

Nataliia Cherhik

Department of Research and Exhibition Work, National Reserve 'Khortytsia', Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
Department of Source Studies, Historiography and Special Historical Disciplines, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0003-4597-7184

Historical and Cultural Context of the Development of the Ukrainian Museography: The Personology Dimension

The development of a distinctive form of scientific journalism, known as museography, started in the second half of the 19th c. within the Ukrainian territories of the Russian Empire. This article aims to explore how financial, industrial, political, sociocultural, and intellectual factors influenced the development of museography in Ukraine in the late 19th and early 20th c. The article describes the impact of political, economic, and sociocultural changes in the Russian Empire during this period, particularly their influence on the evolution of museography as a specialized branch of scientific literature. It is shown how internal reforms led to an expanded assortment of publications about Ukrainian museums and museum collections and the improvement in their material and scientific quality. It was proved that the key factor in the formation of the national museography was the patriotic spirit of the participants of this process. Despite significant subjective and objective obstacles, it is possible to argue that the global outlook of individuals engaged in museographic practices played a fundamental role in the emergence and development of museography on the Ukrainian territories of the Russian Empire.

Keywords: scientific literature, museum publications, Ukraine, Russian Empire, reforms

Słowa kluczowe: literatura naukowa, publikacje muzealne, Ukraina, Imperium Rosyjskie, reformy

Introduction

Full-fledged identification of the source potential of Ukrainian museum publications of the late 19th–early 20th c. is impossible without the identification of the historical and cultural context of their production and identification of the full set of changes in the political, economic, social, and intellectual dimensions that formed the image and the content of Ukrainian museography. Notably, the study of biographies of people relating to the museography process in Ukraine in the late 19th–early 20th c. is a rather widespread

phenomenon of modern scientific research. For example, the famous persona of Baron Fjodor (Theodor) Rudolfovich Steingel (German Theodor von Steinheil, Ukrainian Fedir Rudolfovich Steingail; 1870–1946)¹ is presented in the works of Pavlo Pavlovych Guy-Nizhnik,² Iryna Volodymirivna Kuzmina,³ Oleksiy Oleksiyovych Nestulya and Svitlana Ivanivna Nestulya⁴ and others. Family roots, civil position, and lifespan of Vasyl Vasyliovych Tarnovsky (1837–1899)⁵ were discussed in the works by Aliina Serhiivna Klepak.⁶

Museum work and its sponsorship and patronage activities of Kateryna Mykolayivna Skarzhynska (Kateryna Nikolaevna von Reiser; 1853–1932)⁷ are presented in the monograph by Oleksandr Borysovych Suprunenko.⁸ Natalia Ivanivna Kobyzhcha⁹ studies the ideological views of Borys Dmytrovych Grinchenko (1863–1910).¹⁰ The life and creative works of Kateryna Melnyk-Antonovych (1859–1942) were the subject of Gennady Georhiovych Rudenko's¹¹ research. The work of Mykola Fedotovych Bilyashivsky (1867–1926) on the museum and the monument fields is presented in the research of Leonid Didukh,¹² Olena Oleksiivna Popelnytska,¹³ Olha Olehivna Kovalevskaya,¹⁴ Yaroslav Volodymyrovych Zatylyuk and Yulia Yacheslavivna Ostashevskaya,¹⁵ and many others. The research results of the aforementioned scholars were used to reveal the personology dimension of the museography process.

First of all, the period covered by this study is marked by the development of capitalist dynamics in the Russian Empire. One of the positive effects of such a process (with all its ambiguity) was the open possibilities for implementing business initiatives, accumulation of capital, and professional and social growth of talented people.

This article investigates the influence of financial, industrial, political, sociocultural, and intellectual aspects on the development of museography in Ukraine in the late 19th and

- 1 Ukrainian-Russian politician of German origin, baron, philanthropist, culturalist, Secretary General of Trade and Industry of the Central Council, Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Ukrainian State under the Czarist government in Germany.
- 2 P. Gaj-Nižnik, *Fedir Šteingel' – mecenat, gromads'ko-političnij diâč, posol Ukraïns'koï Deržavi v Nimeččini*, "Diplomatična ta konsul's'ka služba u vimirî osobistosti" 2016, t. 13, p. 95–124.
- 3 Î.V. Kuz'mina, *Ukraïns'ka gilka rodu Šteingeliv: viznačni postati. Istoriko-prosopografične doslidžennâ*, Kiïv 2016.
- 4 O.O. Nestulâ, S.Î. Nestulâ, *Rol' M.F. Bilâšivs'kogo u stvorenni muzeû F.R. Šteingelâ u s. Gorodok na Volini*, "Naukovî zapiski Înstitutu političnij î etnonacional'nih doslidžen' imeni Î.F.Kurasa NAN Ukraïni" 2012, special issue, p. 257–264.
- 5 Ukrainian activist, civic and cultural figure, philanthropist, amateur of Ukrainian antiquity, researcher of Ukrainian Cossacks, master of Ukrainian culture museum work.
- 6 A.S. Klepak, *Gromads'ka ta mecenats'ka diâl'nist' V.V. Tarnovs'kogo-molodšogo v Ukraïni (1838–1899 rr.)*, Kiïv 2018.
- 7 Ukrainian landowner of Swedish origin, philanthropist, civic activist, museographer, national funder.
- 8 O.B. Suprunenko, *Arheologiâ v diâl'nosti peršogo privatnogo muzeû Ukraïni (Lubens'kij muzej K.M. Skaržins'koï): Monografiâ*, Kiïv, Poltava 2000.
- 9 N.Î. Kobizčca, *Kul'turnic'ka diâl'nist' Borisa Grinčenka: svitogládniy aspekt: monografiâ*, Kiïv 2017.
- 10 Ukrainian civil activist, writer, teacher, lexicographer, literary critic, philologist, ethnographer, publicist, politician. Author of many studies on Ukrainian culture and statehood, author of fundamental ethnographic, linguistic, pedagogical works.
- 11 G.G. Rudenko, *Žittévij ta tvorčij slâh K.M. Mel'nik-Antonovič*, "Istorîâ î kul'tura Pridniprov'â: nevidomi ta malovidomi storîni : nauk. šoričnik" 2009, vol. 6, p. 121–129.
- 12 L.V. Diduh, *Mikola Bilâšivs'kij î rozvitok miscevih muzeïv Ukraïni*, "Kraêznavstvo" 2008, no 1–4, p. 120–127.
- 13 O.O. Popel'nic'ka, *Bilâšivs'kij M.F. – peršij direktor Nacional'nogo muzeû istorii Ukraïni*, "Ukraïns'kij istoričnij žurnal" 2008, no 2, p. 100–118.
- 14 O.O. Kovalevs'ka, *Diâl'nist' Mikoli Bilâšivs'kogo v roki Peršoi svitovoi vijni*, "Ukraïns'kij istoričnij žurnal" 2008, no 2, p. 119–128.
- 15 Â.V. Zatylyk, Î.V. Ostashevskaya, *Akademik Mikola Fedotovič Bilâšivs'kij ta jogo personal'nij žittêpis: publikaciâ džerela î perspektivi doslidžennâ*, "Naukovij visnik Nacional'nogo muzeû istorii Ukraïni. Zbirnik naukovih prac" 2019, vol. 4, p. 390–410.

early 20th c. The research subject considers the museum book as an intellectual product. Consequently, the mentioned factors contributing to its emergence are being explored from the perspective of personology.

Contribution of famous Ukrainian families to the development of museography

Considering the financial aspect of museography work, it is important to pay attention to the Ukrainian families, whose finance allowed purchasing antiquities, carrying out archaeological and ethnographic expeditions, and publishing collections in print. For example, Steingel, a representative of the famous Steingel family in the Russian Empire, inherited from his father Gorodok, a town in Volyn – more than 700 acres of land in 1892; in 1900, the financial assets were replenished for a tile manufacturing factory in the city of Holm, which was a part of Lublin province. The pedantic management of the conducted farms brought incomes which allowed him to spend considerable sums of money on social and cultural events, such as the construction and maintenance of hospitals, schools, specialized schools, tea houses, as well as the construction and reconstruction of architectural monuments. One of the major projects of his life was the establishment of the first secular regional museum in Volyn (Volyn Regional Museum), for which Steingel financed archaeological and ethnographic expeditions and took part in them. The owner assumed the duty to allocate 600 roubles annually for the development of the museum. Meanwhile, the real maintenance cost was 1000 roubles. Steingel personally cared for the publication of 'Reports' of the museum and their distribution to the libraries of universities and brotherhoods and the leading writers of the Russian Empire.¹⁶

The profits from the sugar factory and other economic areas and lands in Chernihiv and Poltava provinces allowed a landowner Tarnovsky to focus on cultural projects. He inherited the factory from his father, Vasyl Vasylovych the Elder, in 1861. The main object of Tarnovsky the Younger's life was collecting, funding archaeological research, philanthropist support of talented compatriots, and supporting the printing industry in Ukraine. In the impressive list of funded publications, several included presentations of his and his family's collections: *Istoricheskiye deyat'eli Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii v biografiyakh i portretakh* ('Historical Figures of South-West Russia in Biographies and Portraits'), *Ofort* ('Etching') of Shevchenko, *Katalog predmetov malorossiyskoy stariny* ('Catalogue of Subjects of the Little Russian Old Russian') (memorial and relative to Shevchenko's person), or Tarnovsky's *Katalog ukrainskoy stariny* ('Catalogue of Ukrainian Antiquities'). The museography work was fully financed by Tarnovsky⁴. For example, he was concerned about the destruction of the unique archaeological monument on the Knyazha Hora and allocated 100 roubles for conducting qualified excavations there in the summer of 1891. The head of the expedition was a young archaeologist Bilyashivsky.¹⁷ Tarnovsky invited him to present the archaeological collection in his catalogue of antiquities. From an attractive side, the patronage portrait

16 P. Gaj-Nižnik, *Fedir Štejngel'*.

17 L.V. Diduh, *Mikola Bilâšivs'kij*.

of a collector reveals the museography of Shevchenko, which Tarnovsky distributed free of charge.¹⁸

Skarzhynska had the opportunity to pursue her youthful dream, thanks to four thousand acres of land near Lubny in the Poltava province, which included exemplary economic and rent plots. She wanted to collect antiquities and open a museum. In the early 1880s, Skarzhynska founded a museum in the Kruhlyk estate. To facilitate its development, the founder not only purchased art objects but also financed the examinations of the monuments in Posulya and archaeological studies on Lysa Hora in Lubny. Additionally, she organized and participated in expeditions. Among the articles on financial expenses, the patrons included printed publications. The collection of museography works of the Skarzhynska Museum consists of: *Kolektsiya starozhytnostey z muzeyu K.M. Skarzhynskoy* ('The Collection of Antiquities from K.M. Skarzhynska's Museum') (the list laid out by Fedir Ivanovych Kaminsky for the general *Katalog vystavki vos'mogo Arkheologicheskogo s'yezda v Moskve* ('Catalogue of the Exhibition of the 8th Archaeological Congress in Moscow in 1890'); series of Malorussia types postcards, *Malorossiya* ('Malorussia'), *Vidy Malorossii i landshafty* ('Types of Malorussia and Landscapes') (prepared by Oleksandr Zavadsky in cooperation with Serhiy Klimentiyovych Kulzhinsky); *Programma dlya sobiraniya narodnykh pisanok* ('Program of a Collection of Folk Pysanka and The Description of a Collection of Folk Pysanka') – developed with Kulzhinsky. Under the auspices of the Lubny Museum, two works of Karl Vasilyevich Bolsunovsky¹⁹ were published: *Drevniye gir'ki naydenniye v Kiyevе, i otnosheniye ikh k razlichnym vesovym sistemam* ('Ancient Weights Found in Kyiv, and Their Relationship to Various Weighing Systems') and *Svintsovyje plastiny (plomby) s uslovnymi znakami cerkovnykh prazdnikov* (Lead Plates (Seals) with Conventional Signs of Church Holidays) and *Ocherki Lubenskoj stariny* (The Essays on Luben antiquities) by Kirill Petrovich Bochkarev.²⁰

Unfortunately, Aleksey Zosimovich's *Katalog sobraniya arheologicheskikh i istoricheskikh drevnostey Yekateriny Nikolayevny Skarzhinskoy* ('Catalogue of the collection of archaeological and historical antiquities of Kateryna Mykolaiivna Skarzhinska') and drafted *Oryhinaly malyunkiv V.I. Ivanovoyi dlya arheologicheskoho katalogu* ('The Original drawings by V.I. Ivanova for the Archaeological Catalogue') was left unpublished. In the late 1920s, these materials were kept in the archive of the Poltava Regional Museum in the form of an illustrated folder, two notebooks on 66 pages, and a letter review by Vladimir Bonifatyevich Antonovich²¹ of Zosimovich's text. Today, the manuscript is available in the Regional Archives of Poltava. The dependence of publishing activity on money accounts is clearly traced in the example of Olga Semenivna Pol's museum collection. He took a difficult path to become the 'owner of millions'. In 1866, Pol found iron ore deposits while reviewing the territory of the Dubova beam for archaeological purposes. Having become sure of the scale of deposits, he formed a lease on promising areas with the intention of their industrial development in 1870. However, he did not receive any help either from the government or from local authorities, so he transferred the right of lease to the French

18 A.S. Klepak, *Gromads'ka ta mecenats'ka diâl'nist'*.

19 K.V. Bolsunovskij, *Drevnie gir'ki, najdennye v Kieve, i otnošenje ih k različnym vesovym sistemam*, Kiev 1898; Idem, *Svintsovyje plastiny (plomby) s uslovnymi znakami cerkovnykh prazdnikov*, Kiev 1899.

20 K.P. Bočkar'ev, *Očerki Lubenskoj stariny*, Moskva 1901.

21 V.B. Antonovič, *Katalog sobraniâ arheologičeskikh i istoričeskikh drevnostej Ekateriny Nikolaevny Skaržinskoy*, Poltava 1891.

company called Obshchestvo zheleznykh rud Krivogo Roga ('The Society of Iron Ore of Kryvyi Rih') in 1880 and became its shareholder. Except for business and social affairs, Pol was collecting antiquities.²² Nevertheless, he tried to sell the collection (which he estimated at 200,000 silver roubles) shortly before he died in 1890, being burdened by debts.

For the purpose of the sale, *Katalog kolleksiy drevnostey A.N. Polya* ('A Catalogue of O.M. Pol's Collections of Antiquities')²³ was created. The manager and author of the catalogue, Melnyk, worked on the order of the heirs, whose financial condition influenced the publication result. Pol chose a large format and small font for the catalogue, which allowed saving on the payment for the museographer – Melnyk received a remuneration of 20 roubles.²⁴ An important financial and business aspect, directly connected to the museographic output, is the development of the printing industry in the second half of the 19th c., marked by the growth of printing workshops and bookshops, and the active modernization of printing equipment. The printing houses were involved in the publication activity of the Ukrainian museums. For example, Volodymyr Oleksiyovych Bets was a professor of anatomy at the Kyiv University of St. Volodymyr and the owner of the first collotype in Kyiv. The photo laboratory at the Anatomy Theatre of the University and university typography gave impetus to the photography business since 1872. The desire to demonstrate important discoveries in the field of medicine and, at the same time, dissatisfaction with the price-quality ratio of illustrated publications prompted Bets to establish their own collotype. It existed from 1881 to 1886, when it was transferred to the property of a famous Kyiv typographer Stefan Vasilovych Kulzhenko.²⁵

A passionate fan of photography, Bets took up the issue of a museography art based on Tarnovsky's private collection – *Istoricheskiye deyat'eli Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii v biografiyakh i portretakh* – in 1883. Although the concept of the publication was criticized by experts, one of the reviewers spoke positively about the quality of reproductions and noted the progress in Bets's photography:

In the process of comparing the old products of Bets's phototype with the released portraits, we can say that [...] his phototype has made a huge success: it's such a clear and clean work on portraits, though it is impossible to say that she did not leave us wanting something better.²⁶

The leader of the typography business in Kyiv of the late 19th–early 20th c. was Kulzhenko, whose publishing house was dedicated to improving the quality of publications. He started in 1864 with 250 roubles of inheritance and 100 roubles of his own funds, had only 4 printing, 3 lithographic, and 2 embossed machines, but Kulzhenko developed his business so well that in 1886 he bought professor Bets's phototype, and in 1897 he purchased Zavadsky's shop – the oldest university printing house in Kyiv. During 50 years of doing business, Kulzhenko updated the equipment and took the best experience of foreign and Russian and Ukrainian masters of printing.²⁷

22 I.F. Vetrogradov, *Pamâti A.N. Polâ. Po povodu 20-ti letiâ so dnâ ego smerti*, Ekaterinoslav 1910.

23 Ibidem.

24 G.G. Rudenko, *Žittêvij ta tvorčij šlâh*.

25 V.B. Antonovič, V.A. Bec, *Istoričeskie deâteli Ūgo-Zapadnoj Rossii v biografijâh i portretah*, Kiev 1885.

26 Ibidem.

27 S.S. Petrov, *Knižkova sprava v Kiêvi. 1861–1917: monografiâ*, Kiïv 2002.

As of 1904, Kulzhenko printing house included everything necessary for the production of high-quality products: type foundry, stereotype and electrotype – for producing fonts and clichés; typesetting for composing text and incorporating decorations; machine department with the high-speed printing machines both for large and small formats, rotary and automatic machines (latest invention then); lithography for reproduction and production of illustrations (including lithochromatics for colour images); phototype for publication of photographic images (including chromocolotype for printing of colour images); bookbinding equipped for soft stitching, ruling, overgilding and other bookbinding practices; power plant for bringing machines in operation. Works from Kulzhenko's printing house were repeatedly awarded at national exhibitions in Russia. The list of their masterpieces includes museography works, namely, six editions of the album *Starovynni rechi Prydniprovia* ('Antiquities of the Dnipro Region') by Bogdan and Varvara Khanenko. Kulzhenko's work on this project received a positive review in the influential magazine 'Istorichesky Vestnik': 'A luxurious album with many phototype tables.'²⁸

One can judge the development of technical capabilities and quality of Kulzhenko's museum publications from the assessments of the first readers – experts-reviewers. Thus, Vasyl Gorlenko noted about the album *Oforty T. Shevchenka v kolektsiyi V. V. Tarnovskoho* ('Etching of T.H. Shevchenko in V.V. Tarnovsky's collection'):

As much as the idea of the publication deserves unconditional gratitude, the execution of the pictures by the S.V. Kulzhenko workshop is not always up to the task. Some pictures have pale spots, and others do not match the original overall tone. In general, however, as one of the first attempts at a strict local art publication, the work of the Kulzhenko workshop can be considered satisfactory.²⁹

Later publication – *Katalog kolektsiy drevnostey A.N. Polya*, which also was lavishly illustrated, deserved more positive feedback: 'The publication is beautiful, even luxurious, decorated with good photo-prints' – noted M. Hrushevsky in the review. Another reviewer added: 'The pictures, and the entire content in general, are excellently published.'³⁰ In addition to the already mentioned *Starovynni rechi Prydniprovia*, two more albums came from the Kulzhenko press: *Russkaya staraya zhizn'* ('Old Life Russian') by the Khanenkos and the series *Rukopisi Tserkovno-arkheologicheskogo muzeya Imperatorskoy Kiyevskoy dukhovnoy akademii* ('Albums of the Church-Archaeological Museum at the Kyiv Theological Academy (Church and Archaeological Museum opened in the Academy)').³¹

For the printing of *The Description of the Collection of Folk Pysanky* by Kulzhinsky and *The Essay of Luben's Antiquities* by Bochkarev³² Skarzhynska chose a Moscow printing house of Osyp Levenson. The workshop opened in 1881 with a small printing press, a hand-held machine, a cutting machine, several racks and a cash register, which, thanks to the development of capacities and the introduction of new technical methods of printing, already in 1887 became a limited liability company that managed both small

28 Ibidem.

29 Ibidem.

30 I.F. Vetrogradov, *Pamâti A.N. Polâ*.

31 Ibidem; V.B. Antonovič, V.A. Bec, *Istoričeskie deâteli*; S.S. Petrov, *Knížkova sprava*.

32 K.P. Bočkarev, *Očerki Lubenskoj stariny*.

and large orders of the simplest and the most complicated high-art works. In 1896, for the impeccable realization of the order placed by the Ministry of the Imperial Court to celebrate the reign of Nicholas II, the company received an award and the title of 'the supplier of His Majesty's Palace'. Printing facilities allowed Levenson's workshop to produce full-colour images of folk pieces for *Opys pysanky* ('The Description of Pysanky') in 1899, which is important for the museography work of this type. The captious reviewer of *Opys pysanky*, Myron Kordub, disagreed with the conclusions of the author of the text (Kulzhinsky) and noted as follows: 'We know from experience how much work and money such publishing house needs, so we must express the great recognition to the publisher.'

Analysis of the factors influencing the development of museography in Ukraine

When speaking of the political and sociocultural aspects, it is important to note that the former had an indirect impact on the development of the museography process, while the intellectual aspects were direct. For example, administrative-territorial reforms, established by the *Polozheniye o gubernskikh zemskikh uchrezhdeniyakh* ('Regulation on Provincial Land Institutions', 1864), *Gorodovyye polozheniya* ('City Regulations', 1870, 1892) and a number of other administrative documents, imposed on local administrations the duty of comprehensive improvement of the living standards, which included changes in education and health care. An important focus of the activity was the financial and economic prosperity of the region. The development of capital relations in industry and agriculture, the expansion of the domestic market, and the expansion of the ways of communication prompted local administrations to reveal the resource potential of the region. The search for useful minerals, building materials, and research of the region's natural resources were immensely important. Active participants in this process were the employees of the land administration, municipal government representatives, members of provincial statistical committees, and local intellectual elites. The material accumulated from scientific expeditions established the foundations of public museums of the regional educational profile, a few of which operated in Ukraine. The main purpose of their activity was to study, collect and display local historical and natural materials. For example, the natural and historical museums of Poltava, Tavria, and Kherson provinces were set up to solve economic problems.³³

The necessity to demonstrate the museum's work for the benefit of society helped to create a special kind of museum publication – 'Muzeynny otchet' ('Museum Report'). The 'Report' of the Volyn Central Museum (acting under the Institute of the Researchers of Volyn) is an example of a socially targeted museum bulletin. A considerable volume of publications is dedicated to the replenishment of collection with receipts, which allowed studies and development of beekeeping, gardening, lea management, oil production, soil reinforcement, mineralogy, and mineral extraction. The museum's scientific research and practical work, aimed at the successful development of agriculture, is presented in the 'Report' of the Museum of Natural History of Tavria province.³⁴ Apart from financial and administrative factors, museography was influenced by politics – both local and central.

33 V.M. Konstantinova, *Urbanizaciâ: pïvdennoukrains'kij vimir (1861–1904 roki): monografiâ*, Zaporïžžâ 2010.

34 A.I. Miller, *Ukrainskij vopros v Rossijskoj imperii: monografiâ*, Kiev 2013.

For example, social movements and revolutionary events negatively affected museography activity. As a result, Skarzhynska seriously considered going abroad for personal reasons and due to the deterioration of the general situation in Lubenshchina caused by the peasant uprising in 1890. Skarzhynska expressed the desire to transfer the collection to Lubny. The resolution of the issue was being delayed. The revolutionary events of 1905 accelerated the decision process – the collection was handed over to the Museum of Natural History of Poltava province. The owner went to Italy in 1905 and subsequently to Switzerland. Thus ended the museography of Skarzhynska's private museum.³⁵

A different situation was with the museography of the Volyn Museum of Steingel. Steingel issued three 'Reports' of his museum. The first stated that the museum would report every year. 'Report' for the second year was published on schedule, and the third issue – published by 1904 – covered six years of the museum's activity. Afterwards, the museum did not 'report' anymore. It is known that in 1904 Aleksey Skrilenko and Steingel prepared a detailed collection catalogue for print, but the work was not published.³⁶ The reason for the termination of the publishing process was not only the change of the museum staff (first of all, the immersion of Bilyashivsky in the process of the establishment of the Kyiv City Museum) but also Steingel's active political engagement. Since 1905 he was the representative of the Cadet party; in 1906 he became a member of the State Duma from Kyiv; since 1908, he was a member of the Kyiv Community of the Association of Ukrainian progressist; during 1915–1917, he headed the Committee of the South-West Front of the All-Russian Federation of Cities; in 1918, he was the Extraordinary Envoy and the authorized Minister of the Ukrainian State under the Tisar Government in Germany.³⁷ Meanwhile, the termination of the museum's activity should be attributed to its evacuation during the military actions of the First World War in Volyn. The collection was removed and dispersed, and the Museum of Steingel ceased to exist.³⁸

Another factor influencing the museography process is censorship policy and the national issue. During the second half of the 19th and 20th c., Russian legislation on freedom of speech was subject to mutations from pre-warning censorship to punitive. For Ukraine, there were additional barriers that were not related to the procedures of the inspection but to the language of publications – the so-called 'Valuev Circular' of 1863 ('presentation' No. 394 to the Minister of National Education, No. 395 to the Head of the 3rd Department, No. 396 to the Prosecutor-General of the Holy Synod) and the 'Ems Order' of 1876³⁹. The censorship of Ukrainian authors is vividly demonstrated in the private correspondence of one of the Ukrainian historians – a museographer Dmytro Ivanovych Yavornytskyi. There are many pieces of advice on how to avoid 'raging and evil censors' and where 'the word of the Malorussia is less susceptible to persecution'; on what needs to be removed from the work, otherwise the censorship will prohibit it, will not let it pass, will 'spoil it without pity'; detailed instructions on the procedure of sending materials and the timelines of their consideration; words of support during the passage of the work through the 'gates

35 O.B. Suprunenko, *Arheologîâ v diâl'nosti*.

36 V.M. Konstantinova, *Urbanizaciâ*.

37 O.O. Nestulâ, S.Î. Nestulâ, *Rol' M.F. Bilâšivs'kogo*.

38 P. Gaj-Nižnik, *Fedir Šteingel'*.

39 A.I. Miller, *Ukrainskij vopros*.

of the censor's purgatory', which will 'cripple', 'distort', 'inflict fatal wounds'. All this is contained in almost every letter. Active exchange of information draws a rather bright and complete picture of how much 'labour cost to pull out [...] the book from the mouth of that terrible Zouava that called the chief executive of the press.'⁴⁰

The conformity of museum publications to the demands of censorship legislation deserves special attention. Here it will be only briefly noted that due to the circumstances, those Ukrainian museographers who chose the 'unproblematic' Russian language conveyed inconvenient themes more easily and, in general, passed censorship checks. Another factor in the secondary development of museography is sociocultural changes. In this regard, the processes of emigration and interregional mobility deserve attention. Viktoriia Mikolayivna Konstantinova's research shows that only a small proportion of the rural dwellers moved to the cities and did not necessarily use the urban cultural infrastructure⁴¹. However, even such a dose of migration has brought the newest (urban) advances into the conservative rural environment. There was also a reverse impact. There have been infiltration and borrowing features of other (national) cultures. These processes of social mobility influenced museography activity. The intellectual elite of Ukrainian society approved of the cultural and domestic effects of modernization. For example, O. Kosach noted: 'Ukrainian style in our national (and not only national) sewing begins to be spoiled, distorted [...] [it] is from this fashion, fashion magazines, and the Moscow collections.'⁴² Bilyashivsky was also concerned that 'Ukrainian cities [...] lost their national identity', that Ukrainian art found a shelter 'in the areas, as it were, far from the contemporary life, under the straw roof of the peasants' hat' and even from here, according to Bilyashivsky, many authentic samples have already disappeared.⁴³

To 'nourish' the national traditions of the village, by the initiative of private individuals and lands, artisanal-industrial societies and educational-production institutions were created. Their activity aimed to identify and study cultural heritage in its material (product) and non-material (methods of manufacturing) aspects; production and sale of similar samples; popularization of the national tradition by participating in industrial, agricultural, and artisanal exhibitions. The Poltava Land and the Kyiv art society were the most active in this respect, having 'a thorough care for the purity of Ukrainian style [...] [to] keep the ancient Ukrainian hut in its own beauty.'⁴⁴ Notably, such activity was not only scientific, educational, and commercial but also museum-oriented. This is evidenced by the 'Reports' of museums, which reflect the replenishment of museum collections by items that constituted a normal course of life and reflected the material folk culture, 'recently submitted to significant changes' or 'quickly [disappearing] when replaced by factory-produced items.'⁴⁵ The desire to popularize the stylistics of folk art contributed to the appearance of a special kind of museography – a colour album with pictures of objects from museum collections as samples for masters to follow. An example of such publications is two editions of the album *Ukrayins'ki Vizerunki 18 stolittya* ('Ukrainian

40 Ibidem.

41 V.M. Konstantinova, *Urbanizaciâ*.

42 O. Pěilka, *Ukrains'ki uzori*, Kiiv 1912.

43 M.F. Bilâšivs'kij, *Ukrains'ke narodne mistectvo*, Harkiv 2017.

44 O. Pěilka, *Ukrains'ki uzori*.

45 V.M. Konstantinova, *Urbanizaciâ*.

Patterns of the 18th Century') or the albums from the '*Ukrayins'ka narodna tvorchist'*' ('Ukrainian Folk Creativity') series.⁴⁶

The development of science and education became a principal factor in museography formation. The establishment of universities and academies, scientific societies and commissions, and the organization of museums with an authoritative scientific staff also contributed to intensive museography activity. For example, the Kyiv University of St. Volodymyr published three editions of *Opisaniya monet i medaley, khraryashchikhsya v numizmaticheskoy kabinetu universiteta* ('The Descriptions of Coins and Medals Stored in the Numismatic Office of the University'); The Kyiv Theological Academy published five issues of 'Drevniye al'bomy tserkovno-arkheologicheskogo muzeya' ('The Ancient Albums of the Church-Archaeological Museum'), the Odesa Society of History and Antiquity regularly issued 'Putevoditeli' ('Guides') on the museum, and the Society of Volyn researchers published the 'Report' on the museum work in the Society Bulletin.⁴⁷

Concluding the review of the factors that contributed to or encouraged the development of the museography activity in Ukraine, it is crucial to note the worldview factor, since the splash of the museography activity is known for this period as the 'national revival', 'Ukrainian revival', or 'the national movement'. Considering several approaches to the periodization of this process, we should pay attention to Iryna Ivanivna Kolesnyk, who offered his own opinion and considered this a 'multi-dimensional sociocultural phenomenon' because of the prism of intellectual processes in Ukrainian territory in the 19th–early 20th c.⁴⁸ The established researcher highlighted a few characteristics which influenced museography as part of the intellectual process. Among these factors were 'ideological formulas' of nationality, fatherland, and unity; a 'psychological factor' – patriotic sentiments and emotional fascination with the Ukrainian heritage; 'language-centred outlook' – concentration on language, writing, and literature; the intellectual factor means thinking 'in the system of hierarchy of numerous remoteness' in which 'the imperial and local patriotism, loyalty to the central Russian government and attachment to cultural-historical and household features of the native land were quite naturally used.'⁴⁹

For Kolesnyk, the 'psychological factor' manifests itself in museographers' epistolary activity, in which their love for history, nature, and cultural traditions of Ukraine is unconstrained and without pathos.⁵⁰ For example, during the forced emigration of 1922, Steingel wrote a letter to a friend, Bilyashivsky, who was his associate in the establishment of the museum in the Horodok (Horodotsky Regional Museum) and the author of the museum 'Reports'. Apart from the recollections of 'different episodes from our previous joint life in the museum', the Baron frankly narrates Ukraine: 'Memories especially flooded back in my native corner.'⁵¹ This is not sentimentality but mentality. P.P. Guy-Nizhnik and I.V. Kuzmina's study of Steingel's biography shows the Ukrainian-centric meaning of his

46 M.F. Bilâšiv's'kij, *Ukrains'ke narodne mistectvo*.

47 V.B. Antonovič, V.A. Bec, *Istoričeskie deâteli*.

48 I.I. Kolesnik, *Ukrains'ka istoriografiâ (XVIII – počatok XX stolittâ)*, Kiiv 2000.

49 Ibidem.

50 Ibidem.

51 P. Gaj-Nižnik, *Fedir Šteingel*'.

scientific preferences, charity, patronage, and political actions.⁵² The civil position of the Baron is fully laid out in the formula: 'a German with the Ukrainian soul.'⁵³

Tarnovsky simply and directly expressed his patriotic stand in a letter to Bilyashivsky. The collector attracted the latter to the excavations of the Knyazha Hora and the description of this collection for the *Katalog ukrainskoy stariny*. Tarnovsky is surprised why anybody would want to search for happiness in something else (i.e., in Russia) other than their homeland – Ukraine: 'You will be taken to the Moscow region. As if it were impossible to search for a business in Kyiv or wherever closer to home.' Tarnovsky's Ukrainian patriotic sentiments were known to his close and distant friends and his contemporaries. In the studies of Tarnovsky's philanthropic activities, Klepak gave numerous examples of his patriotic behaviours.⁵⁴ The author included the 'Cossacks period' – serious interest in the Cossacks' history, uncritical and fanatic love of the creative heritage of Shevchenko, or the sponsorship of Ukrainian masters of the artistic world. In the review of the Tarnovsky's *Katalog ukrainskoy stariny*, Hrushevsky called the collection owner a 'sincere Ukrainian patriot.'⁵⁵

Bilyashivsky was a scientist involved in creating a few museums on the territory of Ukraine and a participant in several museography projects.⁵⁶ His ideological views are presented in a series of scientific studies. For example, in the comments to the scientist's autobiography, Zatylyuk and Ostashevska noted that to get acquainted with Antonovich, Bilyashivsky 'was not interested in either politics or the national [i.e. Ukrainian] issue' and only joined the ranks of the Kyiv intelligence 'opened to the Ukrainians.'⁵⁷ According to the authors, Bilyashivsky's national position was indirectly expressed, although the whole course of his life demonstrated the desire to preserve the samples of the Ukrainian culture.⁵⁸ The study of Bilyashivsky's correspondence shows that the scientist did not stand aside from political processes, although he was not on the 'barricade' during the dramatic events at the beginning of the 20th c.⁵⁹ However, his political activity in the 1st State Duma of 1906 and in the Committee of the South-West Front of the All-Russian Land Union during the First World War was awakened by the idea of preserving the cultural heritage of the Ukrainian people. The same portrait of Bilyashivsky was painted by Didukh, who sees him as both indifferent and active on the cultural front.⁶⁰

Bilyashivsky's nationality-conscious attitude is visible in his museum work, printed works, and handwritten legacy. The title of the article devoted to the issues in art – to 'the signs of a true beauty' and to 'forgeries in art' – is quite telling. Its draft version is given two titles: the first reads: 'From the field of Ukrainian art' (the title is outlined), and below it says: 'We are the Lords to ourselves' (underlined).⁶¹ The correlation between the two leads to the author's opinion on Ukrainian independence. Bogdan Khanenko's letter to

52 Ì.V. Kuz'mina, *Ukrains'ka gilka rodu Štejngeliv*.

53 Ibidem.

54 A.S. Klepak, *Gromads'ka ta mecenats'ka diâl'nist'*.

55 Ibidem.

56 L.V. Diduh, *Mikola Bilâšivs'kij*.

57 Â.V. Zatilûk, Û.V. Ostaševs'ka, *Akademik Mikola Fedotovič Bilâšivs'kij*.

58 L.V. Diduh, *Mikola Bilâšivs'kij*.

59 O.O. Kovalevs'ka, *Diâl'nist' Mikoli Bilâšivs'kogo*; Â.V. Zatilûk, Û.V. Ostaševs'ka, *Akademik Mikola Fedotovič Bilâšivs'kij*.

60 L.V. Diduh, *Mikola Bilâšivs'kij*.

61 M.F. Bilâšivs'kij, *Ukrains'ke narodne mistectvo*.

Bilyashivsky with the warning to stay away from Ukrainian film events is a confirmation of the scientist's active position in the Ukrainian cultural movement:

Highly esteemed Bilyashivsky, given the anxious mood of the nationalists, I would like to offer you some advice to be especially cautious at the upcoming celebration of the anniversary of Shevchenko, which some are trying to turn into a political demonstration.⁶²

Grinchenko's worldview was studied in detail by Kobyzhcha.⁶³ The author showed how the Ukrainian mentality was shaped and the exact factors on which it was based. One of the manifestations of his conscious position was the work on Tarnovsky's collection catalogues.⁶⁴ Grinchenko was loyal to these principles for the rest of his life. In an elevated tone, he noted:

For the money received from the sale of my compositions and the fee for the performance of plays, [I plan] to open and support a national school in the city of Kyiv or in a village near Kyiv. The teaching in this school should be conducted in Ukrainian.⁶⁵

While the personology dimension of museography work is only occasionally addressed, it validates Valentyna Stepanivna Shandra's⁶⁶ and Ihor Dvorkin's⁶⁷ argument regarding the successful use of the Ukrainian intellectual elite and their social and political status for legal participation in the implementation of the Ukrainian state policies.

Conclusions

Therefore, the emergence and development of museography on the Ukrainian territory of the Russian Empire were influenced by a few mutually dependent economic, political, and sociocultural factors. The growth of capitalist relations and economic prosperity in the Russian Empire had a positive impact on Ukraine's museography. For instance, it led to advancements in the printing industry, which resulted in an increased quantity and improved material quality of museum publications. The range of museum editions expanded, and administrative reforms prompted museums to focus their activities on social and economic matters, highlighting the institutions' contribution to society through museum reports. Urbanization processes were marked by the regional-ethnographic direction of the museum activities and the popularization of such heritage by creating coloured albums. The development of science brought to life the museography of scientific societies and universities and promoted the dissemination of scientific knowledge about national treasures. These factors collectively served as powerful stimuli, expanding

62 L.V. Diduh, *Mikola Bilâšivskij*.

63 N.ĭ. Kobižča, *Kul'turnic'ka diâl'nist'*.

64 Ibidem.

65 Ibidem.

66 V.S. Šandra, *Dvorânstvo «ukraïns'kih gšubernij» Rosijs'koï imperii u zems'komu samovrâduvanni (1860-ti rr.–počatok XX st.)*, „Ukraïns'kij istoričnij žurnal” 2020, no 4, p. 46–60.

67 ĭ.V. Dvorkin, *Vsupereč ĭmpers'kij političi: ukraïnoznavstvo v muzeâh Naddnprânšini drugoi polovini XIX–počatku XX st.*, „Ukraïnoznavčij al'manah” 2019, t. 24, p. 56–60.

museum collections and bolstering the competent management of museography amidst other scientific publications.

External global interference – such as military actions that led to evacuation, dissolving or liquidation of museum collections – had a detrimental impact on the museography process and, as a result, the termination of scientific and polygraph activities within museums. Prior to the cessation of museum work, private circumstances also played a role – such as financial deterioration, emigration, and shift in life priorities. Furthermore, local problems affected the scientific processing and publication of museum collections. For example, censorship restrictions for Ukrainian publishing houses and national issues depended on the language of publication and the chosen subjects. These contextual realities significantly influenced the content and form of museum publications, shaping the face and essence of this specific type of intellectual and polygraph product.

Bibliography

Sources

- Antonovič V.B., Bec V.A., *Istoričeskie deâteli Ūgo-Zapadnoj Rossii v biografiâh i portretah*, Kiev 1885.
- Antonovič V.B., *Katalog sobraniâ arheologičeskikh i istoričeskikh drevnostej Ekateriny Nikolaevny Skaržinskoj*, Poltava 1891.
- Bilâšivs'kij M.F., *Ukraïns'ke narodne mistectvo*, Harkiv 2017.
- Bočkarev K.P., *Očerki Lubenskoj stariny*, Moskva 1901.
- Bolsunovskij K.V., *Drevnie gir'ki, najdennye v Kieve, i otnošenie ih k različnym vesovym sistemam*, Kiev 1898.
- Bolsunovskij K.V., *Svincovye plastiny (plomby) s uslovnymi znakami cerkovnyh prazdnikov*, Kiev 1899.
- Pčilka O., *Ukraïns'ki uzori*, Kiïv 1912.
- Vetrogradov I.F., *Pamâti A.N. Polâ. Po povodu 20-ti letiâ so dnâ ego smerti*, Ekaterinoslav 1910.

Critical literature

- Diduh L.V., *Mikola Bilâšivs'kij i rozvitok miscevih muzeïv Ukraïni*, "Kraêznavstvo" 2008, no 1–4, p. 120–127.
- Dvorkin Ì.V., *Vsupereč ìmpers'kij politìci: ukraïnoznavstvo v muzeâh Naddnìprânšini drugoi polovini XIX-počatku XX st.*, "Ukraïnoznavčij al'manah" 2019, t. 24, p. 56–60, DOI 10.17721/2520-2626/2019.24.10.
- Gaj-Nižnik P., *Fedir Štejngel' – mecenat, gromads'ko-političnij diâč, poslan Ukraïns'koï Deržavi v Nimeččini*, "Diplomatična ta konsul's'ka služba u vimìri osobistosti" 2016, t. 13, p. 95–124.
- Klepak A.S., *Gromads'ka ta mecenats'ka diâl'nist' V.V. Tarnovs'kogo-molodšogo v Ukraïni (1838–1899 rr.)*, Kiïv 2018.
- Kobižča N.Ì., *Kul'turnic'ka diâl'nist' Borisa Grinčenka: svitogládnyj aspekt: monografiâ*, Kiïv 2017.
- Kolesnik Ì.Ì., *Ukraïns'ka istoriografiâ (XVIII – počatok XX stolittâ)*, Kiïv 2000.

- Konstantinova V.M., *Urbanizaciâ: pïvdennoukraïns'kij vimìr (1861–1904 roki): monografiâ*, Zaporizhzhâ 2010.
- Kovalevs'ka O.O., *Diâlnist' Mikoli Bilâšivs'kogo v roki Peršoï svitovoi' vijni*, "Ukraïns'kij ìstoričnij žurnal" 2008, no 2, p. 119–128.
- Kuz'mina Ì.V., *Ukraïns'ka gilka rodu Štejngeliv: viznačni postati. Ìstoriko-prosopografične doslidžennâ*, Kiïv 2016.
- Miller A.I., *Ukraïnskij vopros v Rossijskoj imperii: monografiâ*, Kiev 2013.
- Nestulâ O.O., Nestulâ S.Ì., *Rol' M.F. Bilâšivs'kogo u stvorenni muzeù F.R. Štejngelâ u s. Gorodok na Volini*, "Naukovì zapiski Ìnstitutu političnih ì etnonacional'nih doslidžen' ìmeni Ì.F.Kurasa NAN Ukraïni" 2012, special issue, p. 257–264.
- Petrov S.S., *Knizhkovâ sprava v Kièvi. 1861–1917: monografiâ*, Kiïv 2002.
- Popel'nic'ka O.O., *Bilâšivs'kij M.F. – peršij direktor Nacional'nogo muzeù ìstorii Ukraïni*, "Ukraïns'kij ìstoričnij žurnal" 2008, no 2, p. 100–118.
- Rudenko G.G., *Žittèvij ta tvorčij šlâh K.M. Mel'nik-Antonovič*, "Ìstorîâ ì kul'tura Pridniprov'â: nevidomi ta malovidomi storìнки : nauk. šoričnik" 2009, vol. 6, p. 121–129.
- Šandra V.S., *Dvorânstvo «ukraïns'kih ġubernij» Rosijs'koï imperii u zems'komu samovrâduvanni (1860-ti rr.–počatok XX st.)*, „Ukraïns'kij ìstoričnij žurnal" 2020, no 4, p. 46–60, DOI 0.15407/uhj2020.04.046.
- Suprunenko O.B., *Arheologiâ v diâlnosti peršogo privatnogo muzeù Ukraïni (Lubens'kij muzej K.M. Skaržins'koj): Monografiâ*, Kiïv, Poltava 2000.
- Zatilûk Â.V., Ostaševs'ka Û.V., *Akademik Mikola Fedotovič Bilâšivs'kij ta jogo personal'nij žittèpis: publikaciâ džerela ì perspektivi doslidžennâ*, "Naukovij vîsник Nacional'nogo muzeù ìstorii Ukraïni. Zbirnik naukovih prac'" 2019, vol. 4, p. 390–410.

Acknowledgments

The author of the article expresses his sincere gratitude to a mentor, Professor Volodymyr Ivanovych Milchev, Ph.D., dean of the historical faculty of Zaporizhzhia National University, for his advice and constant support of research on domestic sources, and for passing on his skills and love for scientific work.

In memoriam Nataliia Kuskova, a civilian girl killed by a missile in Kharkiv (Ukraine) on March 3, 2022. She was 26.

Nataliia Cherhik – Senior Researcher at the Department of Research and Exhibition Work, National Reserve 'Khortytsia', Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine; Department of Source Studies, Historiography and Special Historical Disciplines, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.
e-mail: nataliacherhik@ukr.net

Article submitted on 18 August 2022

Article accepted on 15 December 2022

Historyczno-kulturowy kontekst rozwoju muzealnictwa ukraińskiego: wymiar personalistyczny

Rozwój charakterystycznego rodzaju dziennikarstwa naukowego, znanego jako muzeografia, rozpoczął się w drugiej połowie XIX w. na terenach Ukrainy wchodzących w skład Imperium Rosyjskiego. Niniejszy artykuł ma na celu zbadanie wpływu czynników finansowych, przemysłowych, politycznych, społeczno-kulturowych i intelektualnych na rozwój muzeografii na Ukrainie pod koniec XIX i na początku XX w. Artykuł opisuje wpływ przemian politycznych, ekonomicznych i społeczno-kulturowych w Imperium Rosyjskim w tym okresie, zwłaszcza ich wpływ na ewolucję muzeografii jako specjalistycznego działu literatury naukowej. Tekst pokazuje, jak wewnętrzne reformy doprowadziły do rozszerzenia zakresu publikacji na temat ukraińskich muzeów i kolekcji muzealnych oraz poprawy jakości tych publikacji, zarówno od strony poligraficznej, jak i naukowej. Wykazano, że kluczowym czynnikiem w kształtowaniu narodowej muzeografii był patriotyzm uczestników tego procesu. Pomimo istotnych przeszkód subiektywnych i obiektywnych można twierdzić, że „zwrócenie ku światu” osób zaangażowanych w praktyki muzeograficzne odegrało fundamentalną rolę w powstaniu i rozwoju muzeografii na terenach Ukrainy wchodzących w skład Imperium Rosyjskiego w omawianym okresie.