

THEORY AND HISTORY OF CULTURE

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2024-2-6>

THE NATIONAL ELITE OF UKRAINE IN THE POST-HETMANATE ERA AND PROCESSES OF STATE CREATION IN THE EUROPEAN CONTENT

Larisa Gorenko,

Candidate of Arts, Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D), Senior Research Fellow,

Associate Professor at the Department of Music and Performing Arts,

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0613-6836

gorenkolarisa@gmail.com

Abstract. Current problems of the study of the national elite of Ukraine in the post-hetma period at the end of the 18th – the first half of the 19th centuries are highlighted. In the system of cultural studies taking into account the processes of state formation in the European content. The role and place of the descendants of the leading strata of the Ukrainian Cossack-Hetman state in the historical and cultural processes of this period, who were the bearers of the national idea, and the processes themselves are characterized by the revival of Ukrainian national culture, are outlined. The priority in the research is an interdisciplinary integrative approach to the problem, which objectively illuminates the Ukrainian nobility of the former Left Bank of Ukraine-Hetmanship and the post-Hetmanship period of the 19th century as a systemic integrity, united by: the material basis of its existence; political autonomy and independence, which was ensured by the corresponding legal and legal status; common elements of sociocultural psychology, which was based on awareness of its historical mission and protection of national cultural heritage. The theoretical and methodological basis of such research is the principles of historicism, systematicity, objectivity, comprehensiveness, continuity, dialectical understanding of the historical process as a unity of its components. An objective analysis of the problem indicates the need for substantiation, definition and formation of a separate direction in modern humanitarian science – cultural elitology.

Key words: national elite, nation building, elite building, cultural building, Cossack-elder elite, descendants of the Hetman-elder stratum, cultural identification, cultural environment, elite transformation, Ukrainian nobility, cultural elitology.

Introduction. The relevance of the study of the role of the national elite of Ukraine in the late XVIII – the first half of the XIX century in historical and cultural processes is determined by the following reasons. The initial rationale is driven by the endeavor to address a lacuna in the history of Ukrainian national culture during the post-Hetmanate era. It aims to investigate the genesis, operation, and eventual disappearance of specific elite groups and individuals from the historical stage. Of particular value is the reconstruction of the development of elite consciousness, accompanying the constitution of the shlyakhta (noble) class, encompassing stereotypes governing chivalrous behaviour, the concept of honour, worldview, cultural identity, etc. At the same time, it is important to reconstruct the typology of social, cultural and public relations in the conditions of Ukraine during that period. These aspects are among the important and contemporary problems of historical and cultural studies, where the leading category is the cultural memory (Kysliuk, 2009: 15–19; Kysliuk, 2008). The primary emphasis lies on employing an interdisciplinary integrative approach to the issue, which is essential for understanding the shlyakhta (nobility) of the Ukrainian Hetmanate and post-Hetmanate as a cohesive entity bound together by the material underpinnings of their existence, their political supremacy over other classes, secured by pertinent legal status, and shared elements of socio-cultural psychology rooted in their consciousness of historical mission and commitment to safeguarding national cultural heritage.

The aim of the article. As N. Yakovenko emphasizes, “the history of the Ukrainian elite” belongs to “untouched archipelagos” (Yakovenko, 1993: 3). Conceptual clichés persist within the era under examination, portraying the upper social classes of the Right Bank and Left Bank Ukraine as “denationalized”, “polonized”, “renegade”, “recruited” or “incorporated”. Such representations are evident in the national historiography spanning the XIX to the early XXI centuries. In her research, N. Yakovenko poses a significant question: “initiate a new field of study – the history of the elite of the Ukrainian people” (Yakovenko, 1993: 4). First and foremost, N. Yakovenko identifies and characterizes “a new elite – the Cossack and starshyna elite as the historical successor of the shlyakhta (nobility)”. She represents the Cossack starshyna elite from its formation under the conditions of a new state (the Grand Duchy of Lithuania) to its transformation into a novel historical entity, a process notably accelerated during the Khmelnytsky period, culminating in the emergence of the national elite of the Ukrainian Hetmanate (Yakovenko, 1993: 5–6).

The objective of the research. In this context, the aim of this article is to depict the national elite of Ukraine as a historical and cultural phenomenon, emphasizing the characteristics of Ukrainian mentality and identity. Considering that the object is what the subject's activities are aimed at, the following should be noted. The object of cultural studies is the national elite of Ukraine in the late XVIII – first half of the XIX century in the context of creating the cultural space of the Ukrainian nation. Furthermore, the analysis of the issue enables us to draw a conclusion regarding the justification, definition, and establishment of a new field within contemporary humanities – cultural elitology.

Research material and methods. The outlined main tasks of the article are complemented by another approach: the creation of an appropriate conceptual and categorical framework, where the concept of “national elite” will be presented as a phenomenon of historical and cultural process on the basis of Ukrainian and cultural studies methodology (for example: “cultural formation of the leading stratum”, “cultural identification of the elite”, “cultural self-awareness of the elite”, “cultural relevance”, “acme-personal orientations of the elite”, “cultural values of the elite”, “cultural transformation of the elite”, “national elite as a cultural phenomenon”, “criteria of the elite in Ukrainian studies”, “Ukrainian studies and personal characteristics of the elite”, etc.

Analysis of recent research and publications. It should be mentioned that the development of elite theory in general has been and continues to be carried out within the framework of individual disciplinary discourses: sociological (O. Kont, V. Pareto, M. Veber, H. Lassuall, Dzh. Bernkhem, Ch. Mills, S. Keller, R. Dal, H. Ashyn; in Ukraine – L. Bevzenko, M. Shulha, S. Vovkanych, and others), political science (H. Moska, R. Mikhels, K. Ismal, in Ukraine – V. Lypynskyi, S. Tomashivskyi, V. Kuchabskyi, D. Dontsov, V. Moroz, Ya. Pelenskyi, V. Potulnytskyi, D. Vydrin, O. Haran, B. Kukhta, V. Skyba, and others), social and psychological (V. Pareto, L. Humplovych, Z. Freid, E. Fromm, H. Lassuall; in Ukraine – S. Vovkanych, Kh. Kopystianska, B. Kukhta, and others), historiographical and historiosophical (A. de Tokvil, R. Aron; in Ukraine – O. Lazarevskyi, O. Yefymenko, D. Doroshenko, N. Polonska-Vasylenko, I. Krypiakevych, Ye. Malaniuk, I. Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, H. Hrabovych, O. Apanovych, S. Bilokin, V. Kryvosheia, O. Putro, P. Tolochko, V. Tomazov, Yu. Shemshuchenko, and others), which are characterised by certain humanitarian concepts, contexts, and paradigms. A coherent cultural and ethno-cultural discourse concerning the role of the national elite has not yet been fully developed; however, each of the aforementioned disciplinary areas partly encompasses a cultural aspect that needs further elaboration. In addition, all disciplinary areas are characterised by three fundamentally different methodological strategies for understanding the role and place of the national elite in the historical and cultural process: institutional, acmeological (value) and functional, the design of which reflects the main stages and directions of interpretation of the object and subject of socio-cultural processes by social theory.

Results and discussion. The theoretical and methodological framework of this study is based on the principles of historicism, systematicity, objectivity, comprehensiveness, continuity, and dialecti-

cal understanding of the historical process as a unity of its components. Considering the dialectical cultural correspondence between the method and the subject of knowledge, both general scientific and specialized methods of historical and cultural inquiry are employed in accordance with the purpose and objectives of the study. Simultaneously, it is advisable to utilize methods such as historical, historiographical, and source analysis, synthesis, and generalization, alongside problematic, logical, comparative, retrospective, biographical, descriptive, historical, and chronological methods. Additionally, methods of typology, classification, periodization, and prosopography should be employed, as they collectively facilitate the optimal resolution of the aforementioned issue.

The dynamics of research on this topic allows us to identify four historical and cultural stages of research in this regard. The first stage: from the mid – XVIII century, when the descendants of Ukrainian Cossack and starshyna families began “landlord historiography”. The historian O. Lazarevsky called them “the initiators and facilitators of the scientific study of Malorussian history” in Ukraine: H. Poletyka, A. Chepa, F. Tumanskyi, Ya. Markovych, M. Antonovskiy, V. Poletyk, O. Martos, V. Lomykovskiy, D. Bantysh-Kamenskiy, M. Berlynskiy, O.M. Markovych, M.O. Markevych (Lazarevskiy, 1894: 351). As D.I. Bahalii underscored, as early as in the second half of the XVIII century, there existed in Ukraine “a noble school of Ukrainian historiography with its patrons, such as Bezborodko, Hetman K. Rozumovskiy, and O. Rumiantsev” (Bahalii, 1993: 30). Among the prominent representatives of the noble Ukrainian historiography of the second half of the XVIII century D.I. Bahalii also mentions the brothers Y.M. Markovych and O.M. Markovych, O.I. Martos, and others (Bahalii, 1993: 31). During the second stage (XIX – early XX centuries), there was a process of accumulation of factual material, in which M. Kostomarov, M. Maksymovych, D. Bantysh-Kamenskiy, S. Soloviov, M. Bilozerskiy, O. Lazarevskiy, V. Modzalevskiy, V. Lypynskiy, H. Myloradovych, D. Bahalii, V. Barvinskiy, M. Hrushevskiy, V. Herasymchuk, I. Kamanin, D. Korenets participated. The works of these scholars included studies of the personal staff of the Cossack-Hetman starshyna and their descendants, as well as individual genealogical studies. Attempts were also made to compile registers of hetmans, general officers and colonels, and to study families that retained political and economic influence in the early XX century. Initially, the biographical sketches focused only on the starshyna of the Left Bank. However, a breakthrough in the biography studies of the Right Bank starshyna was made by V. Lypynskiy. He became the founder of the historiographical domain of research not only exploring the phenomenon of cossackification of shliakhta, but also delving into the study of its local groups. The third period of cultural historiography is characterized by heterogeneity. The accumulation of historical and cultural knowledge regarding the issue under study can be categorized into three additional subperiods: 1) 1917–1930s, 2) 1930s – first half of the 1950s, and 3) second half of the 1950–1991s. During the 1917–1930s period, M. Hrushevskiy continued his scholarly pursuits in the context of Soviet Ukraine, while I. Boiko, O. Hrushevskiy, K. Kozubenko, I. Krypiakevych, O. Ohloblin, L. Okinshevych, M. Petrovskiy, M. Tkachenko, and S. Shamrai initiated their scientific research. At the same time, V. Bidnov, M. Vozniak, D. Doroshenko, S. Narizhnyi studied this issue outside the Ukrainian SSR. They upheld the tradition of examining the starshyna of specific sotnias and notable commanders through the compilation of starshyna registers, along with tracing the lineages of their descendants from the late XVIII to the early XIX centuries. During the repressions of the 1930s and 1950s in the USSR, the investigation of this issue was suspended, and the identities of the Cossack starshyna and the Ukrainian nobility were suppressed as they were perceived as class enemies of the workers.

Since the late 1950s, a series of publications by Y. Krypiakevych, F. Shevchenko, V. Diadychenko, K. Stetsiuk, and O. Kompan have emerged, signifying the beginning of a new phase in the historiography of this issue. Furthermore, publications by O. Pritsak, L. Okinshevych, B. Krupnytskiy, and O. Ohloblyn were published abroad. Scientific objectivity is becoming characteristic of the works of a new generation of researchers, such as O. Apanovych, O. Hurzhii, V. Borysenko, A. Kolodii, O. Putro,

P. Mykhailyna, Yu. Mytsyk, V. Serhiichuk, V. Smolii, V. Stepankov, O. Strukevych, V. Tomazov, H. Shvydko (Kolodii, 1997; Strukevych, 2003; Tomazov, 2001; Tomazov, 2006). During the Soviet period (1917–1991), under the pressure of the class approach and political conjuncture, scholars failed to fully realize the scientific principles of systematicity, argumentation, and comprehensiveness in their approaches to the history of the Cossacks and starshyna in general. During this phase, Soviet historiography portrayed the new elite, the Cossack-Hetman's starshyna, through only two perspectives: either as heroic leaders of the masses or as exploitative landlords. Scholars from the Ukrainian diaspora, including Yu. Haietskyi, L. Vynar, and V. Seniutovych-Berezhnyi, furthered the examination of the personal structure of the Cossack starshyna, showcasing profound familiarity with the source material and presenting compelling arguments (Horenko, 2007: 55–59; Horenko, 2009: 109–114; Kolodii, 1997: 10; Kryvosheia, 1998; Kryvosheia, 2002; Yakovenko, 1993). A novel historiographical subject explored in these works is the investigation of the ethnic composition of the starshyna and their immediate descendants.

For a holistic analysis of the national and political role of the elite, it is necessary to identify the essence, concept, structure of this group, its historical features, sources of formation and functions. The term “elite” comes from the Latin *eligere* and the French *elite*, which means “the best, the chosen, the selected”. It is utilized across diverse spheres of life, pertaining to objects and phenomena that vary in their purposes. It should be emphasized that the concept of “national elite” is broader than the concept of “political elite”. It encompasses an integrated array of elites from all social spheres, united by the aspiration to actualize the national idea. In this context, the national elite is the spiritual and intellectual, economic, political, artistic, and academic elite. By its structure, sources of formation, and typology, the national elite exhibits heterogeneity; however, concerning the purpose of its endeavors, it manifests homogeneity, as it consciously or unconsciously endeavors towards the establishment and advancement of the national state, alongside the formation of a political nation as a collective of all citizens residing within a specific cultural and historical context within a particular state. The structure and functions of the national elite largely depend on the stage of historical development at which the national community is currently located: whether it is a period of national awakening, or the struggle for national independence, or a time when a certain form of national statehood is already functioning. However, under all circumstances, the existence of a developed national elite is the key to the success of both nation-building and the formation of a nation-state, where cultural processes become cultural policy.

The issue of the formation and engagement of the national elite held particular significance in Ukrainian political theory, notably for Viacheslav Lypynskyi (Vaclav-Vikentiy; 1882–1931), a historian, pioneer of the statehood school in Ukrainian historiography, and descendant of polonized nobility, who referred to it as “aristocracy”. According to the scholar, it is this group that assumes a leading role in shaping the national idea and fostering a coalition of political values upon which the nation is founded (Ostashko, 1997: 233–234). The national idea guides the nation, standing at the head of its political institutions, creates certain cultural, moral, political and organizational values, which are subsequently embraced by the entire nation and serve as the foundation for its collective existence and endeavors. Therefore, the national aristocracy (elite) facilitates the resolution of the conflict between the individual (subjective) interests of individuals and the collective (objective) interests of the entire nation, favoring the latter. Hence, it serves as the bearer of the unifying principle, fostering the establishment of statehood in all its intellectual and cultural manifestations.

An important part of a developed national elite is the political elite, which reflects the power and political differentiation of society. It consists of people involved in the exercise of power, political influence, and plays the role of the nation’s political leader. The history of the political elite of any nation is the history of national statehood and national culture, and vice versa (Zhuravskyi, 1998: 54–62). The political elite is the basis for the formation of the institution of political leadership.

In sociology and political science, the concept of “elite” has been widespread since the beginning of the XX century, and in the United States since the 1930s. It has become the fundamental category of a distinct area of social research – elitology, which investigates the activities of the stratum directly involved in social and political governance. For this reason, political elitology and social elitology are distinguished in scientific practice. Some philosophers and publicists used other similar concepts instead of the term “elite”, such as: “ruling class” (H. Moska); “caste of the best people”, “leading stratum”, “ruling stratum” (D. Dontsov); “aristocracy” (V. Lypynskyi); “national aristocracy” (S. Bilokin); “political avant-garde” (in the former USSR) and other definitions (Bilokin, 1992: 240–244).

The Ukrainian political scientist V. Lypynsky primarily associated the advancement of the elite with the issue of Ukraine's national renaissance, asserting that it should commence with the revival of the national elite structure – “the collective of the most capable individuals within the nation at a particular historical juncture, serving as the organizers, rulers, and guides of the nation” (Ostashko, 1997: 233–234). A competent national elite – the aristocracy – is unattainable without the material influence it accrues through the process of material production, as well as the moral authority it establishes based on the legitimacy of its national responsibilities. Hence, according to V. Lypynskyi's concept, the formation of the new Ukrainian national elite ought to comprise the most capable individuals from all societal strata (farmers, workers, intellectuals, military personnel, industrialists) who recognize the necessity of the Ukrainian national idea and actively strive for its realization (Ostashko, 1997: 234). The more complex and developed the material life of a nation is, the more difficult the tasks of organising civic life are for the national aristocracy. Thus, according to V. Lypynskyi, the continuous renewal of the national aristocracy is a prerequisite for its effective functioning. All these processes are simultaneously characterized by nation-building, culture-building and state-building.

The problems of creating a new leading stratum, a new elite, were also an important element of the theory of integral nationalism of Dmytro Ivanovych Dontsov (1883–1973), who came from a well-known Cossack-starshyna family. He contrasts the ideas of democracy and Western European parliamentarism with the “idea of a hierarchical society”. According to D. Dontsov, the realization of the idea of statehood and the revitalization of peoples can only occur through the efforts of a fully-fledged leading stratum, the foundation of which is not the populace, not the masses, not any particular class, and not even a party-political agenda, but solely “a caste of the finest individuals, a distinct stratum in position and spirit within society, which would be comprised of individuals from all societal classes based on rigorous selection criteria, while simultaneously safeguarding its spiritual and moral supremacy, its form, and its vigor” (Ostashko, 1997: 138–139). In his interpretation of this problem, Dontsov considered himself to be a fellow thinker with the Spanish philosopher Jorge Ortega y Gasset, who developed the idea of the crisis of the leading strata as a common European problem of the XX century.

Despite the differences in the definition of the concept of “elite”, representatives of different academic schools agree on one thing: the elite is a social stratum, a minority, whose members have social and intellectual qualities that enable them to play leading roles in the whole society or within its individual spheres. According to R. Darendorff, elites are groups of holders of leading positions in various structures of politics, economy, education, law, military, religion and culture. Depending on the sphere of formation and activity of elite groups, there are political, economic, spiritual, military, scientific, educational, artistic, technical, diplomatic and other types of elites. It is no exaggeration to say that every type of social activity has its own elite. At the same time, there are elite groups that ensure the integration of society, the resilience of the state, and the stable functioning of the political system. They include the political elite and the national elite – a social stratum that exercises power, ensures the preservation, creation and reproduction (reconstruction or self-reproduction) of political (cultural) values and the political (socio-cultural) system as a whole, acts to meet the needs and interests of individual social groups and the entire nation, and enjoys

certain advantages of its social position. However, the political elite is a relatively closed community with a fairly constant and numerically limited composition, which has a decisive influence on the justification of national (public) goals and on the development, adoption and implementation of political decisions. It is united by strong internal ties and certain, more or less distinct group interests. Power relations and political activity are systemic, multistructural phenomena, which determines the structure of the political elite in general. Therefore, the problem of elite structure is raised in many concepts of political and national elites (Atamaniuk, 2003: 8–15).

Conclusions. The diversity, richness, and social significance of the historical and cultural achievements of the national elite of Ukraine in the late XVIII and first half of the XIX century, as well as their inadequate use in the practice of subsequent generations, underscore the need for a systematic and in-depth study of the historical and cultural experience of the national elite of Ukraine, especially of the post-Hetman period of the late XVIII and first half of the XIX century. In this context, “the primary and prioritized research domains within the field of cultural studies should encompass: the exploration of the experiences and critical lessons from the establishment of the Ukrainian ethnonation, its territorial dynamics, state-building endeavors, the evolution of societal constructs, the advancement of national cultural expressions, and the spiritual dimensions of the Ukrainian people” (Tokar, 2002: 57–58). These areas are relevant for every historical stage, as they have defined and continue to define the main highways of Ukraine's national development. In all historical and cultural processes, the leading cultural layer, which includes the political and national elite, plays a leading role. In this interpretation, the term “national elite” should be used to refer to a group of people who occupy a leading position in society, manage certain sectors of social and cultural life, produce, preserve and disseminate the national idea. The typology of the elite depends on the basic functions it performs in society. During the late XVIII to the first half of the XIX century, it was the Ukrainian shlyakhta, descendants of the leading hetman and starshyna strata, who wielded control over and influenced the cultural and educational policies in Ukraine throughout this epoch (Horenko, 2009: 55–61; Horenko, 2007: 57–60). Therefore, the national elite of Ukraine, as a historical and cultural phenomenon, is particularly characterised by the features of the Ukrainian mentality and identity, and is also distinguished as a carrier and guardian of the national cultural code. In general, the analysis of the issue enables us to draw a conclusion regarding the justification, definition, and establishment of a new field within contemporary humanities – cultural elitology.

References:

1. Atamaniuk Z. M. (2003) Sotsialno-filosofski kontseptsii ukrainskoi natsionalnoi elity. Avtoref. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. filosof. nauk, spetsialnist 09.00.03 – sotsialna filosofii ta filosofii istorii. Odesa. 19 s. (in Ukrainian)
2. Bahalii D. I. (1993) Narisy ukrainskoi istoriohrafii doby feodalizmu y doby kapitalistychnoi. Tretii rozdil: Pomishchytska istoriohrafia kintsia XVIII i pershoi chverti XIX v. Arkhivy Ukrainy. No. 1–3. S. 23–31. (in Ukrainian)
3. Bilokin S. I. (1992) Pro natsionalnu arystokratiuu Ukrainy. Rozbudova derzhavy. Vyp. 26. S. 240–249. (in Ukrainian)
4. Horenko L. I. (2009) Intelktualna elita Ukrainy kintsia XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX st. (za materialamy diialnosti Novhorod-Siverskoho hurtky “avtonomistiv”). Kultura i suchasnist: Almanakh. Kyiv: Milenium. No. 1. S. 54–61. (in Ukrainian)
5. Horenko L. I. (2007) Proekty zasnuvannia universytetiv v Ukraini XVIII – pochatku XIX stolittia (kulturolohichniy aspekt). Aktualni problemy istorii, teorii ta praktyky khudozhnoi kultury: Zb. nauk. prats. Vypusk XIX. Kyiv: Milenium. S. 51–60. (in Ukrainian)
6. Horenko L. I. (2009) Ukrainske naukove rodoznavstvo: stan, problemy ta perspektyvy doslidzhenia. Ukrainska osvita u svitovomu chasoprostori: Materialy Tretoho Mizhnarodnoho konhresu

- (m. Kyiv, 21–22 zhovtnia 2009 r.). Kyiv: Ukrainske ahentstvo informatsii ta druku “Rada”. Kn. 1. S. 108–115. (in Ukrainian)
7. Zhuravskiy V. S. ta in. (1998) Politychna elita Ukrainy: teoriia i praktyka transformatsii [V. S. Zhuravskiy, O. Yu. Kucherenko, M. I. Mykhalchenko]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo “Lohos”. 264 s. (in Ukrainian)
 8. Kysliuk K. V. (2009) Ukrainska istoriosofia yak fenomen kulturnoi pamiaty. Avtoref. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia doktora kulturolohii za spets. 26.00.04. – ukrainska kultura. Kharkiv: KhDAK. 38 s. (in Ukrainian)
 9. Kysliuk K. V. (2008) Istoriosofia v ukrainskii kulturi: vid kontseptu do kontseptsii: monohrafiia. Kharkiv: KhDAK. 288 s. (in Ukrainian)
 10. Kolodii A. (1997) Natsiia yak subiekt polityky: monohrafiia. Lviv: Kalvariia. 55 s. (in Ukrainian)
 11. Kryvosheia V. V. (2002) Henealohiia ukrainskoho kozatstva. Narisy istorii kozatskykh polkiv. Vydannia druhe, dopovnene. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Stylos”. 389 s. (in Ukrainian)
 12. Kryvosheia V. V. (1998) Natsionalna elita Hetmanshchyny (Personalnyi sklad i henealohiia. 1648–1782 rr.). Kyiv: IPIEND NANU. Ch. I. 269 s.; Ch. II. 344 s. (in Ukrainian)
 13. Kryvosheia V. V. (1994) Ukrainska henealohiia: stan i perspektyvy rozvytku. Persha zaochna nauk. konf. z pytan henealohii i biohrafiky, prysviach. 160-richchiu z dnia narodzhennia O. M. Lazarevskoho. Tezy povidomlen. m. Vinnytsia, 14 chervnia 1994 r. Vinnytsia. S. 3–4. (in Ukrainian)
 14. Lazarevskiy A. M. (1894) Prezhnye yzuskately malorusskoi starynu. Kyevskaia staryna. T. XLVII. No. 12. S. 34–387. (in Ukrainian)
 15. Ostashko T. (1997) Dontsov Dmytro Ivanovych. Malyy slovnyk istorii Ukrainy [V. Smolii, S. Kulchytskyi, O. Maiboroda ta in.]. Kyiv: Lybid. S. 138–139. (in Ukrainian)
 16. Ostashko T. (1997) Lypynskiy Viacheslav. Malyy slovnyk istorii Ukrainy [V. Smolii, S. Kulchytskyi, O. Maiboroda ta in.]. Kyiv: Lybid. S. 233–234. (in Ukrainian)
 17. Strukevych O. K. (2003) Politychna elita. Istoriiia ukrayinskoi kultury. U piaty tomakh. Tom 3: Ukrayinska kultura druhoi polovyny XVII–XVIII stolit. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. S. 319–358. (in Ukrainian)
 18. Tokar L. K. (2002) Dosvid ta uroky buttia v samopiznanni y samotvorenni ukrainskoho narodu. Ukrainoznavstvo. Kyiv: NDIU. No. 3. S. 56–63. (in Ukrainian)
 19. Tomazov V. V. (2006) Henealohiia kozatsko-starshynskykh rodiv: istoriohrafia ta dzherela (druha polovyna XVII – pochatok XXI st.). Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Stylos”. 284 c. (in Ukrainian)
 20. Tomazov V. V. (2001) Stanovlennia ukrainskoi henealohii yak naukovoi dys-tsypliny. Pochatkovyy etap. Spetsialni istorychni dystsypliny: pytannia teorii ta metodyky. 36. nauk. prats i spohadiv: U 2 ch. Kyiv, 2001. Chyslo 6 (7). Ch. 1. S. 96–104. (in Ukrainian)
 21. Yakovenko N. M. (1993) Ukrainska shliakhta z kintsia XIV do seredyny XVII st.: (Volyn i Tsentralna Ukraina). Vidpov. red. V. Smolii. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka. 416 s. (in Ukrainian)