

THE METHODS OF INTERNAL CRITICISM OF WRITTEN SOURCES
IN THE WORKS OF UKRAINIAN HISTORIANS: ON THE EXAMPLE OF
SCIENTIFIC NARRATIVES ON THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION
(1840s-1930s)

MYKOLA HALIV AND VASYL ILNYTSKYI*

In the context of the study of the methodological foundations of Ukrainian historical science, the analysis of the critique of written sources used by authors remains an understudied aspect. The clarification of sources is driven by the need to form a holistic image of the epistemological approaches of Ukrainian scholars, who laid the foundations for the study of the history of education as an aspect of historical studies. The division of criticism of sources into internal and external was introduced into scientific circulation in the late nineteenth century by the French historians Charles Seignobos and Charles-Victor Langlois.¹ Also important in the scientific interpretation of methods for critiquing sources were the works of Ernst Bernheim,² Kristian Erslev,³ Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu,⁴ Christopher Behan McCullagh,⁵ Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier⁶ and Philipp Müller,⁷ among others. Among the many Ukrainian scholars who have dealt with the critique of sources, we should mention, first of

* Mykola Haliv, PhD, Professor, Department of Ukraine's History of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, Ukraine; e-mail: halivm@yahoo.com. Vasyl Ilnytskyi, PhD, Professor, Department of Ukraine's History of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, Ukraine; e-mail: vilnickiy@gmail.com.

¹ Charles-Victor Langlois, Charles Seignobos, *Vvedenie v izuchenie istorii* [Introduction to the Study of History], 2nd ed. (Moskva: Gosudarstvennaya Publichnaya Istoricheskaya Biblioteka Rossii, 2004).

² Ernst Bernheim, *Einleitung in die Geschichtswissenschaft* (Leipzig: G. J. Göschen, 1907); Idem, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1908).

³ Kristian Erslev, *Historisk Teknik. Den historiske undersøgelse fremstillet i sine grundlinier* [Historical Technique. The Historical Study Presented in Its Baselines] (Köpenhamn: Gyldendal-Nordisk Forlag, 1963).

⁴ Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu, *Îndrumări în cercetările istorice* [Guidelines in Historical Research] (București: Casa Școalelor, 1943).

⁵ Christopher Behan McCullagh, *Justifying Historical Descriptions* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

⁶ Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2001).

⁷ Philipp Müller, "Understanding History: Hermeneutics and Source-Criticism in Historical Scholarship," in Miriam Dobson and Benjamin Ziemann, eds., *Reading Primary Sources. The Interpretation of Texts from Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century History* (London: Routledge, 2009): 21-36.

Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Historica 25, I (2021): 281-297;

<https://doi.org/10.29302/auash.2021.25.1.14>.

all, Aleksandr Lappo-Danilevskiy,⁸ Ivan Krypiakevych,⁹ Mykola Kovalskiy,¹⁰ Anatoliy Santsevych¹¹ and Viacheslav Strelskiy.¹² Certain aspects of the use of external and internal criticism of sources by Ukrainian historian-positivists, romantics and neo-romantics of the nineteenth to early twentieth centuries have been researched by Olena Bogdashyna,¹³ Iryna Kolesnyk,¹⁴ Mykola Haliv¹⁵ and Olga Vladyha.¹⁶

It should be noted that in Ukrainian historical science there is currently no synthesized study of the methodology of the internal critique of sources as operated by researchers into the history of education. It should be noted that a rather wide timeframe was chosen for the present analysis: from the 1840s, when the first studies on the history of education by domestic authors appeared, to the 1930s, when Marxist theory established itself as the methodological foundation of historical science in the Soviet Ukraine. This broad historiographical background creates opportunities to describe the research question in a more general way.

During the period under study, Ukrainian scholars gradually improved their internal critique of sources. In the 1840s, Yosyp Mikhnevych and Mikhail Bulgakov mostly used documents rather uncritically, “extracting” information about the past from them without proper verification, often without regard to the position of the author of the source, the explanatory-rhetorical layer of the document; however, these approaches were to change. Two decades before the

⁸ Aleksandr Lappo-Danilevskiy. *Metodologiya istorii* [Methodology of History], 2nd ed. (Moskva: Izdatelskiy Dom Teritoria Budushchego, 2006).

⁹ Ivan Krypiakevych, “Narysy metodyky istorychnykh doslidzhen” [Essays on the Methodology of Historical Research], *Ukrainskyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal* 2 (1967): 100-106; 3 (1967): 113-115; 4 (1967): 106-108; 7 (1967): 121-123; 8 (1967): 113-116; 9 (1967): 130-132; 10 (1967): 94-97.

¹⁰ Mykola Kovalskiy, “Nekotorye problemy teorii i metodiki istorycheskogo istochnikovedeniia” [Some Problems of the Theory and Methods of Historical Source Study], accessed 30.10.2020, <http://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/en/statti/56-nikola-kovalski-nekotorye-problemy-teorii-i-metodiki-istoricheskogo-istochnikovedeniia>.

¹¹ Anatoliy Santsevych, *Metodika istoricheskogo issledovaniia* [Historical Research Methodology] (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1990).

¹² Viacheslav Strelskiy, *Teoriia i metodika istochnikovedeniia istorii SSSR* [Theory and Methodology of Source Study of the History of the USSR] (Kyiv: Vyshcha Shkola, 1968).

¹³ Olena Bogdashyna, *pozytyvizm v istorychnii nautsi v Ukraini (60-ti rr. XIX – 20-ti rr. XX st.)* [Positivism in Historical Science in Ukraine (60ies of the XIX – 20ies of the XX Century)] (Kharkiv: Apostrof, 2010).

¹⁴ Iryna Kolesnyk, *Ukrainska istoriografii: kontseptualna istoriia* [Ukrainian Historiography: Conceptual History] (Kyiv: Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2013).

¹⁵ Mykola Haliv, “Krytyka pysemnykh dzherel v istoryko-pedahohichnykh pratsiakh Ivana Franka” [Critique of Written Sources in the Ivan Franko’s Historical and Pedagogical Works], *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho Derzhavnoho Universytetu imeni Ivana Franka* 4 (2016): 51-55.

¹⁶ Olga Vladyha, “Mykhailo Hrushevskiy yak arkheohraf (ohliad dzherel)” [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy as an Archeographer (A Review of the Sources)], *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk / East European Historical Bulletin* 4 (2017): 36-41.

appearance of Wilhelm Dilthey's hermeneutic studies in historical science, including Ukrainian science, the need to delve into the text of the source and critically comprehend the author's position was already being affirmed.

For example, Mykola (Nikolai) Lavrovskiy, in the 1850s and 1860s, repeatedly mentioned in his works the careful study (reading, consideration and revision) of his historical sources.¹⁷ In this way, he attached importance to the information isolated from the sources and to his conclusions on the one hand, while on the other hand, he pointed to the general hermeneutic principle of penetrating the text, that is, of reading it with great care. In addition, Lavrovskiy emphasized the need to "delve" into the content of the source.¹⁸ The scholar noted the need for impartial, unbiased, yet "healthy" (based on "common sense") historical criticism. Speaking about the work of Vasil Tatishchev in particular, he related these points to the history of education in ancient Russia, noting that, "It would be unwise, of course, to assert an unconditional faith in everything that Tatishchev says, but a *healthy and dispassionate historical critique*, not limited to the commonplace, can and should separate in this work what constitutes a capacious heritage of history from fiction" (emphasis added).¹⁹ In this statement, we can see the scholar's firm belief in the significant potential of scientific and historical criticism.

Artemiy Gotalov-Gottlieb, who worked in Soviet Ukraine, also emphasized the value of internal criticism of sources. In 1927 he wrote:

If a historical document (source) has a literary form, then it is subjected to pre-critical processing: its authenticity is established, and its text is cleared of extraneous layers. It should be noted, of course, that the critical purification of the source often leaves traces of the subjective views of the researcher, but in any case, without prior scientific processing, the historical document has questionable value.²⁰

Authenticity, perhaps, should be understood as the adequacy of the information provided in the source. It can be established through internal criticism (of course, taking into account external criticism). Even acknowledging the

¹⁷ Nikolai Lavrovskiy, *O pedagogicheskom znachenii sochynenii Ekateriny Velikoi* [On the Pedagogical Significance of the Catherine the Great's Works] (Kharkiv: V Universytetskoi Tipohrafi, 1856), 7, 102; Idem, "Vasylyi Nazarevych Karazin i otkritie Kharkovskago universiteta" [Vasiliy Nazarevich Karazin and the Opening of Kharkiv University], *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniya* CLIX (1871): 218, 223; Idem, *Zamechaniya o pervonachalnoi istorii Kharkovskago universiteta* [Remarks on the Initial History of Kharkiv University] (s.n., s.a.), 20; Idem, *Gimnazia vysshykh nauk kn. Bezborodko v Nezhine (1820-1832 g.)* [The Prince Bezborodko Higher Sciences Gymnasium in Nizhyn (1820-1832)] (Kyiv: Tipohrafiya M. P. Frytsa, 1879), 19.

¹⁸ Lavrovskiy, *Gimnazia vysshykh nauk*, 164.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 43.

²⁰ Artemiy Gotalov-Gotlib, "O khrestomatyakh po istorii pedagogiki (Kritiko-metodologicheskyy ocherk)" [On Textbooks on the History of Pedagogy (Critical-Methodological Essay)], *Zapisky Odeskoho Instytutu Narodnoi Osvity* 1 (1927): 263-264.

subjectivity of the scholar in studying the source, A. Gotalov-Gottlieb emphasizes the need for “scientific processing” of the historical document.

We emphasize two features of the implementation of internal criticism of historical sources by Ukrainian historians. The first is that they rarely applied internal criticism to the so-called “official” sources on the history of schooling, such as legislation, statutes of educational institutions, reporting documents of educational authorities, minutes of meetings of pedagogical or academic councils, and so on. These documents, despite their authorial nature (because laws and statutes have authors), were not in doubt, especially if they concerned the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. Characteristic in this regard is the remark of Ivan Filipchak who, when writing the history of schooling in Lemkivshchyna (1939), dealt with “official documents” such as *courends* – reports (“extracts”) of pastors on the activities of schools. Even when there was doubt in the reporting information, he understood its unverifiability, noting that “We must believe in it because it is written in the extract.”²¹

The perception of “official” documents as reliable sources can be seen, for example, in the works of Stepan Golubev, who, by the way, sometimes replaced the concept of “authenticity” with the concept of “documentary.” Thus, in discussing a list of rectors, prefects and teachers of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy compiled in the second half of the eighteenth century, he noted that: “Although this list, not to mention significant gaps, is full of major errors and trustworthy use of it can bring (and has done) more harm than good – nevertheless, the evidence reported in it about the Yasynskyi rectory bears traces of documentation, and therefore and reliability.”²²

The second feature of internal criticism’s implementation by Ukrainian historians is where it is used to prove the authenticity of the evidence of a written source by first analysing its content and then comparing this content with that obtained from other sources. Manifestations of this approach will be demonstrated in the context of the analysis of methods of internal criticism of written sources.

In their attempts to analyse historical sources to extract factual information, researchers into the history of education mostly used the following methods of internal criticism:

1. *Determination of the reliability of the source by indicating the specifics of its occurrence, above all through the analysis of the author’s ability to reflect reality adequately.* In particular, Mykola Lavrovskyi, characterizing the memoirs of a former student of Kharkiv University, Tymofiy Selivanov,

²¹ Ivan Fylypchak, “Shkilnytstvo na Lemkivshchyni. Istorychni narys” [Schooling in the Lemko Region. A Historical Essay], *Shliakh Vykhovannia i Navchannia* 2 (1939): 97.

²² Stepan Golubev, *Kievskaja Akademia v kontse XVII i nachale XVIII stol.* [Kiev Academy in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries] (Kyiv: Tipographia I. I. Gorbunova, 1901), 34-35.

noted that although these are the memories of an elderly man, they were not written for the general public and were not intended for public consumption.²³ In fact, by emphasizing that the memoirs were not recorded for the public, the researcher tried to emphasize their impartiality, objectivity, and thus their authenticity. This thesis does not make the source more reliable, because even if one writes for one's self, rather than for publication, one might embellish reality regardless of whether one is a conscientious scholar or a person not connected with science.

Amvroziy Androkhovych in his work on the Ruthenian Institute (*Studium ruthenum*) of Lviv University (1922) spoke about the authenticity of Ivan Garasevych's memoirs. Although they were written and published at the end of Garasevych's life (in *Zoria Galytska* 1851), the scholar grants them credibility, pointing out that as a seven-year-old boy, I. Garasevych saw the discovery of *Studium ruthenum*, then studied at Lviv University where he was acquainted with students of the Ruthenian Institute; from 1803 to 1807 he was a professor of dogmatics at the same institute. "Therefore, we can safely consider him almost a seer of the beginnings of the study of rutheni and we have no reason not to believe his words,"²⁴ – summed up A. Androkhovych.

Similarly, Mykhailo Vozniak in 1936 described the state of schooling in the second half of the sixteenth century based on a description provided by the Protestant writer, P. Oderbon, dating from 1581. Oderbon provided the following description:

Ruthenians always have school in churches; here a thirty-year-old young man teaches children the first principles of writing; their alphabet is very similar to the ancient Greek. Catechism is not taught: children are given only prayers to the Virgin and St Nicholas, written in books; and yet they learn the apostolic symbol, somewhat altered. Then there are the Psalms of David, which are used both by day and at night.²⁵

Vozniak asserted the authenticity of this testimony by pointing to the author's knowledge of the source with the state of affairs about which he wrote. According to him, P. Oderbon was the pastor of the city of Kovno, and therefore knew the life of the local people. In addition, he went to Vilno, so he saw the way of life of the Ruthenians.²⁶

²³ Lavrovskiy, *Zamechaniya*, 26-27.

²⁴ Amvroziy Androkhovych, "Lvivske "Studium ruthenum"" [Lviv "Studium ruthenum"], *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Shevchenka* CXXXII (1922): 195.

²⁵ Mykhailo Vozniak, "Shkola Uspenskoho Bratstva u Lvovi (U 350-littia ii povstannia)" [School of the Assumption Brotherhood in Lviv (On the 350th Anniversary of Its Uprising)], *Shliakh Vykhovannia y Navchannia* 3 (1936): 129.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 129.

The Ukrainian historians Mykhailo Linchevskyy,²⁷ Dmytro Bagaliy,²⁸ Oleksandr Panasyuk,²⁹ Stepan Tomashivskyy,³⁰ Ilarion Svientsitskyy,³¹ Mykhailo Hrushevskyy,³² Hanna Shamrai,³³ Ivan Krypiakevych,³⁴ Oleksandr Nazarevskyy³⁵ and Henadiy Zhurakovskyy³⁶ repeatedly emphasised the author's awareness of the historical document as an important guarantee of the reliability of source information. However, some historians, emphasizing the author's awareness of current events, noted their possible ignorance of previous historical realities. Thus, the historian H. Zhurakovskyy (late 1930s), writing about education in

²⁷ Mychailo Linchevskyy, "Pedagogiia drevnikh bratskykh shkol i preimushchestvenno drevnei Kievskoi Akademii" [Pedagogy of Ancient Brotherly Schools and Mainly of the Ancient Kyiv Academy], *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* 7 (1870): 104-154; 8 (1870): 437-500; 9 (1870): 535-588.

²⁸ Dmytro Bagaliy, *Opyt istorii Kharkovskogo universiteta (po neizdannym materialam)* [Experience in the History of Kharkiv University (Based on Unpublished Materials)], vol. 1 (Kharkiv: Parovaya Tipographia y Litographia Zilberberga, 1893-1898), vol. 2 (Kharkiv: Parovaya Tipographia y Litographia M. Zilberberga y Synova, 1904).

²⁹ Oleksandr Panasiuk, *Istorieskii ocherk nachalnogo obrazovaniia v g. Kamenets-Podolsk* [Historical Outline of Primary Education in Kamenets-Podolsk] (Kamenets-Podolsk: Tipolitohrafiia L. Landvigera, 1904).

³⁰ Stepan Tomaszewski, "Pogląd na rozwój Gimnazjum Brzeżańskiego (1789-1905). Część druga" [A Look at the Development of Berezany Gymnasium (1789-1905). Part Two], in *Sprawozdanie dyrekcji c.k. Gimnazjum wyższego w Brzeżanach za rok szkolny 1906* [Report of the Directorate of the Higher Gymnasium in Berezany for 1906] (Brzeżany: Nakładem funduszu szkolnego, 1906), 63-105.

³¹ Ilarion Svientsitskyy, "Shkilna osvita dukhovnykh kandydativ v rr. 1756-1788" [School Education of Candidate Priests in the Years 1756-1788], *Ukrainsko-Ruskyi Arkhiv* IV (1909): 1-9; Idem, "Shkilni zaniatia Petra Bilianskoho" [Petro Bilyansky's School Classes], *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* CVII (I) (1911): 115-119.

³² Mychailo Hrushevskyy, *Kulturno-natsionalnyi rukh na Ukraini v XVI-XVII vitsi* [Cultural and National Movement in Ukraine in the 16th-17th Centuries] (Kyiv-Lviv: Drukarnia S. V. Kulzhenko, 1912); Idem, *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury* [History of Ukrainian Literature], 2nd ed., vol. 6 (Kyiv: Lybid', 1995).

³³ Hanna Shamrai, "V starorezhymnii shkoli i naokolo nei (Opovidannia A. Soltanovskoho, promyneni pry vydannii 1892-4 rr.)" [In and Near the Old-Regime School (A. Soltanovsky's Stories, Omitted During the Publication of 1892-4)], *Ukraina. Naukovyi Dvokhmisiachnyk Ukrainoznavstva* 5 (1926): 90-114.

³⁴ Ivan Krypiakevych, "Uchytel Bohdana Khmelnytskoho (Andrii Hontsel Mokrskyi)" [Teacher for Bohdan Khmelnytsky (Andriy Honzel Mokrsky)], *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Shevchenka* CXXXIII (1922): 27-38.

³⁵ Oleksandr Nazarevskyy, "Yuvilei Kyivskoho universytetu i studentski zakoloty 1884 roku" [Anniversary of the Kyiv University and the Student Uprisings in 1884], *Za sto lit. Materialy z hromadskoho y literaturnoho zhyttia Ukrainy XIX i pochatkiv XX stolittia* 2 (1928): 224-250; Idem, "'Bereznevyy rukh' kyivskykh studentiv r. 1878" ["March Movement" of Kyiv Students in 1878], *Za sto lit. Materialy z hromadskoho y literaturnoho zhyttia Ukrainy XIX i pochatkiv XX stolittia* 3 (1928): 102-122.

³⁶ Henadiy Zhurakovskyy, "Do pytannia pro dzherela osvitnoi diialnosti staroi Kyivskoi Hromady" [On the Question of the Sources of Educational Activities of the old Kyiv Community], *Zapysky Kyivskoho Instytutu Narodnoi Osvity* IV (1930): 125-136.

ancient Rome in the first centuries AD, used as historical sources the works of Juvenal and Tacitus, who wrote about the differences in the upbringing of children in the republican period and the empire. The scholar, well acquainted with the works of these authors, noted that their description of the past could be fictitious because in their day comparisons of past and present were a literary technique aimed at emphasising the author's views on contemporary events.³⁷

An example of the incorrectness of the internal critique of the source, which is based not only on the fact of reliable knowledge of its author, is the reasoning of Israel Hait (1936), who quoted the memoirs of a former student mid-nineteenth-century student of Kharkiv University, De Poulet. In particular, he focused on De Poulet's thoughts on mental silence, humility and spiritual poverty, which at that time were considered ideals. The scholar quoted the text without analysing the content, and supported the authenticity of the document only with the words: "that is the way the contemporaries wrote."³⁸ In other words, it was only because certain considerations were expressed by De Poulet's contemporaries that the researcher considered their description objective.

2. *Determining the reliability of the source and information through the analysis of the author's motives.* Among the numerous examples of such criticism is the analysis of chronicle reports on the establishment of schools in Kiev Rus by M. Lavrovskiy in one of his narratives (1854). The scholar took into account two reports about: 1) Prince Volodymyr, who gathered boyar children for book study; 2) Prince Yaroslav, who gathered 300 children of boyars and elders for education in about 1030 in Novgorod. He immediately noted that these mentions have varying degrees of reliability, but expressed confidence in the certainty of the first because found in all lists of all chronicles.³⁹ The second report is only in three lists of the Sophia Chronicle of the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries, from where it was rewritten to the Nikon Chronicle of the seventeenth century. In one of the lists of the Sofia Chronicle, there is a mention of the founding of the Novgorod school by Yaroslav on the margins of the text (in the other two it is mentioned in the text itself). No other chronicle says anything about this school, including the Novgorod Chronicle.⁴⁰

At the same time, M. Lavrovskiy rejected doubts about the authenticity of this record and gave the following arguments. 1) The compiler of the first list, in the Sophia Chronicle, had no possible motivation to invent such an event

³⁷ Henadiy Zhurakovskiy, *Ocherky po istorii antichnoi pedagogiki* [Essays on the History of Ancient Pedagogy] (Moskva: Gossudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo Narkomprosa RSFSR, 1940), 342-343.

³⁸ Israel Hait, "Pro istorychnu nepravdu i istorychnu pravdu" [On Historical Untruth and Historical Truth], *Komunistychna Osvita* 3 supl. (1936): 30.

³⁹ Nikolai Lavrovskiy, *O drevne-russkykh uchylyshchakh* [About Ancient Rus' Schools] (Kharkiv: Pechatano v Universitetskoi Tipohrafii, 1854), 20.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

and record it, apparently borrowing the fact from some older list which has not reached us. 2) The very nature of the message – short, simple and unexpected – shows that the author himself did not find much weight in it and placed it as if by accident between other events (if the event was invented for a specific purpose, its mention in the chronicle would take up more space). 3) The absence of this mention in the Novgorod chronicles can be explained by the fact that at that time in Novgorod there were several chronicles by different people who looked at historical events in ambiguous ways (for example, Suzdal and Kyiv chroniclers evaluated the same princes differently). So the Novgorod chroniclers could have excellent assessments and views about the school – some chroniclers wrote about it, and these chronicle testimonies did not reach us, but reached to the author of the Sofia Chronicle, others chroniclers did not write about the school, but their texts have reached us (in the Novgorod chronicles about Prince Yaroslav also had different descriptions). 4) At the Council of the Clergy in 1551, it was mentioned that there was a school in Novgorod in ancient times.⁴¹ The first two statements are aimed at refuting the possible authorial fiction of the described event; the third aims to advance the hypothesis of the existence of the message about a historical event in earlier sources that have not survived; and the fourth supports the idea of the existence of educational institutions in Novgorod in general, while at the same time establishing an intentional idea of the existence, in particular, of Yaroslav's School. In our opinion, all four components of this explanation represent problems in dealing with evidence and are questionable. However, M. Lavrovskiy considered the mention in the Sofia Chronicle of Yaroslav's establishment of a school in Novgorod to be reliable.

Attention to the psychology of historical figures – the authors of the sources – was one of the main tools historians of this era used to determine their motives. For example, Pavlo Lukyanovych, in an 1881 work on the history of the school in Ostroh, characterized the motives of an unknown author of “Perestorohy” (“the Cautions”) – a polemical work of the early seventeenth century. The researcher emphasized that the author of this treatise described the activities of the founder of the Ostroh school – Prince Constantine of Ostroh – in very sublime terms. However, the author of “Perestorohy” did not claim that the school in Ostroh was an “academy”. Lukyanovych suggests that if the Ostroh school had become a college or academy, the medieval author would have certainly mentioned it, trying to emphasize Prince Ostrozkyi's achievements.⁴²

Another example is found in a 1904 review by Mykola (Nikolai) Petrov of Dmytro Vyshnevskiy's dissertation, devoted to the history of the Kyiv

⁴¹ Ibid., 23-26.

⁴² Pavlo Lukyanovych, “K voprosu ob Ostrozhskoj shkole (XVI v.)” [On the Question of the Ostroh School (Sixteenth Century)], *Volynskiiia Eparkhialnyia vedomosti* 23-24 (1881): 776-777.

Academy in the first half of the eighteenth century. The scholar paid special attention to a letter from the President of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, Feofan Prokopovych, to the Metropolitan of Kyiv, Raphael Zaborovskiy, in 1736, in which F. Prokopovych rebuked the Fraternal Monastery for poor management. M. Petrov argues that one should not take Prokopovych's criticism in a straightforward way, given the historical and biographical circumstances. At that time, Kyiv Metropolitan R. Zaborovskiy had appealed to the Synod to obtain permission to resume cash payments from the Hetman's Military Treasury to the Kyiv Academy. These payments were granted until 1722, when the Russian government ordered that funds from the Hetman's treasury should only go towards fulfilling military needs. As president of the Synod, F. Prokopovych, according to M. Petrov, did not want to go against the government, and therefore wrote a letter of reply to R. Zaborovskiy in which he refused the Metropolitan's request. F. Prokopovych rebuked the Kyiv metropolitan for the poor management of the Fraternal Monastery which operated the Kiev Academy. But in reality the motive for the refusal was another – the president of the Synod does not want to ask for money from the government again (during the E. Biron's regime), but did not write about it in a letter to R. Zaborovsky. The professor stressed that the financial health of the monastery, and hence the educational institution, was poor, but due to "historical circumstances" rather than bad management. In 1904, Professor Petrov wrote a review of the young historian Vyshnevsky's dissertation (this is at the beginning of the rubric). The professor criticized Vyshnevsky for incorrectly analyzing Prokopovych's letter to Zaborovskiy (1736).⁴³ In essence, Petrov was showing a young colleague how to take into account the social status, job responsibilities and related motives of the source's author, and thus interpret that author's opinion and seek for incentives other than those that directly declared.

An interesting way is to determine the reliability of source information given the motives of one of the authors, as was demonstrated by Stepan Golubev. In one of his works (1907), he presented the memoirs of I. Tymkovskiy, who studied at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy from 1785 but wrote his memoirs a few decades later (first published in 1852). The former student of the academy, in particular, mentioned the consequences of the fire of 1780, which caused significant damage to the school's building and library. One of S. Goluiev's opponents, Fedir Titov, noted that I. Tymkovskiy had not witnessed the fire of 1780, and therefore his memoirs were of little value. S. Golubev denied this, claiming that I. Tymkovskiy, although not present during the fire, was "*well informed* (and this is quite natural) *about the fire and its*

⁴³ N. P. [Nikolai Petrov], "Kievskaja Akademia v pervoi polovine XVIII stoletia" [Kiev Academy in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century], *Kievskaja starina* 2 (II) (1904): 83-84.

consequences. Tymkovskyyi's language about this is so clear and definite that it is beyond doubt"⁴⁴ (emphasis by S. Golubev).

Professor S. Golubev went further, comparing two documents that spoke of the same event: 1) the testimony of a former student of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, I. Tymkovskyyi, about the fire in the library in 1780 and the state of the books after the fire (in 1785); 2) the testimony of the rector of the academy, who wrote to the authorities about the fire almost immediately after it happened. The scholar rejected the idea that the testimony of the rector should be preferred to the memories of the ex-student, referring to the fact that the rector exaggerated the size of the problem in the hope of getting more help.⁴⁵ S. Golubev therefore believed the testimony of I. Tymkovskyyi, as an unbiased witness, more than the that of the rector.

In Soviet historical science, which began to take shape in Ukraine in the 1920s, special attention was paid to the social position of the authors of historical sources, and thus to their social and class motives. The testimony (especially memoirs) of an author who seemed to be in a class-hostile position were immediately considered dubious, even unreliable. However, there were reverse cases when the testimony of the "class enemy" was perceived as true. For example, in an article on the history of women's higher education in Ukraine (1927), Oleksandr Nazarevskyyi spoke about women's higher courses in Kyiv in the 1870s and 1880s and analysed the testimony of several sources (including periodicals) about the alleged immorality of female students. In contrast, the scholar cited a letter from the curator of the Kyiv school district, General Platon Antonovych, who dismissed the evidence, interpreting it as slander. At the same time, O. Nazarevskyyi emphasized that P. Antonovych had no sympathy for women's courses and had even sought to close them down.⁴⁶ So, O. Nazarevskyyi argued that P. Antonovych was not biased – General had a negative attitude to the women's higher courses, but at the same time protected women (who studied in these courses) from slander. That is why P. Antonovych's words are authentic.

In the work of Stepan Tomashivskyyi (Tomaszewski), devoted to the history of the Berezhany Gymnasium (1906), we see an example in which *the testimony of the source's author is judged unreliable based on an analysis of the author's motives*. The document in question is a secret report on the teachers of

⁴⁴ Stepan Golubev, *Neskolko stranits iz noveishei istori Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* [A Few Pages from the Recent History of the Kyiv Theological Academy] (Kyiv: Typ. I. I. Horbunova, 1907), 61.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Oleksandr Nazarevskyyi, "Do istorii vyshchoi zhinochoi osvity na Ukraini (Z zhyttia kyivskykh zhinochykh kursiv 70-80-kh rr.)" [To the History of Higher Women's Education in Ukraine (From the Life of Kyiv Women's Courses of the 1870s-80s)], *Zhyttia i Revoliutsiia* 4 (1927): 114-115.

Zbarazh Gymnasium, written by Prefect E. Kovach and sent to the highest regional authorities in 1804. In this document, of the entire team of teachers, the author positively described only two (teachers of infima and grammar) and described the others in negative terms.⁴⁷ S. Tomashivskyi questioned the authenticity of the source: "If it were so in reality, as the then prefect Kovach wrote, it would be very sad. On closer examination and comparison with other information, however, we must call these notitiae secretae, if not works of some ugly malice of the prefect, then in any case very oversalted."⁴⁸ The scholar questioned the "credibility of the prefect's testimony" after finding a great deal of information about him from other sources. Throughout his prefecture, from 1789 to 1810, E. Kovach waged a "long war with teachers, at least with some of them" and for this, in 1792 he was to be transferred to Sambir. There was a particularly fierce struggle between him and the teacher A. Sulishevskyi, who characterised in the most negative terms by Kovach in his document. S. Tomashivsky described the substance of the conflict between them, adding that their misunderstanding became especially acute in 1804 when these "secret notes" were sent to the authorities.⁴⁹ Therefore, Tomashivsky felt that the motives of the source's author offered grounds to conclude that his testimony was unreliable.

Unfortunately, there are not many examples of the unreliability of certain sources being recognised, given that researchers of the history of education often did not incorporate into their texts descriptions of the procedures involved in negative assessments of sources. Usually, they rejected the evidence of the source as they were preparing to write the work, and did not worry about providing additional explanations on their rejection of sources in their published academic texts.

3. *Establishing reliability by confirming the information in one source from the testimony of another that is related to the previous location, chronological period, theme and/or ideology.* Mykola Lavrovskyi, speaking about the memoirs of Rommel, a former professor of Kharkiv University, noted that testimonies, "as generally reported in the memoirs, require in each case a thorough examination."⁵⁰ He verified the content of Rommel's memoirs with the help of the memoirs of a former student of the same educational institution, T. Selivanov. Dmytro Bagaliy took a similar approach. Describing the educational activities of Fr. Vasiliy Fotiev from Sloboda, he noted that the priest had suffered imprisonment during the reign of Paul I. He cited two documented sources: the story of a contemporary and the memories of Kharkiv residents. "Both sources, diverging in detail, generally confirm and complement each

⁴⁷ Tomaszewski, *Pogląd na rozwój Gimnazjum Brzeżańskiego*, 66-67.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Lavrovskyi, *Zamechanyia o pervonachalnoi istorii*, 3.

other,”⁵¹ the professor noted. He then re-examined the sources and finally compared them. The scholar pointed out that both documents i) mention historical figures (for example, Kharkiv Bishop H. Sulim) and ii) record the historical events of that time (in particular the fact that Alexander I ascended the throne on 12 March 1801, that is, just before Easter, and this was stated in one of the sources). While he notes that there are differences in the details and chronology, the researcher explains that each of the described events are possible. Then D. Bagaliy concluded that the event took place.⁵²

Hryhoriy Maksymovych (1913) used the reports of a Cossack officer dating from 1767 to 1769 in his work on teaching children literacy and military affairs in the regiments of the Hetmanate in the second half of the eighteenth century, which he compared with the same reports for 1775. The researcher suggested that the information in the reports can be trusted because they contain not only quantitative indicators but also the names of children and their ages. However, H. Maksymovych expressed doubts about the reports from the two companies (known as Hundreds) of the Chernihiv Regiment (the Stolin and Sedniv Hundreds), because the report from 1775 indicated a somewhat young age of students who studied at the school in 1769.⁵³

An example of the establishment of a fact (the dating of an event) based on internal criticism of the source and by means of comparison with other documents is offered by Stepan Golubev’s clarification of the period in which a famous educator, Isaiah Trofimovych-Kozlovskiy, held the rectorship in Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium, in the first half of the eighteenth century. Many researchers believe that he was the rector as early as 1635, when his name was mentioned in the *Patericon*. S. Golubev cited an excerpt from the *Patericon* of 1635 in which it was stated in Polish that in 1633, P. Mohyla sent Fr. I. Trofymovych – at that time the rector of Kyiv schools. The scholar claimed that in 1635, when *Patericon* was written, I. Trofymovych was no longer the rector. He foresaw the remarks of possible critics regarding the fact that the words “*na ten czas*” have a double meaning and can be translated both “at that time” and “at this time”. But in his opinion, it is necessary to adhere to the first of the indicated meanings of these words for the following reasons. Firstly, if I. Trofymovych was still rector in 1635, the author of the *Patericon* could not have used the word “at that time” because of his inexpediency (according to S. Golubev, he would have simply written that I. Trofymovych was the rector). Secondly, in

⁵¹ Dmytro Bagaliy, *Ocherkiiz russkoi istoriy*. T. 1. *Stati po istoriy prosveshcheniya* [Essays on Russian History. Vol. 1. Articles on the History of Education] (Kharkiv: Tipohrafia Pechatnoe Delo, 1911), 24.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 24-29.

⁵³ Hryhoriy Maksymovych, *Obuchenie hramote i voynskoi ekzertsitsiy v Staroi Malorossiy v kontse XVIII veka* [Teaching Literacy and Military Exercise in Old Malorossia at the End of the Eighteenth Century] (Kyiv: Tipohrafia T. H. Meinandera, 1913), 12-13.

the treatise *Teraturgima* by Atanasy Kalnofoiskyi, which was first published in 1637, I. Trofymovych is mentioned among those who broke away from the Uniate Cathedral of St Sophia in 1633, and it is also mentioned that he was “at that time the Rector of Mohyla College in Kyiv [but is] now abbot of the monastery of St Hierarch Mykolai Pustynnyi.”⁵⁴ Hence the scholar reached a conclusion which he considered to be fact: that I. Trofymovych-Kozlovskiy was rector in 1633, and in 1635-1637 he was not.

Professor Nikolai Petrov (1895) analysed a fragment of a historical document about the first rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Isaiah Trofymovych-Kozlovskiy, focussing in particular on the fact that it mentions that in 1633 Trofymovych-Kozlovskiy was a teacher in Kyiv and Hoshcha colleges. However, at the time of M. Petrov’s research, it was already known that the board at the monastery in Hoshcha was founded in 1639, so I. Trofymovich could not have been teaching there in 1633. In addition, the scholar denied the statement made in a historical document that I. Trofymovich was a teacher of theology, because it was known from other (previously verified) sources that until 1633 this rector taught philosophy, and that from 1635, according to royal privilege, he could teach science no higher than dialectics and logic in the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium. Thus, his knowledge of other sources allowed M. Petrov to clarify certain inaccuracies in the historical document. Incidentally, he explained the mention of Kozlovskiy teaching theology with reference the fact that in 1640 he was awarded the title of Doctor of Holy Theology at Kyiv Cathedral.⁵⁵ There are many other examples of the critical assessment of sources by comparison with other verified historical documents in the works of N. Petrov,⁵⁶ as well as in studies by Mykhailo Maksymovych,⁵⁷ Yakiv Shulhyn,⁵⁸ Oleksiy Markevych,⁵⁹ Konstantyn

⁵⁴ Stepan Golubev, “Gedeon Odorskyi (byvshyi rektor Kievskoi Akademii v nachale XVIII stol.)” [Gedeon Odorskyi (Former Rector of the Kiev Academy in the Early Eighteenth Century)], *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* 12 (1900): 601.

⁵⁵ Nikolai Petrov, *Kievskaiia akademiia vo vtoroi polovine XVII veka* [Kyiv Academy in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century] (Kyiv: Tipographia H. T. Korchak-Novitskago, 1895), 8-9.

⁵⁶ Idem, “Kievskaiia Akademiia v tsarstvovanie imperatritsy Ekateriny II (1762-1796 gg.)” [Kiev Academy in the Reign of Empress Catherine II (1762-1796)], *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* 7 (1906): 453-494; 8-9 (1906): 582-609.

⁵⁷ Mychailo Maksymovych, “O pervykh vremenakh Kievskago Bogoiavlenskago bratstva” [About the First Times of the Kiev Epiphany Brotherhood], *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* 3 (1869): 349-386.

⁵⁸ Yakiv Shulhyn, “Neskolko dannykh o shkolakh v pravoberezhnoi Ukraine v polovine XVIII v.” [Various Data on Schools in Right-Bank Ukraine in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century], *Kievskaiia Starina* XXXIV (1891): 97-118.

⁵⁹ Oleksiy Markevych, *Dvadsatypiatyletie Imperatorskago Novorossiiskago universiteta. Istoricheskaia zapiska. Akademicheskie spiski* [Twenty-Five Years of the Imperial Novorossiysk

Kharlampovych,⁶⁰ Ivan Franko,⁶¹ Bohdan Barvynskyi,⁶² Petro Kudriavtsev,⁶³ Ivan Fylypchak⁶⁴ and Stepan Siropolko.⁶⁵

In the aforementioned work on the history of Berezhany Gymnasium (1906), S. Tomashivskyi used the same approach. The researcher did not question the evaluation of teachers, which was given in the reports by the prefect of the gymnasium, A. Sulishevskyi, in the first half of the nineteenth century, noting that “it is difficult to attribute bias to this prefect.” However, he emphasized not so much the honesty of the author of the cited sources, but the comparison with other documents, noting that his “acts confirm this characteristic.”⁶⁶

4. *Establishing fact based on criticism of the content of one source through the use of logical and epistemological procedures.* Again, we cite as an example the analysis of Stepan Golubev, who attempted to establish exactly when the riots of Orthodox Kyivans against Lavra Collegium took place in Kyiv. Previously, this event had been dated to 1634 or 1635. The source which formed the basis of this dating was the text *Exegesis*, a treatise defending Kiev schools written by Sylvester Kosiv and published in 1635 which described this event as if it had happened recently. However, S. Golubev used the same source to prove a different opinion. Taking *Exegesis* as his basis, he submitted it in full and then placed the riots at the Mohyla Collegium in the autumn of 1631.⁶⁷

University. Historical Note. Academic Lists] (Odessa: Ekonomicheskaiia Tipohrafiia Odesskago Vestnika, 1890).

⁶⁰ Konstantin Kharlampovych, “Ostrozhskaia pravoslavnaia shkola. Istoriko-kriticheskyi ocherk” [Ostrog Orthodox School. Historical and Critical Essay], *Kievskaiia Starina* 5 (1897): 177-207; 6 (1897): 363-388.

⁶¹ Ivan Franko, *Materiialy do istorii halytskoho ruskoho shkilnytstva v rr. 1801-1848* [Materials on the History of Galician Ruthenian Schooling in 1801-1848], in *Materiialy do kulturnoi istorii Halytskoi Rusy XVIII i XIX viku* [Materials on the Cultural History of Galician Rus’ in the 18th and 19th Centuries] (Lviv: Nakl. NTS, 1902), 174-257.

⁶² Bohdan Barvynskyi, “Predtecha universytetu im. Frantsa I u Lvovi (Krytychni zamitky do pytannia pro genezu Lvivskoho Universytetu)” [Forerunner of the Franz I University in Lviv (Critical Notes on the Genesis of Lviv University)], *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Shevchenka* CXXV (1918): 1-41.

⁶³ Petro Kudriavtsev, “Do istorii osvity na Ukraini. Dva nevydani uryvky z avtobiohrafichnoi zapysky Or. M. Novytskyoho” [To the History of Education in Ukraine. Two Unpublished Excerpts from an Or. M. Novytsky’s Autobiographical Note], *Zapysky Istorychno-Filolohichnoho Viddilu Ukrainskoi Akademii Nauk XIII-XIV* (1927): 174-184.

⁶⁴ Ivan Fylypchak, “Uchytelska seminariia v Sambori (Istorychnyi narys)” [Teachers’ Seminary in Sambor (Historical Essay)], *Shliakh vykhovannia i navchannia* 1 (1938): 24-36; 2 (1938): 105-112; 3 (1938): 141-144; Ivan Fylypchak, Roman Lukan, “Okruzhna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi 1788/89-1910/11” [District Main School in Lavriv 1788/89-1910/11], *Zapysky Chyna Sv. Vasyliia Velykoho V* (1-4) (1932): 1-158.

⁶⁵ Stepan Siropolko, “Istoriia osvity na Ukraini” [History of Education in Ukraine], *Shliakh Vykhovannia y Navchannia* 2-3 (1937): 1-174.

⁶⁶ Tomaszewski, “Pogląd na rozwój Gimnazjum Brzeżańskiego,” 69.

⁶⁷ Stepan Golubev, *Kievskiy mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvizhniki (Opyt istoricheskago*

To confirm his opinion, he put forward the following arguments. First, S. Kosov placed the timing of this event as the time when he, along with other teachers of the newly opened school, had just arrived in Kyiv. He explicitly stated that the events took place at a time when, under the protection of the “holy guards” (by which he was hinting of the Lavra, where the holy “benefactors” were buried), they applied *primus Minervae munus* (the first duty to serve Minerva). According to S. Golubev, this statement contains two indications of the date: i) the need to say that the Kyivans’ dissatisfaction with Mohyla Collegium occurred when they were under the protection of the “holy guards”; and ii) the Latin expression indicates that S. Kosov and his colleagues had only just started studying (performed the first duty to serve science). Secondly, in this document S. Kosov draws a sharp line between the alarming situation in which Mohyla Collegium found itself when they applied *primus Minervae munus* and the current situation for *Exegesis*, when “everyone’s heart was enlightened” and Kyiv residents willingly filled schools with their children. Sylvester Kosov wrote his *Exegesis* in 1635. In this book he writes that the people of Kyiv loved and respected the teachers of the Mohyla Collegium and gave their children to this school. Professor Golubev claims that there was no revolt of Kyivans against the school and teachers in 1634 and 1635, because it is impossible in such a short time to get respect from Kyivans who wanted to destroy the school. Therefore, the Kyivans uprising was several years earlier.⁶⁸ Thirdly, if it is true that the people of Kyiv intended to destroy the Kyiv Collegium in 1634-1635 (i.e., after it had been in existence for three or four years), it seems strange that this would have happened at the time when P. Mohyla, who undertook energetic activity in favour of Orthodoxy during the Diets of 1632-1634, was earning the general support of the Ukrainian people and was honoured for his services by election to the rank of Metropolitan.⁶⁹ As we can see, the third argument is not based on the source – it is extracurricular but deductive-logical.

The historian Vladislav Buzeskul, writing about the situation of schoolteachers in ancient Greece in the second century AD, turned to one of the satires of Lucian of Samosata, who wrote that satraps and kings after death (in the afterlife) were forced, due to poverty, to teach children to read and write. According to the researcher, such a mention is evidence of the plight of primary school teachers, that is, grammarians.⁷⁰ Again, we see an example of deductive logic by the historian, who argued that Lucian, in describing fictional

izsledovania) [Kyiv Metropolitan Peter Mohyla and His Associates (Experience of Historical Research)], vol. 1 (Kyiv: Tipohrafiia H. T. Korchak-Novytskago, 1883), 438.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 438-439.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 439.

⁷⁰ Vladislav Buzeskul, *Shkolnoe delo u drevnikh grekov po novym dannym* [Schooling Among the Ancient Greeks According to New Data] (Kharkiv: Izdatelstvo Soiuz, 1918), 18.

suffering in the afterlife, was drawing on the realities of contemporary life in which grammar teachers were poor.

Another example is found in one of the works of Mykola (Nikolai) Makkaveiskyi (1897) in which the scholar quoted the early Christian writer, Tertullian, presenting his description of the life of a Christian teacher who was forced to participate in pagan rites, donate money to Minerva and teach literature about pagan gods, making this teacher virtually idolatrous. However, the professor urged readers to be careful about Tertullian's reasoning: "This opinion of the church writer, who is well known for extreme judgments on many issues, of course cannot be considered, in this form, the general opinion of all Christians of the time; but the peculiarity of the position of the modern schoolteacher indicated by him – the close contact of the latter with the pagan world, irreversible to him through the very order of things – cannot be doubted."⁷¹ M. Makkaveiskyi, therefore, distinguished between Tertullian's own opinion, which was burdened by a conservative assessment (concerning the enrolment of such Christian teachers as idolaters), and his descriptive statements (about the forced pagan religious practices of such didactics), about which the researcher did not express doubts and considered these statements a true description of the past reality.

An example of the use of internal criticism is offered by the method used by scholars to draw conclusions based on uninformative sources. For example, in his work on education among the Jews of antiquity, M. Makkaveiskyi quoted Deuteronomy 3, which speaks of the need to teach children the Law, to tell them what God had done for the people of Israel, and to ensure that the child does not forget these things but retells them to his sons and their sons.⁷² Analysing this content, M. Makkaveiskyi first notes the limitations of this as an informative source: these instructions are an insufficient basis on which to draw "any broad conclusions" or "to paint a picture of how educational work was conducted in the era of Moses" given that "we have no data for this in the law of Moses."⁷³ Nevertheless, he pointed out that "these few words are enough to say with certainty that the program of ancient Jewish education must have included instructing students in the Law, acquainting them with the religious foundations of Israeli life. Moreover, based on the above words of Moses, it is possible to conclude that this element, religion, was the most important and essential part of the education of the Jewish youth and

⁷¹ Nikolai Makkaveiskyi, *Pedagogika drevnikh ottsev i uchitelei tserkvi. Neskolko myslei o vospitaniiz drevne-otecheskikh tvorenyy* [Pedagogy of Ancient Fathers and Teachers of the Church. A Few Thoughts on Upbringing from Ancient Paternal Works] (Kyiv: Tipografya P. Barskogo, 1897), 57.

⁷² Idem, "Vospitanie u vetkhozavetnykh evreev" [Education of the Old Testament Jews], *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* 5 (1901): 123.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 124.

that everything else by comparison occupied a secondary official place.”⁷⁴ That is, despite the narrow textuality, the scholar still singled out the most important information, based on which it was possible to deductively build a description of the principles of education of the Jews in antiquity.

Olha Vodolazhchenko demonstrated a rather simple but logically interesting way of extracting useful information from one source in her work on the history of Kharkiv Collegium in the eighteenth century (1927). The researcher used a set of instructions for the inspectors who were responsible for students living in private apartments. From this document, she highlighted the norms that forbade an inspector from insulting students with ridiculous nicknames, calling them “scoundrels, beasts, sons of bitches,” etc., beating them on the cheeks and back, tearing their hair, poking them in the eyes, teeth or chest, or beating their hands with a stick such that it breaks from the blow. The researcher argued that this text “shows how students lived in private apartments,”⁷⁵ deducing that since violence was mentioned in the instructions, which include a detailed description of the methods used in quarrels and fights, then such cases must have occurred.

These examples all show how Ukrainian historians recognised the value of internal criticism of historical sources. On the one hand, they rarely applied internal criticism to so-called “official” sources on the history of education; on the other hand, they showed the ability to argue over the authenticity of written historical sources by analysing their content and comparing this with the content of other sources. Among the methods of internal critique of written sources, scholars most often determined authenticity with reference to the specifics of the document, for example, by analysing the author’s ability to reflect reality accurately, by highlighting his or her motives, and by confirming information from one source through evidence from another thematically and ideologically related source.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Olha Vodolazhchenko, “Z istorii Kharkivskoho Kolehiumu v XVIII vitsi” [From the History of the Kharkiv Collegium in the Eighteenth Century], *Naukovi Zapysky Naukovo-Doslidchoi Katedry Istorii Ukrainskoi Kultury* 6 (1927): 117.