

Omelyan Pritsak: In Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Yaroslav Kalakura*

(Article Sent on: 10.06.2019/ Article Accepted on: 05.08.2019)

Abstract

It's highlighted the role of Academician Omeljan Pritsak in the revival of historiography and historiosophy at the Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv, his contribution to the methodological and theoretical reorientation of post-Soviet historians of Ukraine. They considered on the basis of works of predecessors, own studios, observations and personal memories of communication with scientists, his idea and the concept of the founding of the first on the post-Soviet space of the historiosophical chair, formation of its composition, elaboration of the educational-professional program, problems of lectures and seminars.

The unique combination of the scientific work of O. Pritsak and his pedagogical skills is revealed, it was emphasized that the lectures of the scientist were content-rich and methodically perfect, they paid much attention to the works of G. Hegel "Philosophy of History", the views of F. Savigny, Leopold Ranke, leaders of the French school Annals of Mark Blok and Lucien Fever, their follower Fernand Braudel, analysis of the positivist doctrine of Auguste Comte, neo-Kantianism, modernism, instrumentalism, uniqueness of approaches to the history of supporters of the civilizational understanding of history O. Spengler and O. Toynbee. The atmosphere of high activity and recklessness was marked by historiosophical seminars, turning into lively scientific discussions, interesting and sharp polemics on the basis of reports prepared by their participants, abstracts. Lectures and seminars, individual work and personal communication of the professor with students and post-graduate students contributed to the conception of the historiosophical conceptualization of Ukrainian and foreign history.

It is shown that the practical formation of the chair of historiosophy, the organization of its work encountered bureaucracy and was hampered in every way by the post-Soviet conservatism. The leader of the department did not receive proper support and assistance. In spite of this and for a brief period

* Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv, Ukraine, email: kalajar@ukr.net.

of the functioning of the department, the contours of historiosophical preparation of historians, ways of integrating Ukrainian historiography in the world historiographic and historiosophical field were laid.

The expediency of using the experience and work of academician O.Pritsak in theoretical, historiosophical and methodological training of professional historians and the return to his idea of separation in the structure of the University of a Separate Department of historiosophy as a scientific-theoretical and methodological center of the interfacial format is substantiated.

Keywords: Omelyan Pritsak, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv University, Department of Historiosophy, Historical Science, Historiography, Methodology, Oriental Studies.

Omelyan Yosypovych Pritsak – a unique phenomenon in the intellectual history of Ukraine. Though more than half of his life has gone beyond its borders, but he never gave up hope of returning to Ukraine, to the golden-domed Kyiv, which he remembered from years 1940-1941, when he studied orientology at the Institute of Linguistics under the leadership of Agatanhel Krymsky. The scientist liked to emphasize that he was born in an independent Western-Ukrainian People's Republic in the year of the Unification of Ukraine, and the struggle for its independence became for him the highest call. Throughout his life he has always been in a state of intellectual pursuit as a builder and creator, discoverer and inventor, designer and architect of science.

Proposed article, the basis of which is the author's intelligence decade ago [4], aims to highlight the role of Professor Omeljan Pritsak in the methodological and theoretical reorientation of post-Soviet historians, in particular in the restoration of historiography and historiosophy at the Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv. In the process of writing the author took into account the works of predecessors, in particular prof. V.Potulnitsky - one of the active supporters of the creation of the historiosophical chair [8], who touched on the idea of the

founding of the department, the characteristics of its educational and professional program, problems of lectures and seminars. Continuing these studios, it seems expedient to share some of their own memories and impressions of personal acquaintance and communication with the outstanding person and prominent intellectual scientist - Omelyan Yosypovych, as a witness of his contribution to the creation of the first in the post-Soviet space of the chair of historiosophy.

On the way to high science

Omelyan Pritsak (1918-2006) was fascinated by the history of his native land since childhood. This interest to the past has crystallized during the classroom in classical gymnasium in Ternopil and finally became established at Lviv University dreaming to create "a vision of Ukraine's history from the point of view of world humanitarianism. Since the young years when a future scientist with a world name founded historical and linguistic workshops of high school students in Ternopil and learned the German language and literature from Professor M. Mozlera, he studied the Persian language on his own, when he was trained at Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, working side by side with the students of M. Hrushevsky - I. Krypiakivych, M. Korduba, T. Kostruba, and then laid the foundations of Ukrainian Oriental studies in the diaspora, relying on the support of Professor of the University of Gettogenberg Hans Schöder.

The founder of Ukrainian Studies and Turkology in the United States

Being in the early 1960's in the United States, Omelyan Pritsak continued a high-pioneer mission of orientalist pioneer in world-wide Ukrainian studies, headed the Department of Turkology at Harvard University. Here he created an amazing plan for the creation of the Ukrainian Harvard. He initiated the formation of a fund of Ukrainian studies departments, so he founded and headed the Department of History of Ukraine

named after M. Hrushevsky, finally became director of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute at Harvard University and launched a multi-volume anthology "Harvard Library of Ancient Ukrainian Writing". Thanks to the English edition of his three-volume work, "The Origin of Rus" (1981) Western world has become acquainted with one of the most daring versions of ancient history of Ukraine. Professor was among the first of Ukrainian scholars who became a member of the National Academy of Sciences and Arts of the United States, a member of the Nobel Committee, among those who were the first to return to Ukraine at the turn when it restored state sovereignty and independence.

In 1990 O. Pritsak was elected a foreign member of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and a member of its Presidium, appointed as director of the renovated in its composition Institute of Oriental Studies named after. A.Yu. Krymskoho, headed the Academic Archeological Commission and remained indifferent to the transformation of the training of historians at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, joined, in particular, to the establishment of the Department of Historyosophy and the Department of Oriental Studies, which has already been written in part [2,3,4,7,8].

The author of these lines is happy with the fact that he was able to directly recognize this inconspicuous Man, touching it in the age of radical change, when Ukraine fought state sovereignty and freedom, laid the foundations of independence, when the Soviet historians faced a choice: to remain in captivity of the failed Marxist methodology, to break the dogmatic bundles, to take advantage of the freedom of creativity and to return to the national traditions of Ukrainian historiography. The fact that this second choice won, was possible due to, on the one hand, to the return from special guardians and reprints of works M. Hrushevsky, D. Doroshenko, I. Krypiakevich, V. Lypynsky, I.

Nagaevsky, N. Polonskoy-Vasilenko, I. Ogienko, O. Ogloblyn, etc., and on the other hand, the arrival of leading Ukrainian historians from the Ukrainian diaspora in Ukraine, in particular O. Pritsak, L. Vinar, T. Gunchak, A. Zhukovskii, Z. Kogut, V. Kosik, F. Sysyna, O. Subtilny, R. Shporluk, etc., their speeches, lectures, meetings with teachers and teachers, graduate students and students. It is recalled that, as one of the first reports at a conference in Kyiv, Omelyan Yosypovych noted that Ukrainians can enter the world of culture and civilization only under their own name, knowing above all who they are and from where they originated. This requires a true and not fake story. History pages can be rewritten, he noted, but it can not be changed. History becomes a science when it integrates the achievements of other sciences, relies first and foremost on philosophy and methodology. Then, in fact, for the first time we heard about the historiosophy, which in the communist times was attributed to pseudoscience, and the historical philosophical materialism as a component of Marxism was considered as the philosophical canon of history.

Communicating with O. Pritsak, it was pleasant to realize that he became one of the founders of a phototype reprint of "History of Ukraine-Rus", wrote a thorough article "The History of Michael Hrushevsky", which opened the first volume of fundamental labor. It played an important role in the inclusion of post-Soviet historians in world and national historiography, and made it possible to look at the figures of the Great Ukrainian and Historian not through the points of Soviet myth-creation, but through the prism of national, European and world historiography, to trace the evolution of his historiosophical views. Omelyan Yosypovych tried to convey as much as possible to us - the historians of the Soviet school - historical and sociological vision of M. Hrushevsky, his concept of the isolation and continuity of the Ukrainian historical process, the approaches of the scientist to the key concepts of historical science: people, state and hero in history [10]. Very instructive

and timely for post-Soviet historians who began to resume the study of the history of Ukraine in all branches of education was the intelligence of O. Pritsak «What is the history of Ukraine?»[11], In which it was not for the first time that it was about the need to overcome the provincial limitations of the part of historians, their ideological flutter, and the stereotypes of our neighbors in our history, such as "One people", "general history" It was also spoken about the expediency of deeper immersion in ancient Ukraine, its location at the crossroads of various cultures of the Old World, the influence of the Great Grail and the contribution of nomadic civilizations to the formation of our distinctive mentality.

Already the first meeting with O. Pritsak made a huge impression on me, and his bright image still remains in my memory. Slightly higher than average height, with a round and open face, with a deep hollows, somewhat stubborn, elegantly dressed in a strict suit of dark color, in a white shirt with cufflinks, a burgundy tie with an eastern pattern, the professor at first glance differed little from his appearance from the other intellectuals. For this it was necessary to hear his calm, penetrating voice, his tongue, which poured as a song. Although the scientist was the 72nd year, but he looked surprisingly younger, energetic, cheerful, confident and optimistic. His eyes, despite the glasses in the big plastic frame, emitted light, wisdom, meekness and benevolence, which caused the trust and affection of the reciprocal. It is this man who destined to lay the foundation for the revival of historiosophy at Kyiv University.

In addition, we recall that in the University of St. Vladimir since the time of his first rector, M. Maksymovych paid particular attention to the theoretical, philosophical, historiographical, source-study and methodological preparation of historians. Although there was no independent history of historiosophy, but its thematic presence was felt in lectures M.

Kostomarova, V. Antonovich, V. Ikonnikova, V. Lashnyukova, M. Dashkevich, M. Lunin, M. Bubnov, F. Fortinsky, etc., which, albeit from different ideological approaches, still touched upon the theory and philosophy of history, the current trends in Western European historiography. This tradition was picked up by the new generation of university professors in the first decades of the XX century, especially after the Ukrainian revolution. However, with the escalation of the Bolshevik regime, the struggle against the so-called bourgeois and bourgeois-nationalist methodology and the power plantings of Marxism-Leninism and historical materialism as a monopoly interpretation of the historical process unfolded. The Iron Wall from the Western countries, built by the Stalinists, for seven decades tore off the Soviet historians from the achievements of world historiography, but to destroy the inherent traditions of the professors of the university, the innovations to the end failed. Therefore, as soon as the ideological pressure was restrained in conditions of perestroika, when the monopoly of Marxism was shaken, university historians showed a great interest in the experience of Western historical science and education.

O.Pritsak led historiosophical department at Kyiv University

In the wake of the renewal of the educational process, the idea of introducing new teaching courses in the methodological direction at the university arose, which required a separate historiosophical chair. O. Pritsak argued that it need was convincing, expressing readiness to share it knowledge and experience of reading the course on historiography, philosophy and methodology of history. The idea was supported by the Academic Council of the University, considering the candidacy of Omelyan Yosypovych as a potential head of the Chair of Historyosophy. With his characteristic energy and obsession, he took up the preparatory work. The department appeared to him

in the western format as an inter-faculty institution, as a university-wide research and educational center for conducting research, lecture courses, seminars and individual work with graduate students and students. It was supposed to create a department consisting of 5 people: academician O.O. Pritsak, associate professors V.A.Potulnitsky, T.A. Gryshchenko, assistants M.V.Tomenko and L.V.Dyachuk. The room for the department, laboratory staff rate, two post-graduate students were allocated, and then it was necessary to begin practical work. Here's the Harvard professor and faced the "soviet" realities and the inertia of the administration: there were no regular units, the deans did not apply for the relevant courses and did not hurry to make changes to the curriculum. Instead, the manager was required to submit plans of work, various reports and other bureaucratic documents, visits to diverse meetings and, of course, lectures. All this took a lot of time, which obviously was not enough, because Omelyan Yosypovych worked simultaneously in the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine as a member of its presidium, created the academic Institute of Oriental Studies, joined the revival of the Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and the Archaeological Commission.

In the work on the creation of the department O.Pritsak relied on the active assistance of associate professor V.T.Potulnitsky, researcher V. Tkachenko, who worked on a voluntary basis, graduate students A. Dotsenko, V. Maievsky, I. Bilenko and others. He read the most basic lecture courses, first of all, historiosophy, history theory, and later foreign historiography of Ukraine, and held seminars on the groups that initially came not only to students, post-graduate students and university lecturers, but also representatives from other universities, in particular the Kyiv Mohyla Academy, polytechnic, construction and food institutes.

Organic unity of scientific and educational activity

Omelyan Yosypovich as a talented scientist and a teacher shared his knowledge and experience with generous transfer of young people. His seminars, which were held on the rating system and were open, turned into a kind of "master class". He paid a lot of attention to training, bringing home-speakers original literature, mostly in the language of originals, clearly set the task before the seminar participants, demanded to formulate their own thoughts, make independent conclusions. Unlike the Soviet methods, designed for conveyor training, large flows and group work, it was activity at the individual-partner level. As some contemporary students, postgraduates and lecturers mention, in particular, I. Verba, T. Gryshchenko, T. Mandibura, A. Pizhik, M. Tomenko, V. Ulyanovsky and others, workshops by O. Pritsak turned into interesting scientific discussions. Their participants prepared independent reports, creative abstracts, in the process of their listening, an acute polemic unfolded. The professor always created an atmosphere of liberation, carefully listened to the speakers, tactfully and respectfully raised the issue, strongly encouraged to participate in the discussion

As to the practical formation of the chair of historiosophy, the organization of its work, it was completely hindered by carriers of post-Soviet conservatism. In addition, in the mid-1990s, when the euphoria of independence passed when insecurity and pessimism fell on the background of the crisis, material difficulties, shortages and unemployment, the indifference of some leaders in the education industry and higher education to the transformation of the system of science and education, infantilism for foreign experience, the life of the Ukrainian diaspora and its achievements. All this was reflected in the formation of the conceived department of historiosophy, which was not properly completed, and therefore its activities as a

separate institution in 1995 began to collapse. The lectures of Omelyan Yosypovych were transferred to the department of source studies (now the department of archival studies and special branches of historical science), which since 1995 began to be the author of this article. Despite poor health, family problems and a great time at the Academy of Sciences, A. Pritsak still continued to give lectures, conducted seminars and do not lose hope that the experts will be able to prepare and give real life department (formal order for its liquidation was not). The situation was also aggravated by the fact that one of the students, and possibly the teachers, provoked the writing of a collective letter addressed to the rector, which stated that students did not understand the lectures of the professor O. Pritsak, they say, he reads them in Galician dialect and in a foreign language. The rector familiarized me with this letter and instructed me to "sort out". After attending several lectures and seminars of the professor, speaking with teachers, postgraduate students and group leaders, I made sure that the information in the letter did not correspond to reality. In fact, the lectures by Omelyan Yosypovych were extremely interesting, meaningful and high-quality, but in their form and technique they differed greatly from the traditional lessons of our teachers. The feature of the lectures of the academician was that they were based on the original texts of the eminent thinkers of the Renaissance, Enlightenment, in particular, on the views of Voltaire as the creator of the very concept of "philosophy of history," which had to establish a critical or scientific history, to build historical knowledge on the foundation of general science theory and methodology. In lectures with academic pedanticism he considered the work of Hegel "The Philosophy of History," its fundamental idea that each nation has its own specific sociocultural identity and its national character, analyzed the theoretical concepts of representatives of various scientific schools, in particular F. Savigny, Leopold Ranke, a French school

Annals, the doctrines of positivism Auguste Comte, neo-Kantianism, modernism, the uniqueness of approaches to the history of supporters of instrumentalism, business and intellectual history. Particular attention was paid to the analysis of the views of the French Annalists Mark Blok and Lucien Fever, their follower Fernand Bradeel, who prioritized a dialogue with sources and overcoming interdisciplinary barriers in the humanities. Omelyan Yosypovich very vividly depicted the biography of Fernand Bradeel as a unique man and scientist as the editor of the journal Annals in the 1950s, and hence the director of the House of Science in Paris, the honorary doctor of Oxford and Cambridge, the author of the fundamental historical and philosophical work "Material civilization, economy and capitalism, XV-XVIII centuries."

An important place was given to the axial concept of the history of K. Jaspers, the civilization interpretation of the historical process, the legacy of O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, the critique of Soviet historiography for its absoluteization of the formative and party-class approach, and the exaggeration of the role of the material factor in history. The favorite subject of the lectures were the questions of the morphology of history as the domination of cultural development, the elucidation of mentality and everyday life.

Much attention in the lectures of O. Pritsak was paid to the intellectual influences of Western concepts on the development of Ukrainian historiography, the creativity of the historians of the Ukrainian diaspora, and the integration processes in historical science as a section of humanitarian. The scholar often turned to personal memories of prominent scholars, in particular about D. Chyzhevsky, who supported creative contacts for almost three decades. The historian himself has repeatedly imagined that he, as a student of I. Krypiakovich, considers himself to be his son and grandson of M Grushevsky, which means that he is the heir

to the scientific traditions of the state direction of Ukrainian historiography and historical documentaries.

Omelyan Yosypovich, as a person with unique memory, encyclopedic knowledge from various branches of humanitarianism, as the owner of a rare books library, almost always brought the works of prominent Western thinkers to works, often used to cite their statements, sometimes in the original in classical or in German, French or in English, since there were no translations in Ukrainian or Russian at that time. Incidentally, he initiated translations and publication in the "Basics" of the Ukrainian heritage of a number of Western intellectuals, wrote a preface to the two-volume A. Toynbee's "Research on History" . It is likely that the professor came from the experience of Harvard, other western universities, where students speak several languages, while not taking into account that most of our audience did not accept this kind of lecture lessons due to lack of knowledge of languages. As for the Ukrainian language, Omelyan Yosypovych was brilliant in it, as he was not only a historian but also a linguist, almost the only researcher of Ukrainian-Turkic linguistic ties. In his comparative source-linguistic studies, the scientist used more than 60 languages of the world. By the way, he joined the establishment of the Department of Oriental Languages at the Faculty of Philology of the University (now the Institute of Philology), lecturing there and consulting the teachers. Speaking about Ukrainian language, that it had been literary, elegant, words flowed without strain, gently, sometimes monotonously as euphonious songs, although there were few archaisms and dialect characteristic for Ukrainian Galicians who have been living in the Diaspora. The professor returned to the university vocabulary such words as "cathedral", "studio", "vision", "opinia", "exposition", etc. I talked to students, many of them said that they did not know the contents of this wicked letter, that they put the signatures on a blank sheet, that the lectures

of the academician were encyclopedically rich, interesting, accessible, and they were quite happy with them. We heard a lot from him, - said the students, - what they did not know and could not read anywhere. Some students expressed regret that they did not have the opportunity to listen to lectures on methodology at junior high schools in order to take advantage of these knowledge while writing thesis work, they mentioned that several lectures ended with the ovations to the professor. Omelyan Yosypovych himself did not attempt to report anything about this incident, although he intuitively felt some kind of lackluster in the relationship that some of us had called him "Harvard Professor" with irony, and this nihilistic syndrome further depressed a truly intelligent scholar with a world name.

Several times Omeljan Yosypovych participated in the meetings of the Department of Archival Studies, was interested in the theoretical preparation of historians-archivists, the organization of archival practice. As a rule, he was accompanied by a staff member of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Larysa Gvozdyk, who, under the direction of F. Shevchenko, completed the work on the candidate's dissertation on the history of the Cossacks and consulted Professor O. Pritsak. By the way, she prepared and successfully defended a rather interesting candidate's dissertation on Moldovan-Ukrainian economic ties in the middle of the XVII century. (I had to defend myself and act as a member of a specialized academic council at the Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies named after M.S.Hrushevsky). O. Pritsak wrote meaningful prefaces to her monographs on issues of economic and political vision of Bogdan Khmelnytsky, his international treaties. Mrs. Larisa was attentive to her scientific mentor, assisted him as an assistant in conducting seminars, organizational and methodical and household matters, and subsequently became his wife. As Larisa Dmitrievna admits, now she continues to work on the creation of a thorough "Intellectual biography of Omelyan Pritsak," in

which he intends to elaborate in detail the scientist's life and creative path with an emphasis on analyzing his legacy, contributing to the development of historiography and historiosophy, to publish unidentified autographs, including "Confession", submit rare letters and photographs.

In the summer of 1998, Omelyan Yosypovych asked that, in connection with the deterioration of his health and the need to be treated abroad, in the future, he should not put him in a schedule of occupations. The course of historiosophy (philosophy of history) was transferred to the department of the history of philosophy of the philosophical faculty of Professor I. Boychenko (alas, now the dead man), the author of a well-known textbook on this topic[1], and I prepared courses from the general (world) and Ukrainian historiographies, which consisted of three blocks, respectively: a) Theoretical, historiosophical and methodological foundations of historiography; b) the history of world historical science; c) the methodology of historiographical research. By the way, Omelyan Yosypovych expressed a number of constructive recommendations and gave me some very good advice on the program of the course of not only foreign but also Ukrainian historiography. I was pleasantly impressed when I received from him in early 2002 a Letter of Inquiry from the United States with his thoughts on including in my program the achievements of historians from the Ukrainian diaspora and about the structure of my course of lectures [5]. Under the beneficial influence of the professor and communication with him, he subsequently began to prepare a scientific and methodological manual on the methodology of historiographical research [6].

Noble affair O.Pritsak lives

Thus, one of the merits of Omeljan Yosypovych Pritsak before Ukrainian historiography is that thanks to him he managed not only to return to the Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv

historiosophy and the theory of historical science, but also to initiate the creation of the first post-Soviet space of the corresponding department, to launch in Ukraine a scientific Wakivska specialty "historiosophy". Although the department was not able to fully expand its work, the curricula of university bachelor's studies in history, specialists and masters were supplemented with a whole series of training courses in philosophy and theory of historical science, its methodology and historiography. This cycle includes the basic course of philosophy with career orientation on history, read by the current rector of the university academician L. Gubersky. From the easy hand of Academician O. Pritsak to a number of historians and methodologists, a number of younger generation historians, in particular V.Verba, V.Kapelyushny, V.Kolesnik, B.Korotkij, A.Katsur, O.Lyapina, T.Orlova, M.Palienko, I.Patrylyak, A.Pihik, V.Ulyanovsky, and later N.Kont, T. Pshenychnyi and et.

Thus, the idea of Omeljan Yosypovych to improve the historiosophical preparation of Ukrainian historians is materialized, although not in its entirety. The lectures of the outstanding scientist left a good mark and contributed to the historiosophical conceptualization of Ukrainian and foreign history, and the functioning of the department even during such a short period laid the outlines of the integration of Ukrainian historiography in the world historiographical and historiosophical field. I would like to believe that in the course of time the activity of the chair of historiosophy created at Taras Shevchenko National University under the initiative of O.Prytsak will be resuscitated and continued, which, perhaps, will bear the high name of its founder.

Sources and Literature

- Бойченко І.* Філософія історії. Підручник. К.:Знання, 2000.723 с.
- 2.Гирич І. Пріцак Омелян Осипович (1919–2006) // Український археографічний щорічник. К., 2007. Вип. 12. С. 845–848.
- Дашкевич Я.* Омелян Пріцак: життя і творчість – творчість і життя [Доповідь, виголошена на II-й Міжнародній науковій конференції, присвяченій пам'яті Омеляна Пріцака, 21–22 травня 2009 р., Національний університет “Кієво-Могилянська академія”] // Електронний ресурс. – [Режим доступу]: pritsak-center.com/book/Issue_4-5/3_Dashkevych.
- Калакура Я.С.* Професор Омелян Пріцак віродив історіософію в Київському університеті / Українська орієнталістика: Зб. наук. праць викл. та студ. Нац. Університету «Кієво-Могилянська академія» і Київ. нац. лінгв. ун-ту до 90-річчя професора Омеляна Йосиповича Пріцака / К., 2009–2010. Вип. 4–5. С.38–44.
- Калакура Я.* Українська історіографія. Курс лекцій. Вид.друге. доп. К.: Генеза. 2012. 512 с.
- Калакура Я.* Методологія історіографічного дослідження. К.:ВПЦ «Київський університет», 2016. 319 с.
7. Портнов А. Омелян Пріцак – історик модерної України //Україна модерна, 2007. Ч.12. с.137-147;
- Потульніцький В. А.* Створення Омеляном Пріцаком кафедри історіософії у Київському університеті у 1992–1994 роках та її значення // Український археографічний щорічник. Нова серія. 2016. Вип. 19–20, т. 22–23. С.362–379.
- Пріцак О.* Історіософія та історіографія Михайла Грушевського. Київ; Кембридж, 1991. 80 с.
- Пріцак О.* Історіософія Михайла Грушевського // Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси. Т.1. К., 1991. С. XL – LXXIII.
- Пріцак О.* Що таке історія України // Вісник Міжнародної асоціації українців. К., №1. С.44–54.

References

1. Boichenko I. Filosofii istorii. Pidruchnyk. Kyiv: Znannia, 2000. 723 s.
2. Hyrych I. Pritsak Omelian Osypovych (1919–2006) // Ukrainskyi arkhografichnyi shchorichnyk. Kyiv, 2007. Vyp. 12. S. 845-848.
3. Dashkevych Ya. Omelian Pritsak: zhyttia i tvorchist – tvorchist i zhyttia [Dopovid, vyholoshena na II-y Mizhnarodnii naukovii konferentsii, prysviachenii pamiaty Omeliana Pritsaka, 21–22 travnia 2009 r., Natsionalnyi universytet

“Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia”] // Elektronnyi resurs. – [Rezhym dostupu]: pritsak-center.com/book/Issue_4-5/3_Dashkevych.

4. Kalakura Ya.S. Profesor Omelian Pritsak vidrodyv istoriosofiiu v Kyivskomu universyteti / Ukrainska oriientalistyka: Zb. nauk. prats. do 90-richchia profesora Omeliana Yosypovycha Pritsaka / Kyiv, 2009-2010. Vyp. 4-5. S.38-44.

5. Kalakura Ya. Ukrainska istoriohrafii. Kurs lektsii. Vyd.druhe. dop. Kyiv: Heneza. 2012. 512 s.

6. Kalakura Ya. Metodolohiia istoriohrafichnoho doslidzhennia. Kyiv: Vydavnycho-polihrafichniy tsentr «Kyivskiy universytet», 2016. 319 s.

7. Portnov A. Omelian Pritsak – istoryk modernoi Ukrainy // Ukraina moderna, 2007. Ch.12. s.137-147.

8. Potulnytskyi V. A. Stvorennia Omelianom Pritsakom kafedry istoriosofii u Kyivskomu universyteti u 1992–1994 rokakh ta yii znachennia // Ukrainskyi arkhiohrafichniy shchorichnyk. Nova seriia. 2016. Vyp. 19–20, t. 22–23. S.362-379.

9. Pritsak O. Istoriosofiiia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho // Hrushevskiy M. Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy. T.1. Kyiv, 1991. S. XL – LXXIII.

10. Pritsak O. Shcho take istoriia Ukrainy // Visnyk Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv. Kyiv, №1. S.44-54.

11. *Pritsak O. Shcho take istoriya Ukrayiny // Visnyk Mizhnarodnoyi asotsiatsiyi ukrajinistiv. K., №1. S.44–54.*