out by I. Krypiakevych, his disciple. He stated that in working at the course of history of Ukraine, M. Grushevskyi was preparing materials about the Cossacks and the Army of Zaporizhzhya which were reflected in its 7th and in the first part of the 8th volumes of "History of Ukraine-Rus", in the studios "Hetman Bogdanko", in "Additions to the history of the Cossacks – on the occasion of the talk about the Cossack times of Volodymyr Antonovych" and in the compilation "Materials of the Cossack movements of the 1590s". For the first time ever, this research was based on authentic sources. The researcher paid special attention to the fact that the author had begun "to be unbiased in describing various legends typical of the starting era of the Army of Zaporizhzhya" [16, p. 400].

V. Gerasymchuk emphasized that M. Grushevskyi had paid great attention to "the research of social relations" [3, c.12]. The researcher stated that M. Grushevskyi "was the strongest among all the previous historians who combined the characterless and weak-pulsed present times … with the forgotten but great traditions of the past, who directed the competition of Upper Dnepr and Galichina Ukraine onto one path, … thus strengthening patriotism, who united the parts divided by the border into one living organism". This unity of ideas made it possible to result in "amalgamation of the whole nation into one state body" [3, p. 2].

V. Doroshenko ascertained that "his popular Russian "Essay" and "Illustrated history of Ukraine" are becoming a formidable weapon of national consciousness and self-recognition among various groups of our population" [15, p. 297].

Unlike the Ukrainian readers, Russian chauvinistic forces demonstrated very negative attitudes towards M. Grushevskyi's activities.

In considering M. Grushevskyi's scientific and publicist works, A. Tsarinnyi (A. Storozhenko), a Russian researcher of the Ukrainian origin, stated that "another example of falsifying history typical of M. S. Grushevskyi's works …, especially in "History of Ukraine-Rus" and in "History of the Ukrainian Cossacks" as well as in the articles about Pereyaslav Oath and about Mazepa is unlikely to be found in the historical science" [34, p. 178 – 179].

The chauvinistically repossessed Russian historian and philologist T. Florinskyi was forced to admit that for the first "six years of his stay in Lviv M. Grushevskyi had written a great number of works in the history of South Russia". Those were articles, monographs, messages, reviews and overviews. But their scientific level cannot be very highly praised. In the critic's words, those were works of "different price and significance" [32, p. 373].

In the article published in the form of direct address to M. Grushevskyi, I. Linnichenko evaluated the historian's historical views from the point of view of a great parent country. He made the conclusion that his conceptual "Usual pattern" was rather politically biased, irrational, non-scientific and prejudiced" [19, c. 262]. With some exceptions, the same views were presented by O. Volkonskyi, Iu. Romanovskyi, A. Savenko and A. Storozhenko [2, p. 31; 29, p. 301; 30, p. 291; 31, p. 289, 290].

But D. Korsakov, a corresponding member of the Academy and professor of Kazan University, presented quite a different view. He positively evaluated "Essay on the history of the Ukrainian nation" nominated for Count Uvarov prize. Having analyzed all the aspects of the work in every detail, the Russian historian made related conclusions. He emphasized that the "Essay" was a brand new and the only existing overview of "South-Russian" (Ukrainian) history since the ancient times till the late 18th century published in Russian; the Ukrainians needed such an overview "from the point of view of pragmatic interpretation" of their history, because in most of the courses of history and in the overviews of Russian history "the history of South Russia is interpreted insufficiently and in fragments"; the work is not rid of discrepancies resulting from the fact that the author was not always impartial about historical sources; but these discrepancies available in M. Grushevskyi's work do not overcome its positive characteristics". Therefore the reviewer makes the conclusion that M. Grushevskyi's book is worthy of Count Uvarov prize [23, p. 498].

Thus the historiographical analysis has revealed the contemporary researchers' interest in the study of M. Grushevskyi's scientific activities who researched the problems of the Ukrainian nation's past as well as the vital problems of the present times. Polarization of the evaluations of the scientist's creativity is revealed primarily on political grounds. On the one hand, V. Doroshenko, V. Gerasymchuk, V. Picheta and I. Franko positively evaluated M. Grushevskyi's scientific activities and legacy, emphasizing its importance for the development of the historical science in Ukraine. On the other hand, the chauvinistically biased Russian and some of the Ukrainian scientists, such as O. Volkonskyi, I. Linnichenko, Iu. Romanovskyi, A. Savenko, T. Florinskyi, and A. Tsarinnyi expressed extremely negative attitudes towards M. Grushevskyi's historical views and scientific work, challenging his scientific strategy which rejects the traditional pattern of the overall Russian historical development. The works written by some of the contemporaries have proved to be very much biased as per the views presented. Those works are of rather a personality-minded character, which does not make it possible for their authors to be impartial towards M. Grushevskyi. Sometimes one can see a certain political prejudice demonstrated by some of the authors. In the course of further research, it is worthwhile comparing the evaluations of M. Grushevskyi's scientific and managerial activities presented by his contemporaries and historians of a later time.

References

1. Винар Л. Найвидатніший історик України Михайло Грушевський (1866-1934) / Л. Винар // Силуєти епох. Дмитро Вишневецький, Михайло Грушевський. Історичні розвідки. – Дрогобич : Відродження, 1992. – С. 77 – 167

2. Волконский А. Историческая правда и украинофильская пропаганда / А. Волконский // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология національного раскола : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – 432 с.

3. Герасимчук В. Михайло Грушевський як історіограф України / В.Герасимчук // Записки Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка. – 1922. – Т. CXXXIII. – С. 1 – 26.

4. Грушевський М. С. Ілюстрована історія України / М. С.Грушевський. – К. – Львів, 1911. – 555 с.

5. Грушевський М. С. Історія України-Руси. – Т. VI : Житє економічне, культурне, національне XIV – XVII віків / М. С.Грушевський. – К. – Львів, 1907. – 667 с.

6. Грушевський М. С. Історія України-Руси. – Т. VII : Козацькі часи – до р. 1625 / М. С. Грушевський. – К. – Львів, 1909. – 624 с.

7. Грушевський М. С. Історія України-Руси. – Т. VIII. Ч. I : Від Куруківщини до Кумейківщини (1525 – 1638) / М. С. Грушевський. – К., 1913. – 317 с.

8. Грушевський М. С.Культурно-національний рух на Україні в XVI - XVII віці / М. С. Грушевський. – К. – Львів, 1912. – 248 с.

9. Грушевський М. С. Про давні часи на Україні (популярна історія України з малюнками) / М. С.Грушевський. – Спб., 1907. – 176 с.

10. Грушевський М. С. Про українську мову і українську школу / М. С.Грушевський. – К., 1912. – 63 с.

11. Дорошенко В. Михайло Грушевський: Культурно-національний рух на Україні / В. Дорошенко // РНВ. – 1912. – С. 297 – 298.

12. Крип'якевич І. Історично-філософічна секція НТШ під керівництвом Михайла Грушевського у 1894 – 1913 роках / І. Крип'якевич // Записки Нукового товариства ім. Шевченка. Праці історико-філософської секції. — 1991. – Т. CCXXII. - С. 392 – 411.

13. Крип'якевич І. Історія України /І. Крип'якевич; відп. ред. Ф. П. Шевченко, Б. З. Якимович. – Львів : Світ, 1990. – 520 с.

14. Крип'якевич І. Михайло Грушевський. Життя й діяльність / І. Крип'якевич // Великий українець : матеріали з життя та діяльності М.С. Грушевського / упоряд., підгот. текстів та фотоматеріалів, комент., приміт. А. П. Демиденка; вступ. слово Л. М. Кравчука; післямова Ф. П. Шевченка. – К. : Веселка, 1992. – С.448 – 483.

15. Линниченко И. А. Малорусский вопрос и автономия Малороссии / И. А. Линниченко // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология національного раскола : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – 432 с.

16. Nowaski R. Михайло Грушевський на тлі доби / R. Nowaski, W. Telwak. – Дрогобич – Opole, 2008. – Ч. 1. - 378 с.

17. Об изъятии при обыске у крестьянина с. Лесочин Захарченко брошури М.Грушевского «Про старі часи на Україні» // ЦДІАК України. – Ф. Харківського губернського жандармського управління №3043. – Оп. І. – Од. зб. 3043. – Арк. 2271.

18. Отзыв о сочинении М.С.Грушевского: «Очерк истории украинского народа», изд.2-е, дополненное, С.-Пб., 1906 г. (с приложением трех географических карт), составленный Д.А. Корсаковым. Отчет о сорок девятом присуждении наград графа Уварова // Записки Императорской академии наук по историко-филологическому отделению. – Т. X. – СПб, 1910. – С.1 – 498.

19. Пичета В. Введение в русскую историю (Источники и историография) / В. Пичета. – М., 1922. – 209 с.

20. Романовский Ю. Украинский сепаратизм и Германия / Ю.Романовский // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология національного расколб : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – 432 с.

21. Савенко А. И. К вопросу о самоопределении населения Южной России / А. И. Савенко // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология национального раскола : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – 432 с.

22. Стороженко А. Малая Россия или Украина / А.Стороженко // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология национального раскола : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – 432 с.

23. Флоринский Т. Малорусский язик и «українсько-руський» литературный сепаратизм / Т. Флоринский // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология национального раскола : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – 432 с.

24. Франко І. Причинки до історії України-Руси // Франко І. Зібрання творів. У 50-ти тт. / І. Франко. – К. : Наукова думка, 1984. – Т. 47. – С. 417 – 548.

25. Царинний А. Украинское движение / А.Царинний // Украинский сепаратизм в России. Идеология национального раскола : сб. – М. : Москва, 1998. – С.135 – 252.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 03.04.2015 р.

Н.І. Романцова

НАУКОВА ТА ПУБЛІЦИСТИЧНА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ М. ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО (1907 – 1914 РР.): ВИСВІТЛЕННЯ ПРОБЛЕМИ В ПРАЦЯХ ІСТОРИКІВ ПЕРШОЇ ТРЕТИНИ XX СТ.

У статті розглядаються питання щодо висвітлення істориками першої третини XX ст. проблем наукової та публіцистичної діяльності М. Грушевського в 1907 – 1914 рр. та її впливу на наукове та громадсько-політичне життя Наддніпрянської України. Здійснений історіографічний аналіз праць видатного вченого надав можливість з'ясувати масштабність зробленого ним в цей період, коли він став однією з найбільш помітних постатей в українській історичній науці та громадсько-політичному житті.

Історіографічний аналіз виявив інтерес дослідників-сучасників до вивчення питань наукової діяльності М. Грушевського, який у своїх працях досліджував проблеми минулого українського народу та актуальні теми сьогодення. В оцінках наукової творчості вченого виявилася поляризація думок переважно на політичному ґрунті. З одного боку, В. Дорошенко, В. Герасимчук, І. Крип'якевич, В. Пічета, І. Франко позитивно характеризували наукову діяльність, творче надбання М. Грушевського, підкреслюючи його важливість для розвитку історичної науки в Україні. З іншого боку, шовіністично налаштовані російські та деякі українські вчені О. Волконський, І. Линниченко, Ю. Романовський, А. Савенко, Т. Флоринський, А. Царинний відверто негативно сприймали історичні погляди та наукові праці М. Грушевського, відкидаючи його наукову концепцію, яка заперечувала традиційну схему загальноросійського історичного розвитку. Праці сучасників носили дуже особистісний характер, виявляли їх певну політичну заангажованість.

Дослідження засвідчило, що історіографічні аспекти наукової та публіцистичної діяльності М. Грушевського напередодні Першої світової війни (1907 – 1914 рр.) недостатньо досліджені грушевськознавцями. У подальших студіях варто порівняти оцінки наукової та публіцистичної діяльності Михайла Сергійовича з боку його сучасників та представників наступних історіографічних періодів.

***Ключові слова**: М. Грушевський, наукова та публіцистична діяльність, історіографічні оцінки, історики-сучасники.*

РЕЦЕНЗЕНТИ: Темірова Н.Р., д.і.н., проф.; ***Чура В.І.,*** д.і.н., проф.

УДК 94(477.6)"19/20"

O. Samantsov

EVERYDAY LIFE OF WORKERS OF COAL INDUSTRY OF DONETSK-DNIEPER ECONOMIC REGION OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY – THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY IN NATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY – THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH

Traditionally, in the social sciences, the miners are considered as a specific professional group – the leading participants of the social processes of the twentieth century and the present. To confirm this fact there are its causes and reasons, numerical examples. But after appearing in the late nineteenth century, the collier set the objective to improve the material conditions of life by selling their labor, specific skills and abilities. Losing touch with