

FOREWORD

An encyclopedist, a universal scientist, an orientalist, a philologist, a historian, a specialist in source studies and historiography, a teacher, an organizer of science, a pioneer, an intellectual, a visionary, a generator of ideas, an idealist, a strategist, a creator, a “tornado” – this is an incomplete list of professional and personal characteristics of Omeljan Pritsak (1919–2006) which were used by his contemporaries, colleagues, and students in the time span of his life in order to define his multifaceted contribution to the world and Ukrainian science. Pritsak belonged to a rare type of scientists who combined the features of an armchair scholar, a university lecturer, and a manager in the academic sphere. His main areas of research were comparative and historical Altaistic linguistics, Turkology, language and history of Huns and Proto-Bulgars, the history and culture of steppe peoples, civilizations and states of Eurasia, history of the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate, as well as the medieval history of Ukraine in European and world context. He authored more than 700 scientific works (monographs, articles, and reviews), the most famous of which is his opus magnum “The Origin of Rus”. The scientist’s name is related to the creation of international scientific associations, editions, and forums (Societas Uralo-Altaica, Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, Ural-Altaische Bibliothek, The Permanent International Altaistic Conference). Omeljan Pritsak raised Ukrainian Studies to the level of world science, establishing three departments of Ukrainian Studies at Harvard University, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and initiating scientific editions in Ukrainian Studies. His professional and scientific achievements were made within the walls of famous German and American universities for almost 50 years and were highly praised by a wide range of international scientific institutions. After gaining recognition in world science, in the early 1990s, the scientist came to Ukraine, where he

founded and headed the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the Chair of Historiosophy at Taras Shevchenko National University, and facilitated the incorporation of Ukrainian humanities to the world scientific context.

Since 2007, Pritsak's unique and rare scientific heritage, i.e., a library, an archive and an art collection, have been stored at the National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy". The Omeljan Pritsak Research Center for Oriental Studies was established there, which is designed to study, popularize, and publish the scientist's intellectual heritage. Since 2008, the University has been holding international scientific conferences and academic events dedicated to Omeljan Pritsak. Thus, in 2009 and 2014, anniversary conferences were organized to celebrate the 90th and 95th anniversaries of the scientist's birth. In 2019, the University celebrated Pritsak's 100th anniversary with an international conference with the participation of scientists from Ukraine, the United States, Canada, and Poland, including students and colleagues of the scientist.

The volume offered to readers includes most of the texts of reports presented at the conference dedicated to Pritsak's 100th anniversary, as well as several articles prepared by the other authors as an attempt to draw the attention of the scientific community to such a prominent and multifaceted personality and scientist as Omeljan Pritsak. The subject matter of the articles led to the organization of the volume into three sections: 1) Omeljan Pritsak's intellectual biography; 2) Omeljan Pritsak's scientific heritage; 3) the issues of global history in the framework of Omeljan Pritsak's scientific interests.

The first chapter opens with Andrii Feloniuk's article "Shadows of Ancestors: the Family Tree of Omeljan Pritsak", which reproduces Pritsak's paternal and maternal ancestry dating back to the last third of the 18th century together with the scholar's collateral ancestors from the families of Vynnytskyis – Klizevyches – Chechels traced back to the 17th century. The author claims that Omeljan Pritsak's ancestral memory was limited to three or four generations and was based on oral tradition (mostly his mother's stories), so it has some gaps and inaccuracies. Based on an extensive corpus of sources, A. Feloniuk analyzed the socio-demographic characteristics of Pritsak's ancestors, including family ties, anthroponymy, marital behavior, birth rate, age charac-

teristics, socio-professional status, territorial mobility, etc., and compiled seven genealogical tables and diagrams of the scientist's family tree.

Taissa Sydorchuk's article "Omeljan Pritsak's Training in European Scientific Schools as a Factor in the Formation of a Universal Scientist: the Main Stages (1928–1948)" presents an insufficiently studied topic of training a future scientist and his professional development as an orientalist, historian, and researcher. Based on the personal documents preserved by Pritsak and his biographical essays, the author gradually examines the circumstances of Pritsak's educational growth, starting from studying at Ternopil Classical Gymnasium, studies at Lviv and Berlin universities and ending with the preparation and defense of doctoral dissertation at Göttingen University. The article traces the consistent intellectual influence of the representatives of various scientific schools on Pritsak and his personal motivation clearly observed from a young age and his persistence in acquiring professional and research knowledge, which jointly formed a universal scientist who initiated and implemented important scientific ideas and projects for the world and Ukrainian science.

The next two articles highlight the figure of Omeljan Pritsak as the founder and longtime head of the Ukrainian Studies Center at Harvard University. Pritsak's former student, Professor Frank Sysyn, in his article "Omeljan Pritsak and the Establishment of Ukrainian Studies at Harvard: The Vision and the Actuality" reveals the historical content of the creation and formation of the "Harvard miracle" in the late 1960s, i.e., three Ukrainian studies chairs and a Research Institute at Harvard University and highlights Pritsak's role in their formation and development. The author analyzes the core points of Pritsak's concept of Ukrainian studies at Harvard, its active discussion in the Ukrainian environment in North America, reproduces complex ways of institutional implementation, as well as the main directions and results of scientific and organizational activities of the institute during Pritsak's leadership.

A researcher Oleksandr Avramchuk in the article "Ukrainian Kissinger"? Omeljan Pritsak, "Reality of Homeland" and "The Ukrainian Scholarly Offensive" considers one of the plots of Pritsak's multifaceted scientific and organizational activities as a director of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, in particular, on the background

of emigration projects of the so-called “realitetnyi”, a group of Ukrainian intellectuals and politicians in the United States, who viewed the post-Stalinist “thaw” and the Ukrainian Sixties in the 1960s as a chance to influence political and intellectual life in Soviet Ukraine through official contacts and academic exchanges. The author argues that in these contacts, Pritsak saw an opportunity to have access to libraries and archives that were important for students and research projects. The article also examines Pritsak’s project of the “Ukrainian Scholarly Offensive”, according to which the development of Ukrainian studies with the support of the American government should have become a tool in the Cold War. Based on Pritsak’s personal archive, Harvard University collections and CIA archives, the reasons for the project’s failure and the scientist’s role in the “Intellectual Cold War” were analyzed.

The articles of the authors included in the second part of the volume “Pritsak’s Scientific Heritage” focus on the coverage of the personality of the scientist as a historian, historiographer, and source researcher. In the article “Omeljan Pritsak’s Contribution to the Development of Research on the History of Ukraine: Thematic, Methodological, and Conceptual Aspects”, Volodymyr Potulnytskyi, using the materials from Pritsak’s archival and documentary heritage, makes the first attempt to investigate the scientist’s contribution to Ukrainian history. Applying Karl Mannheim’s methodology, the author highlights Pritsak’s thematic, conceptual, and methodological approaches to the development of four major issues in the history of Ukraine: 1) the conceptualization of the history of Ukraine as a science; 2) the disclosure of argumentative issues of “The Tale of Bygone Years”; 3) the phenomenon of sovereignty as a cross-cutting problem of the ancient princely state of Rus’; 4) the problems of the Ukrainian Cossacks as a domestic and later socio-political phenomenon. The article also traces the evolution of the scientist’s vision of key problems of historical science during research work in different countries and on different continents, compares the ideas and concepts which he formulated in different periods of life, and highlights what the scientist introduced into his vision of the history of Ukraine at the next stage of history and the vicissitudes of his own life.

Oleksandr Halenko’s article “What is the History of Ukraine? Revising O. Pritsak’s Theorem” is devoted to one of the important ideas

of the scientist, i. e. defining the object/subject of Ukrainian history, which, according to the author of the study, Pritsak tried to implement in all his roles as an Orientalist, a Ukrainianist, a patriot, and an activist of the Ukrainian diaspora. Formulated in two special speeches in 1980 in the United States and in 1990 in Kyiv, Pritsak's vision of the object/subject of the history of Ukraine was shown not only as the past of the Ukrainian people, but of all types of states and civilizations that have been present on the territories of modern Ukraine since the beginning of history, including ethnically non-Ukrainian communities and states, as well as those located in the south and considered hostile to Ukrainians, primarily the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire. O. Halenko claims that this idea of an outstanding scientist, despite its relevance, is still ignored by scientists and has not yet triggered a comprehensive discussion in academia. Instead, Pritsak's formulation of the object/subject of the history of Ukraine more than a few decades ago, before the proclamation of Ukraine's independence in 1991, testifies to the scholar's scientific intuition.

Heorhii Papakin's research "A Source Study Component of Omeļjan Pritsak's Scientific Heritage" focuses on the source aspect of the scientist's research work, in which he predominantly analyzed the written sources. The author argues that an important component of the academician's source methodology was the analysis of the text of monuments, the whole linguistic context, and the mentality of the authors. In addition, he also used chronology, genealogy, metrology, sphragistics, etc. to obtain source information. According to the author of the article, O. Pritsak considered the recourse to primary sources, the use of new approaches and their own methodology of their study as the only way to resolve scientific issues that have a history of more than one century. Therefore, there is every reason to consider O. Pritsak as one of the brightest source scholars of the 20th – early 21st century, the basic principle of whom was to analyze the entire source complex in the original language based on the historical context, and the general situation of a particular era.

The third section of the volume "Problems of Global History in the Light of Pritsak's Scientific Interests" covers a wide range of thematic and chronological research, which only partially reflects the scholar's scientific interests. Thus, Oleksandr Fylypchuk's article "Mercenaries and Saints. Varangian Churches in Constantinople" considers the

problem of Varangian churches in Constantinople, where, in particular, special attention is paid to the spread of the cult of Saint Olav among the Varangians in the Byzantine service. Determining the origin and composition of the four “Byzantine” miracles of Saint Olav, the author argues that the story of the construction of the Saint Olav’s church in Constantinople needs to be revised. The analysis of the “Varangian” miracles of Saint Olav and the Byzantine narratives of the Battle of Beroia (1121) show that the existing claims about the temple of Saint Olav, as well as about several other temples dedicated to him in Constantinople, have no substantiated grounds (as it is often and unjustifiably believed in historiography). The author concludes that after the battle, Emperor John II Comnenos built a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary, where, given the exceptional role of the Varangians in this military campaign, a chapel was built in honor of Saint Olav. Due to the long association with the Varangians, the temple had a “folk” name: Βαράγγωτισσα. According to the author, only the message about the church of St. Nicholas, associated with the Varangians, find their explanation and inspire confidence.

In the article “Central European Diasporas in North America: At the Head or Behind the Historical Process”, Pritsak’s former disciple Paul Robert Magocsi set out to determine the fact and extent of the influence of Central European diasporas in the United States (and partly in Canada) on political events related to the periods of political activities that reached their peak at the turning points in the historical development of Europe and most of the world in 1918 and 1989, the first of which marked the end of the First World War and the beginning of radical political changes in Europe and the Middle East, and the second was associated with the end of communist totalitarian-type regimes in half of the European continent and the rest of the Soviet political space that stretched across northern Asia to the Pacific coast. Professor Magocsi argues that diasporas living in the United States had an impact on the political, economic, and social life of their homeland. In this case, according to the author, the main difference between the diasporas of the two fateful periods of the 20th century was that the diaspora of 1918 looked to the future, while the diaspora of 1989 was characterized by a hindsight. At the end of the First World War and the time of the collapse of the empires, the Central European diasporas of America had a well-established political goal for their homeland and

were ready to lobby the American government, and especially the allies, at the Paris Peace Conference. The 1989 diaspora was politically one step behind their homeland because their political ideal ended with the creation of a nation-state, while political leaders and much of the population of most Central European countries were aware of the limitations of the nation-state and were strong supporters of European integration. The author emphasizes that the phenomenon of diasporas requires further research, in particular, the impact of Central European diasporas in America on their homeland and how Central European governments respond to requests and use “their” diaspora in North America.

In the article “Position of Ukraine Between Poland and Russia in the Narratives of French and German Intellectual History from the End of the 18th Century until the End of the First World War: Towards Theoretical, Methodological, Conceptual, and Source Aspects”, Heorhii Potulnytskyi, relying methodologically on the definition of intellectual history as a phenomenon presented by Omeljan Pritsak, on the one hand, and the concept of generations of Karl Mannheim, on the other hand, critically analyzed the works of different scholars and publicists selected for each of the three studied periods of German and French history: 1st period (1770–1790), 2nd period (1840–1860), and 3rd period (1890–1918). The research was carried out on the basis of the use of French- and German-language professional literature and sources. The author analyzes the direction, leading issues of the works, the source base, the location of the Ukrainian discourse between Russian and Polish ones, etc. In addition, the article highlights the vision of the image of Ukraine and the interpretation, within this context, of Russian and Polish issues by French and German intellectuals belonging to three different generations.

Iryna Slyusarenko’s study “Restoration of the Monarchy in Spain in the 19th–20th Centuries as a Manifestation of the Phenomenon of Conservative Revolution: Similarities and Differences” synthesized into a single whole and comprehensively studied two phenomena of restoration of dynastic rule in Spain in the 19th–20th centuries. Applying a comprehensive methodological approach, in particular Karl Mannheim’s equilibrium scheme of the system, the author of the article correlated the events of different chronological eras in the history of the Spanish kingdom. It enabled her to identify social and political

features, the main types and stages of restoration, inherent in each of the two studied phenomena of Spanish traditional conservatism, as well as those features that were common to both phenomena. The study obtained a generalized panoramic view of the problem of restoration of the monarchy in Spain during the 19th–20th centuries.

The volume “Omeljan Pritsak: biography, heritage, scientific interests. To the 100th anniversary of his birth” is an expression of gratitude and respect of students, colleagues, and young researchers to the great Teacher and Scientist. In addition, we hope that the collection will be another attempt to draw the attention of a wider range of researchers to the scientific heritage of the eminent scientist, to update the scientific potential of his ideas and concepts for modern science, and to understand the palette and scope of Omeljan Pritsak’s scientific interests and achievements.

Editorial Board
April 2021