UDC 94(477)(092)
DOI https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/70-2-3

Viktoriia TELVAK,
orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X
Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History), Associate Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com

Vitalii TELVAK,
orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X
Doctor of Historical Sciences (Dr. Hab. in History),
Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) telvak1@yahoo.com

Olga VLADYGA,
orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164
Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History),
History Teacher
Lviv Professional College of Computer Technologies and Building
(Lviv, Ukraine) olhavladyha@gmail.com

THE "KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY" OF THE LATE XIX AND EARLY XX CENTURIES: IDEOLOGY, ISSUES, RECEPTION

The article's target is to reconstruct the ideology and issues of the journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" in the first period of its existence, as well as in finding out the reception of the editorial board's activities. The methodological basis of the work is an interdisciplinary approach. At the same time, methods of philosophical, general-scientific and specific-historical character are applied as well. Scientific novelty of the article lies in the study of the little-known problem of the functioning of the Kwartalnik Historyczny in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Conclusions. A general view of the first period of the journal's existence allows us to characterize KH as an important integral part of Polish prewar historiography, a kind of reflection of the modernization processes that took place in it under the influence of Western European methodological innovations. It is safe to say that the universality of the KH's content in its early days, sheds light on the state of the entire Polish historical science, especially given that the reviews published on its pages covered almost all significant phenomena in historical 'Polonistics'. However, KH was not only a reflection of the current state of Polish Clio. The publication, despite its declarative and conservative nature, often initiated discussions of topical scientific issues, which allowed for the rapid modernization of the theoretical and methodological foundations of Polish historiography in the period before the First World War. Along with this, we should also note a powerful socio-political vector in the journal's editorial policy: from the first years of its existence, KH gained fame as an extraordinary printed organ that went far beyond the limits of an ordinary journal. Its creators tried not to limit themselves to narrow professional specialization, but to turn the publication into an authoritative public tribune, from the height of scientific authority and national tolerance, which discussed issues of great importance for the future of Polish society.

Key words: *"Kwartalnik Historyczny", Polish historiography, ideology, issues, reception.*

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК,
orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X
кандидатка історичних наук,
доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com

Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК,
orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X
доктор історичних наук,
професор кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) telvak1@yahoo.com

Ольга ВЛАДИГА,
orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164
кандидат історичних наук,
викладач історії
Львівського вищого професійного училища комп'ютерних технологій та будівництва
(Львів, Україна) olhavladyha@gmail.com

"KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY" КІНЦЯ XIX – ПОЧАТКУ XX СТОЛІТЬ: ІДЕОЛОГІЯ, ПРОБЛЕМАТИКА, РЕЦЕПЦІЯ

Метою статті є реконструкція ідеології та проблематики журналу «Kwartalnik Historyczny» у перший період його існування, а також з'ясування рецепції діяльності редакційної колегії. Методологічне підґрунтя становить міждисциплінарний підхід. При цьому важливу роль відіграли методи філософського, загальнонаукового та конкретно-історичного характеру. Наукова новизна статті полягає у дослідженні малознаної проблеми функціонування часопису «Kwartalnik Historyczny» наприкінці XIX – на початку XX ст. Висновки. Загальний погляд на перший період існування журналу дозволяє охарактеризувати „KH" як важливу інтегральну частину польської довоєнної історіографії, своєрідне відбиття тих модернізаційних процесів, що відбувались у ній під впливом західноєвропейських методологічних новацій. Можна із впевненістю стверджувати, що універсальність змісту „KH" за початкову добу його існування проливає світло на стан всієї польської історичної науки, особливо з огляду на те, що рецензії, друковані на його сторінках, охоплювали практично всі помітні явища в історичній полоністиці. Проте, „KH" був не лише відображенням актуального стану польської Кліо. Видання, попри свій декларативно-консервативний характер, нерідко, ініціювало обговорення актуальних наукових проблем, що дозволило у період до першої світової війни швидко модернізувати теоретико-методологічні засади польської історіографії. Поряд із цим, відзначимо також потужний суспільно-політичний вектор у редакційній політиці часопису – з перших років свого існування „KH" набув слави неординарного друкованого органу, який виступив далеко за межі звичайного часопису. Його творці намагались не обмежитись лише вузькофаховою спеціалізацією, а перетворити видання на авторитетну громадську трибуну, з висоти наукового авторитету та національної толеранції якої обговорювались надзвичайно важливі для майбутнього польського суспільства проблеми.

Ключові слова: *"Kwartalnik Historyczny", польська історіографія, ідеологія, проблематика, рецепція.*

Formulation of the problem. Scientific periodicals as an integral part of the historiographical process are only beginning to become the object of special study. Over the past decade, several special studies have appeared on this topic. In the situation of the formation of this branch of historiography, it is difficult to expect attention to the periodicals of other European nations, at least those neighboring Ukraine. And while much has traditionally been written about the influence of the Russian scientific press on the formation and evolution of national historical thought, Polish historical journals with which Ukrainian scholars collaborated remain virtually unknown. This thesis is especially true of the well-known Lviv journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" (hereinafter – KH), which appeared in 1887 as a publication of the Historical Society in Lviv founded a year earlier. Many national scholars published their works on the pages of this publication, including I. Franko, M. Korduba, O. Kolesa, K. Studynskyi, and such well-known historians as M. Hrushevsky, O. Barvinsky, I. Beley, Y. Tselevych, M. Korduba, and others were longtime members of the society itself. This little-known page of Ukrainian-Polish relations still awaits a detailed study. Our interest in the journal is also stimulated by the fact that KH quickly outgrew the boundaries of a regional publication and became a real center of Polonist studies, the most authoritative Polish scientific

tribune, highly respected among specialists. It was able to unite on its pages scientific forces scattered in different states and turn into a representative of the entire Polish historical science. According to the general recognition of researchers, "...the ups and downs of the journal were simultaneously the ups and downs of the entire Polish historiography" (Maternicki, 1996: 273). However, despite the exceptional role played by KH in the fate of Polish historiography, we can name only a few articles and memoirs devoted to its past. A complete bibliography of the journal has not even been developed yet; the existing one covers only the first thirty-five years of its publication and does not meet modern requirements. Among the various periods of the journal's existence, the least studied was the initial or "heroic" (as it is called by Polish researchers) stage of the journal's history, which lasted until the outbreak of World War I. We will focus on the main milestones of the journal's history during this period below.

The purpose of the article lies in reconstructing the ideology and issues of the journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" in the first period of its existence, as well as in finding out the reception of the editorial board's activities.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Current researchers of the Lviv historiographical community emphasize the importance of studying the contribution of Polish scientific periodicals to the formation of Ukrainian professional historiography (Maternicki, 1996). However, despite the exceptional role played by KH in structuring the Lviv historiographical center (Polish and Ukrainian), we can name only a few articles and memoirs devoted to the first period of its history (Руда, 2004; Тельвак, 2005; Лазурко, 2010; Telwak & Lazurko, 2013; Lazurko & Dikhtiievski, 2021). A complete bibliography of the journal has not even been developed yet; the existing one covers only the first thirty-five years of its publication and does not fully meet modern requirements. This is the reason for the relevance of the topic of our study.

Presenting main material. Explaining the emergence of KH, Polish researchers call the journal "the offspring of positivism" (Maternicki, 1996: 276). At the same time, the publication of KH in Galicia was not accidental. This was due to several factors: institutional (concentration of university departments of Polish history and several historical institutions in Galicia), professional (most professional Polish historians (Maternicki, 1996: 279) lived in Galicia at that time), and political (liberal conditions of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy made it possible to constantly fund the publication from the budget and ensure freedom of scientific creativity). Its appearance in Lviv, not Krakow, is explained by the fact that the eastern capital of Galicia, unlike the western capital, did not have a single scientific historical journal at that time. "Historians", F. Pape wrote about the Polish historical environment of the late nineteenth century, "still lacked proper cohesion" (Papée, 1937: 1).

The new journal was to become the center of such an association. The idea for the name of the new journal, as one of its first editors recalls, probably came from W. Kalinka, who liked such well-known Polish journals as "Kwartalnik Naukowy" and "Kwartalnik Kłosów" (Papée, 1937: 5). Thus, the emergence of a special historical journal was conditioned by the very logic of the development of Polish historiography at the turn of the century, i.e., the rapid processes of professionalization and institutionalization. Since KH appeared at the peak of positivist historiography and was the only universal historical journal of that time that united scientific forces, the organizers immediately gave it an extremely broad informational, critical, and bibliographic focus. The main goal, which for a long time determined the journal's editorial policy, was to compete for the scientific status of historical works through a thorough scientific critique of historical Polish studies (hereinafter 'Polonistics').

The key idea of the journal, formulated above, was reflected in the structure of the journal introduced by its first editor, K. Liske, which Polish researchers call universal. The choice of the journal's structural model was determined by several factors. First, the Polish tradition of publishing scientific journals in the humanities. One of the editors of the journal at the time, F. Pape, stated that the founders of KH "were sympathetic to the example of the Critical Review, which was published in Krakow in 1874–1877 under the editorship of W. Zakrzewski and was marked by a short but bright existence" (Papée, 1937: 4–5). Secondly, the experience of publishing historical journals by the legislators of the German scientific fashion of the time had an impact. In this case, the subjective aspect was also extremely important: the first editor of the KH and the soul of the entire Society, K. Liske, not only studied at German universities for a long time, but also was a reviewer of Polish historical literature for "The Sybels Historische Zeitschrift". It was on the model of this journal that K. Liske gave KH a broad informational and critical character.

Unlike the rest of the Polish historical periodicals of the second half of the nineteenth century, which were usually limited to archaeological and numismatic issues, KH was the first universal publication that provided its pages to representatives of various historical disciplines, and often to historians of lit-

erature and law. As a result, the journal fostered an intensified interdisciplinary dialogue that contributed to the creation of new methodological techniques, the mutual approximation of various fields of humanitarian knowledge, and the overall modernization of the historiographical process. Theoretically, the journal was aimed at defending the interests of Poles within the ancient Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the integrity of the national historical scheme against the chauvinistic statements of German and Russian historians. The idea of the cultural and tragic mission of the German element towards the Polish people was criticized, while the originality of the historical development of the Polish ethnos was emphasized, and the formation of a special socio-political system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which was incompatible with the social order and monarchical state system of its northern neighbor, was pointed out. Therefore, during the period under study, the journal devoted a lot of space to polemics with the official historiographic doctrines of the invading countries. For example, T. Korzon, unable to freely express his views in the Kingdom of Poland, repeatedly used the KH tribune to argue with Russian historians and their vision of Polish-Russian relations. His discussion with M. Kareiev about the causes of the decline of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was particularly bright (N. [T. Korzon], 1889: 214). According to T. Korzon, Russian historians cannot understand the essence of the Polish past if they proceed from the position of official ideology. Summarizing the entire range of issues presented on the pages of KH, we note the dominance of historical and local history research. This is understandable, as Lviv was known for its extremely rich archives. And the KH itself was, first of all, an organ of the Historical Society, whose main tasks included "awakening and assisting the development of historical sciences with special attention to the past of the Red Rus" (Statut, 1886: 1). Attention to Galician local history was also stimulated by the intensification of the Ukrainian-Polish debate about the princely and Polish periods of Galicia's past in the late nineteenth century. In terms of regional distribution, Polish and European medievalism was the most multifaceted. It was represented by such well-known scholars as K. Potkansky, T. Wojciechowski, O. Bruckner, J. Fialek, M. Gumplowicz, F. Pape, A. Prochazka, O. Semkovych, and others. The next in terms of the number of publications are studies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Much less attention was paid to the history of the Polish eighteenth century. The next century, the nineteenth, was represented almost exclusively by documentary materials and memoirs. Publications on world history were limited to a few articles on classical philology (by B. Kruszkiewicz and P. Bińkowski) and L. Cwiklinski's report on G. Schliemann's scientific discoveries. It is noteworthy that the journal's pages were devoted to studies of the past of the Polish language and literature. This was not accidental, given the common understanding of many of the tasks of science by historians and philologists of the time. On the pages of the journal, we find the works of such well-known Polish literary critics as S. Tarnowski, J. Boloz-Antoniewicz, B. Hubrynowicz, and others. Similar to the historical and literary works was the number of works on the past of Polish law, represented by the thorough studies of W. Abraham and O. Balcer. Next came the history of culture and art, as well as publications on special historical disciplines. The other branches of historical scholarship (historiography, military history, ethnography) were represented by barely one or two studies. We do not find any references to the past of industry and the formation of the class structure of capitalist society. Thus, such a dominance of traditionally interpreted political history on the pages of KH, with minor additions of state law and historical and literary issues, once again proves the validity of the thesis about the conservative editorial policy of the publication.

The particular interest to domestic researchers of Polish historical journals is the problem of presenting Ukrainian historiography on their pages. In the case of KH, this interest is reinforced by the fact that Ukrainian scholars themselves actively participated in reviewing Slavic literature for the journal. For example, I. Franko and I. Sharanevych were regular reviewers of the journal. In general, modern researchers write about the importance of studying the contribution of Polish scientific periodicals to the formation of domestic professional historiography (Maternicki, 1996: 284). It is worth noting that the journal has always been characterized by national tolerance, balance, and correctness in its evaluations, and did not allow chauvinism to penetrate its pages. In general, despite the polemical nature of most reviews of Ukrainian scholarly literature, reviewers always noted the high professional level of Ukrainian historians. The works of the most prominent Ukrainian scholars in this area, I. Franko and M. Hrushevsky, were particularly highly praised. I. Franko, a longtime member of the Historical Society and a regular contributor to its periodical, repeatedly delivered reports at the Society's meetings, which were later published in the KH. Thus, in the 1892 yearbook, his extensive essay on Ukrainian literature of the 16th and 17th centuries was published, and in the 1895 volume, a study of the Synod of Brest in 1596. Not a single work by

M. Hrushevsky was ignored by the editorial board, especially since almost all of the scholar's works of the Lviv period were devoted to the situation of Ukrainians within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Critics, often disagreeing with the conceptual foundations of the scientist's works, praised the professional level of his works, his extraordinary erudition and research talent (Czolowski, 1893: 706; Szarlowski, 1893: 140–145; Lewicki, 1895: 565–567). The whole range of evaluative interpretations of the Ukrainian Clio presented on the pages of KH falls into several problematic blocks. It is clear that the most critical remarks of Polish observers of Ukrainian scholarly literature were made by works devoted to the joint era of the two peoples' coexistence within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. For example, Polish historians disagreed with the use of the ethnonym 'Ukraine' by Ukrainian scholars in relation to the events of the Eastern European Middle Ages, rejected their negative assessments of the policy of Polish kings on the Ukrainian Right Bank and in Galicia, and denied its expansionist nature. It should be noted that the arguments of Polish historians were much weaker than those of their Ukrainian colleagues. Reviewers often used ethical arguments. For example, L. Koliankowski, reviewing the fourth, fifth, and sixth volumes of M. Hrushevsky's History of Ukraine-Rus', accused the latter of being too negative about Polish policy on Ukrainian lands. Without refuting the Ukrainian scientist's testimony with any substantial factual information, he got off with a moral dictum: "M. Hrushevsky's work is tendentious, stirs up Polish-Ukrainian hatred, which is not suitable for scientific work" (Kolankowski, 1913: 357; Тельвак, 2008: 82–85). Works on the Cossack era drew no less criticism. Polish scholars disagreed with their Ukrainian colleagues' positive vision of the events of the Khmelnytsky region and the heroization of its leaders, considering them "disturbers of public harmony." In their view, there were no objective grounds for dissatisfaction with state policy, and the numerous facts of socioeconomic and religious oppression cited by Ukrainian researchers were considered farfetched and insignificant. For example, V. Havlik criticized V. Gerasymchuk's work Vyhovshchyna and the Treatise of Hadiach from a similar perspective. He noted the author's politicization of the subject matter, his excessive fascination with the figure of Hetman Khmelnytsky, and concluded that the work was written 'Cum ira et studio' (Gawlik, 1912: 353–354.). Interestingly, however, sometimes Polish scholars defended the patriotic vision of Ukraine's past from the standpoint of objectivity. A notable example was T. Korzon's review of P. Kulish's work "The Fall of Little Russia from Poland," in which the famous scholar defended the historical reputation of Bohdan Khmelnytsky against the Ukrainian historian's accusations (Korzon, 1892: 34–39). In general, it should be noted that Polish scholars, being under the powerful assimilationist influence of the German and Russian states, were quite sympathetic to the attempts of their Ukrainian colleagues to resist the official Russian ideology, which did not recognize the independence of the Ukrainian people and its culture. For example, the reviewer of O. Ohonovsky's essay on Ukrainian literature was quite sympathetic and understanding of the author's attempts to distinguish between the origins of Ukrainian and Russian cultures from the Middle Ages (Tretiak, 1890: 314–325). In general, a distinctive feature of KH of the period under study is considerable national correctness and tolerance, which obviously stemmed from its own bitter experience of statelessness.

Despite the strict scientific position of the editors of KH and their attempts to prevent it from being involved in any political disputes, the journal has never stood aside from public life, often initiating discussions of important social issues through the prism of the historical experience of Poles. The anniversaries of the University of Krakow, the Constitution of May the Third, and the Battle of Grunwald were particularly lively in the scientific debate. The editors devoted separate issues of the journal to these important events in the history of the Polish people. Along with such traditional anniversaries for Polish social and historical thought, a constant topic of discussion was recent events, the echo of which has not yet been rid of a variety of personal impressions and reflections. It is primarily about understanding the historical experience of the events of the Polish uprising of 1863–1865. It is noteworthy that the editors, convinced of the undoubted benefits of public discussion, did not select the materials they received, providing the journal with a space for diverse, often polarized opinions. It is interesting to note that the discussion of national anniversaries on the pages of the journal has always caused a strong public response, attracting not only professional historians but also the widest circles of intellectuals. This gives grounds to agree with E. Maternicki's thesis about the power of historical and socio-political reflection of Poles at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Maternicki, 1996: 273–290). Often, the journal was also a civic tribune, from the height of its authority, defending human honor and dignity. For example, in the early 90s, the case of the famous Polish writer Zygmunt Kaczkowski, who was accused of collaborating with the Austrian authorities during the famous events of

1863 on the basis of rumors and gossip, was quite high-profile (Liske 1891: I–V). In gratitude for the principled civic position of the KH editorial board, Z. Kaczkowski granted the Historical Society exclusive rights to all his works in his will.

Given the importance of the period under study in the development of world historiography, the theoretical and methodological page of KH is interesting, as it allows us to identify the degree of readiness of Polish historians for new discussions and hear their answers to the questions posed by Western European humanities. The revitalization of the discussion of theoretical problems of historical science was largely facilitated by the extraordinary openness of the editorial policy of KH, which provides the journal's pages to all historians who are not indifferent to the Polish past. Even when the views of the editorial board differed significantly from the author's position, the publication appeared on the pages of the journal without any cuts or evaluative reservations. This openness was already evident in the first volume of the journal, which published T. Korzon's article on the 'historiosophical' views of S. Stashytsia. The publication was accompanied by an editorial note: "Respecting the scientific opinion of our esteemed collaborators and not interfering with the originality of their views, we publish the article by the honored author above without any changes, despite the fact that in some places his judgment of Stashytsia and his 'historiosophy' is fundamentally different from our own views" (Od redakcyi, 1887: 561). In general, as already noted, the journal was a rather conservative publication that pursued a strict 'scientific' policy on its pages. First of all, as an "offspring of positivism," KH was particularly determined to promote scientism from the very first years of its existence. At the end of the 1980s, Polish historiography was still quite often a field of amateur work. "KH, keenly focused on the academic model of historical knowledge, fought quite aggressively to raise the scientific level of research. The journal's reviewers did not spare sarcastic expressions to ridicule amateurism and bias. Having summarized the content of the journal and identified the most frequently emphasized methodological problems, we can affirm the priority of the positivist model of science. The authors of the journal defended the requirements of objectivity, criticality, and impartiality of scientific research. A detailed analysis of source data and reconstruction of past facts on their basis were recognized as self-sufficient research operations. 'Comparativism' was proclaimed the main methodological technique. The controversy over the creation of popular and educational historical literature, proposed by the editors, acquired a respectable theoretical and methodological sound. All participants in the discussion recognized the need for increased professional requirements for such works in view of the exceptional importance they play in shaping national consciousness. S. Kutsheba accented this position comprehensively – "The situation should be quite different with a popular or educational book, since much more is required of such a book – hundreds of people learn from it; an error once rooted in it cannot be quickly eradicated. And now the state of affairs is such that our society learns mainly from popular works, including textbooks. This also places a greater responsibility on the popularizers of knowledge to try to refute the errors, to present the results of recent research, recent respectable studies, in an appropriately chosen form. And if such a book cannot comply with this postulate, then it should be clearly warned against, in order to prevent the bad things that can happen. Society should not be presented with dubious results of imagination or negligence of the authors" (Kutrzeba, 1901: 554).

Yet, it is clear that the spokesman for national historiography could not stay away from the latest historiographic trends. This was especially evident in the wide-ranging discussion that broke out on the pages of KH about the methodological innovations proposed by K. Lamprecht. This discussion was a continuation of the methodological controversy initiated at the Third Krakow Congress of Polish Historians in 1900 by Lviv University professor B. Dębinski, an opponent of the German scholar's concept, and supporters of the latter's views, W. Sobieski and S. Zakrzewski (Maternicki, 1996: 273–290). It is noteworthy that the editorial board took a distinctly neutral position in this debate, although it noted the importance of discussing methodological issues for Polish science. In the context of the problem under study, it is extremely interesting to trace the common understanding of scientific theoretical and methodological standards by representatives of the Polish and Ukrainian scientific community. The young Ukrainian historiography was also faced with the task of defending the priority of objectivity and scientific correctness of historical research, and fighting against amateurism and national chauvinism (Тельвак, 2005). This similarity is especially noticeable in a comparative analysis of review texts on the same publications published on the pages of the Shevchenko Scientific Society (hereinafter SSS) and KH. Here is a characteristic example: two reviews, one by A. Czolowski and the other by M. Hrushevsky, on the works of A. Petrushevych (Тельвак & Тельвак, 2005: 210–247). A comparison of the criticisms expressed by these researchers reveals the commonality of the criteria applied by the

reviewers to the work of the famous Galician historian: both write about the lack of systematization and professionalism of A. Petrushevych's work, and criticize the author's specific language. Another example is the Polish and Ukrainian reviews of K. Harlampovich's work "Western Russian Orthodox Schools of the XVI – early XVII century". In general, the materials of the journal refute the claims made in a number of contemporary scholarly works that the editorial board of KH underestimated the importance of researching theoretical and methodological issues (Maternicki, 1996: 11–12).

It is also extremely interesting to trace the geography of the journal's authors, as this will allow us to get an idea not only of the existence of stable national historiographical centers and trace the processes of formation and growth of new centers, but also to identify the places of localization of 'Polonistics' of that time. Of course, we must make allowances for the fact that KH was published in Galicia, but given the impossibility of conditions for the normal development of Polish historical science within the Russian and German states and the more liberal possibilities of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, this circumstance is somewhat leveled. According to our calculations, during the period under study, the journal was published by representatives of more than sixty centers-from Cairo in the south to Tomsk in the north, from Paris in the west to Yaroslavl on the Volga in the east. Most of KH's authors represented Galician centers. Lviv and Krakow, of course, had the unconditional leadership. In the long-standing dispute between these two cities, Lviv authors prevailed numerically until 1911. After the organization of the Krakow branch of the Historical Society in 1912 and, consequently, the concentration of all scientific efforts there, Lviv lost its first place. Among the other Galician centers, we note a permanent increase in the number of representatives of provincial towns such as Drohobych, Sambir, Stryi, Yaroslav, Tarnów, and others. This is largely due to the targeted regional policy of the Society aimed at intensifying scientific life in the provinces. However, contributors from the province often limited their cooperation with the journal to one or two publications. The third place was consistently taken by authors from Warsaw. Undoubtedly, it was in these three centers that the vast majority of Polish scientific forces were concentrated. Representation of other centers, especially abroad, did not exceed one or two regular contributors. For example, Berlin was always represented by the publications of Alexander Bruckner, Riga by Tadeusz Manteuffel, and Halle by Max Perlbach. Thus, we can confidently speak of the journal's important integrative function in the prewar period of Polish historiography, and note the successful policy of concentrating scientific Slavic forces.

Conclusions. A general view of the first period of the journal's existence allows us to characterize KH as an important integral part of Polish prewar historiography, a kind of reflection of the modernization processes that took place in it under the influence of Western European methodological innovations. It is safe to say that the universality of the KH's content in its early days, sheds light on the state of the entire Polish historical science, especially given that the reviews published on its pages covered almost all significant phenomena in historical 'Polonistics'. However, KH was not only a reflection of the current state of Polish Clio. The publication, despite its declarative and conservative nature, often initiated discussions of topical scientific issues, which allowed for the rapid modernization of the theoretical and methodological foundations of Polish historiography in the period before the First World War. Along with this, we should also note a powerful socio-political vector in the journal's editorial policy: from the first years of its existence, KH gained fame as an extraordinary printed organ that went far beyond the limits of an ordinary journal. Its creators tried not to limit themselves to narrow professional specialization, but to turn the publication into an authoritative public tribune, from the height of scientific authority and national tolerance, which discussed issues of great importance for the future of Polish society. Acting as a tribune for testing new ideas and concepts for leading scholars, the journal simultaneously provided its pages for novice researchers to try their hand at writing, thereby consolidating the scientific potential of Poland at the time. All of this gives grounds to agree with the thesis of Czesław Gutra, a well-known researcher of European scientific periodicals, that in the first period of its existence, KH became "a true representative of Polish historiography" (Gutry, 1933: 473–474).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Czolowski A.: Gruszewski M. Južnorusskije gospodarskije zamki w połowyni XVI wieka. Moskwa, 1890. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1893. S. 706.
2. Gawlik M.: Герасимчук В. Виговщина і гадяцький трактат. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1912. S. 353–354.
3. Gutry Cz. Polskie czasopiśmiennictwo historyczne 1918–1932. *Droga*. 1933. № 5. S. 473–474.

4. Kolankowski L.: Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1913. S. 357.
5. Korzon T. O Chmielnickim sądy pp. Kulisza i Karpowa. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1892. S. 34–39.
6. Kutrzeba S.: Gorzycki K. Zarys społecznej historyi państwa polskiego. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1901. S. 554.
7. Lazurko L., Dikhtiievskyi P. From ancient times to Rzeczpospolita: history of the Polish state in the reception of the journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" (1887–1939). *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. 2021. № 19. С. 77–86.
8. Лазурко Л. *Часопис "Kwartalnik Historyczny" і розвиток польської історіографії останньої чверті XIX – першої половини XX ст.* Дрогобич, 2010. 282 с.
9. Lewicki A.: Hruszewskij M. Wstupnyj wykład z dawnioji istoryi Rusy. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1895. S. 565–567.
10. Liske X. W imię prawdy. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1891. S. I–V.
11. Maternicki J. Miejsce i rola „Kwartalnika Historycznego" w dziejach historiografii polskiej. *Historia jako dialog*. Rzeszów, 1996. S. 273-290.
12. N. [T. Korzon]. Prof. Kariejew i jego poglądy na upadek Polski. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1889. S. 214.
13. Od redakcyi. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1887. S. 561.
14. Papée F. Towarzystwo Historyczne 1886–1900. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1937. S.1.
15. Руда О.В. Українська тема на сторінках львівського часопису "Kwartalnik Historyczny" ("Історичний квартальник") в 1887–1914 рр. *Міжнародні зв'язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки.* 2004. Вип. 13. С. 308–321.
16. Statut Towarzystwa Historycznego. Lwów, 1886. 14 c.
17. Szarlowski A.: Gruszewski M. Oczerk istorii Kijowskoj ziemli ot śmierti Jarosława do końca XIV wieku. Kijów, 1891; Gruszewski M. Wołynskij wopros 1097–1102. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1893. S. 140–145.
18. Śreniowska K. Uwagi o nauce historzcynej polskiej w latach 1887–1900 w świetle „Kwartalnika Historzcynego". *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne. Seria I*. 1960. Z. 15. S. 153–163.
19. Тельвак В. "Kwartalnik Historyczny" – феномен інституції (кінець XIX – початок XX ст.). *Ейдос: альманах теорії та історії історичної науки.* Київ, 2005. Вип. 1. С. 317–332.
20. Тельвак Віталій. *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)*. Київ–Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.
21. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. *Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії*. Київ – Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
22. Telwak W., Łazurko L. Ukrainika na łamach "Kwartalnika Historycznego" w okresie międzywojennym. *Rocznik Biblioteki Naukowej PAU i PAN w Krakowie*. Kraków: wyd. Secesja, 2013. R. LVIII.S. 239–255.
23. Tretiak J.: Historya literatury ruskiej Emila Ogonowskiego. Część II. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1890. S. 314–325.

REFERENCES

1. Czolowski, A. (1890). [Review]. Gruszewski M. Južnorusskije gospodarskije zamki w połowyni XVI wieka [South Russian manor castles in the half of the 16th century]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 706. [in Polish].
2. Gawlik, M. (1912). [Review]. Herasymchuk V. Vyhovshchyna and hadiatskyi traktat [Gerasimchuk W. Wygowszczyna i traktat of Hadiach]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 353–354. [in Polish].
3. Gutry, Cz. (1933). Polskie czasopiśmiennictwo historyczne 1918-1932 [Polish historical periodicals 1918–1932]. *Droga*. № 5. S. 473–474. [in Polish].
4. Kolankowski, L. (1913). [Review]. Hrushevskyi M. Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy [Hruszewski M. Historia of Ukraine-Rus]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 357. [in Polish].
5. Korzon, T. (1892). O Chmielnickim sądy pp. Kulisza i Karpowa [Kulish and Karpov's judgment about Khmelnitsky]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 34–39. [in Polish].
6. Kutrzeba, S. (1901). [Review]. Gorzycki K. Zarys społecznej historyi państwa polskiego [Gorzycki K. Outline of the social history of the Polish state]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 554. [in Polish].
7. Lazurko, L. & Dikhtiievskyi, P. (2021) From ancient times to Rzeczpospolita: history of the Polish state in the reception of the journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" (1887–1939). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk.* Vyp. 19. Pp. 77–86.
8. Lazurko, L. (2010). *Chasopys "Kwartalnik Historyczny" i rozvytok polskoi istoriohrafii ostannoi chverti XIX – pershoi polovyny XX st.* ["Kwartalnik Historyczny" Journal and the Development of Polish Historiography in the Last Quarter of the 19th and the First Half of the 20th Century]. Drohobych. 280 s. [in Ukraine].
9. Lewicki, A. (1895). [Review]. Hruszewskij M. Wstupnyj wykład z dawnioji istoryi Rusy [Introductory lecture on the ancient history of Rus]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 565–567. [in Polish].
10. Liske, X. (1891). W imię prawdy [In the name of truth]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. I–V. [in Polish].
11. Maternicki, J. (1996). Miejsce i rola „Kwartalnika Historycznego" w dziejach historiografii polskiej [The place and role of the "Historical Quarterly" in the history of Polish historiography]. *Historia jako dialog*. Rzeszów. S. 273–290. [in Polish].
12. N. [T. Korzon] (1889). Prof. Kariejew i jego poglądy na upadek Polski [Prof. Karejew and his views on the fall of Poland]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 214. [in Polish].
13. Papée, F. (1937). Towarzystwo Historyczne 1886–1900 [Historical Society 1886–1900]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 1. [in Polish].
14. (1887). Od redakcyi [From the editors]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 561. [in Polish].
15. Ruda, O. (2004). Ukrainska tema na storinkakh lvivskoho chasopysu "Kwartalnik Historyczny" ("Istorychnyi kvartalnyk") v 1887–1914 rr. [Ukrainian theme in the pages of the Lviv journal "Kwartalnik Historyczny" in 1887–1914]. *Mizhnarodni zviazky Ukrainy: naukovi poshuky i znakhidky.* Kyiv. Vyp. 13. S. 308–321 [in Ukrainian].

16. *Statut Towarzystwa Historycznego* [Statutes of the Historical Society]. Lwów, 1886. 14 c. [in Polish].

17. Szarlowski, A. (1893). [Review]. Gruszewski M. Oczerk istorii Kijowskoj ziemli ot śmierti Jarosława do końca XIV wieku [Essay on the history of the Kyiv land from the death of Yaroslav to the end of the 14th century]. Kijów, 1891; Gruszewski M. Wołynskij wopros 1097–1102 [Volyn Question 1097–1102]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 140–145. [in Polish].

18. Śreniowska, K. (1960). Uwagi o nauce historzcynej polskiej w latach 1887-1900 w świetle „Kwartalnika Historzcynego" [Remarks on Polish historical science in the years 1887-1900 in the light of "Kwartalnik Historiany"]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne. Seria I*. Z. 15. S. 153–163. [in Polish].

19. Telvak, V. (2005). "Kwartalnik Historyczny" – fenomen instytutsii (kinets XIX – pochatok XX st.) ["Kwartalnik Historyczny" – a phenomenon of the institution (late 19th – early 20th Century)]. *Eidos: almanakh teorii ta istorii istorychnoi nauky*. Kyiv. Vyp. 1. S. 317–332 [in Ukrainian].

20. Telvak, V. (2008). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia)* [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 494 s. [in Ukrainian].

21. Telvak, Viktoriia & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi yak doslidnyk ukrainskoi istoriohrafii* [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 334 s. [in Ukrainian].

22. Telwak, W. & Łazurko, L. (2013). Ukrainika na łamach "Kwartalnika Historycznego" w okresie międzywojennym. *Rocznik Biblioteki Naukowej PAU i PAN w Krakowie*. R. LVIII. Kraków: wyd. Secesja, 239–255 [in Polish].

23. Tretiak, J. (1890). Historya literatury ruskiej Emila Ogonowskiego. Część II. *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. S. 314–325. [in Polish].