

UDC 930.25:82-6:027.7(438)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/59-2-5>**Oleh PETRECHKO,***orcid.org/0000-0002-5535-3730**Doctor of Historical Science, Professor,
Head of the World History and Special Historical Disciplines Department
Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) o.petrechko@ukr.net***Viktoriiia TELVAK,***orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X**Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History)
Associate Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines,
Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) viktoriateltvak75@gmail.com***Sviatoslav ZHURAVLOV,***orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-4038**Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History),
Junior Researcher at the Department of Source Studies of Modern History of Ukraine
Mykhailo Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography
and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
(Kyiv, Ukraine) zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com*

UKRAINIAN ROMANTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE RECEPTION MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY

The article's target consists of a comprehensive clarification of the ideological and conceptual foundations of the Ukrainian romantic historiography in the creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi. The methodological basis of the work is an interdisciplinary approach. At the same time, methods of philosophical, general-scientific and specific-historical character are applied as well. Particular emphasis is placed on the structural and functional system analysis of historiographical facts and the method of critical analysis of documentary material. Scientific novelty is in the research of a little-known topic of reception of the Ukrainian romantic historiography in Hrushevsky's works. The article has concluded that M. Hrushevsky's studies on Ukrainian romantic historiography and its main representatives were, in fact, the first attempt of this kind. The predecessors of the scientist focused exclusively either on the individuality of historians or on the general trends in the development of historical thought in the first half of the 19th century, which led to a certain one-sidedness in understanding both of these aspects of historiographical analysis. The researcher for the first time comprehensively singled out the ways of formation of Ukrainian historical science, traced European influences on this process, reflected the role of historians in the peculiarities of its course, constantly trying to determine the psychological motivation of their work and focusing on the specifics of mutual relations. All this, on the one hand, created new theoretical and methodological dimensions in the national historical-scientific discourse, set the tone for the next generations of researchers of Ukrainian intellectual life. On the other hand, it prompted a deep research reflection both on one's own work and on the contemporary historiographical process and the awareness of one's place in it.

Key words: *M. Hrushevsky, O. Hrushevsky, Ukrainian romantic historiography, ideological foundations, reception.*

Олег ПЕТРЕЧКО,

orcid.org/0000-0002-5535-3730

доктор історичних наук, професор,

завідувач кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) o.petrechko@ukr.net

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X

кандидатка історичних наук,

доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) viktoriateltvak75@gmail.com

Святослав ЖУРАВЛЮВ,

orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-4038

кандидат історичних наук,

молодший науковий співробітник відділу джерелознавства нової історії України
Інституту української археографії та джерелознавства
імені Михайла Грушевського Національної академії наук України
(Київ, Україна) zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com

УКРАЇНСЬКІ ІСТОРИКИ-РОМАНТИКИ У ПРАЦЯХ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО

Мета дослідження полягає у всебічному з'ясуванні ідейних і концептуальних засад української романтичної історіографії у творчій спадщині Михайла Грушевського. Методологічне підґрунтя становить міждисциплінарний підхід. При цьому важливу роль відіграли методи філософського, загальнонаукового та конкретно-історичного характеру. Особливий акцент зроблено на структурно-функціональному системному аналізі історіографічних фактів та методі критичного аналізу документального матеріалу. Наукова новизна статті полягає у дослідженні малознаної проблеми рецепції ідейних засад української романтичної історіографії у творчій спадщині Грушевського-історіографа. У підсумку відзначено, що студії М. Грушевського над українською романтичною історіографією та основними її представниками були, по суті, першою спробою такого роду. Попередники вченого зосереджувалися виключно або на індивідуальностях істориків, або на загальних тенденціях розвитку історичної думки у першій половині XIX ст., що призводило до певної однобічності у розумінні обох цих аспектів історіографічного аналізу. Дослідник уперше комплексно виокремив шляхи становлення української історичної науки, простежив європейські впливи на цей процес, відобразив роль істориків у особливостях його протікання, постійно намагаючись визначити психологічну мотивацію їхньої творчості та зосереджуючись на специфіці взаємостосунків. Все це, з одного боку, створювало нові теоретико-методологічні виміри у вітчизняному історико-науковому дискурсі, задавало тон для наступних поколінь дослідників українського інтелектуального життя. З іншого – спонукало до глибокої дослідницької рефлексії як над власною творчістю, так і над сучасним собі історіографічним процесом та усвідомленням свого місця в ньому.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, О. Грушевський, українська романтична історіографія, ідейні засади, рецепція.

State of the issue. Starting from the 19th century. historiographical approaches of M. Hrushevsky acquire new features. The dominance of generalization approaches, the emphasis on the study of directions and paradigms of Ukrainian Klio, characteristic of the study of pre-scientific forms of historiography, starting from the era of romanticism, is balanced by the individual dimension of the historical-scientific process – the ever-increasing attention to the personality of its leading creators. An important step in the studying of Ukrainian romantically historiography was a Russian-language

work of Mykhailo Hrushevsky “The development of Ukrainian researchers in the 19th century and signs in them of the main questions of Ukrainian studies”. Having focused on problems of the development of Ukrainian studies, the scientist rightly relates the activities of Ukrainians romantics with the earlier movement of the so-called “antiquarians” – collectors of historical signs and materials of the Ukrainian historiography and folklore. For the first time M. Hrushevsky pays attention on the relation between Ukrainian romanticism and the process of the nation and cultural renaissance in Ukraine. The scientist

considers as an art contribution of the Ukrainian romantic historiography such directions in Ukrainian studies as ethnography and folkloristics. The scientist present romantic historiography by many names – O. Martos, A. Chepa, A. Skalkovskiy, I. Sreznevskiy, D. Lomykovskiy, M. Berlinskyy, O. and M. Markovichiv, M. and D. Bantysh-Kamenskyy, but, in the genre of the historical-scientific portrait were described only creative personalities of the most prominent figures of that period of time – M. Maksimovich and P. Kulish.

Researches analysis. The creative output of Hrushevsky, a historiographer, has repeatedly been the focus of interest of researchers of his work in recent decades. As mentioned above, the greatest attention was paid to the works of the historian devoted to understanding the heritage of his notable predecessors and contemporaries. Along with this, we have a number of works by Victoria Telvak devoted to the analysis of a number of conceptual and specific historiographical problems in the creative laboratory of the historiographer Hrushevsky (Тельвак, Вікторія, 2002; Тельвак, Вікторія, 2003; Тельвак, Вікторія, 2011; Тельвак, Вікторія, Тельвак, Віталій, 2005). Vitaliy Telvak comprehensively explored the receptive aspect of his creative work (Тельвак, Віталій, 2001; Тельвак, Віталій, 2002; Тельвак, Віталій, 2006; Тельвак, Віталій, 2008; Тельвак, Віталій, 2010). On the other hand, M. Hrushevsky's views on the Ukrainian romantic historiography have not been comprehensively studied to this day. This determines the relevance of the topic of our research.

The article's target consists of a comprehensive clarification of the ideological and conceptual foundations of the Ukrainian romantic historiography in the creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy.

Presenting main material. For M. Hrushevsky, the figure of M. Maksymovych in Ukrainian studies of the 19th–20th centuries has always been iconic. Specifically in 1827 – in the time of the appearance of the “Little Russian songs” of the latest – the researcher dates the beginning not only of the ideology of populism in Ukrainian studies, but also of scientific Ukrainian studies in general. He calls the preface to this collection of songs a “manifesto of Ukrainian nationalism”. “In the galaxy of scientific works,” the scientist emphasized, “that appeared on the borders of the first and second decades of the 19th century, this fact was the most vivid, the most prophetic, the most sensational, the most conscious – and rich in its consequences” (Грушевський, 1984: 132). M. Hrushevsky devoted a separate article “One Hundred Years of Ukrainian Nationalism” to the analysis of the main conceptual provisions of the

publication. In it, he identified the initial theoretical positions proposed by M. Maksymovych in the preface, which had not only a direct short-term impact on Ukrainian studies, but also determined the further paths of its evolution throughout the century. In particular, the scientist focused in detail on the research principles promulgated by the Kyiv professor for the systematization and study of folklore material. According to M. Hrushevsky, mistakes and miscalculations of domestic ethnography of the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries were, to a greater extent, caused by disregarding the heuristic value of M. Maksymovych's works (Грушевський, 1928: 6-7). Similar to M. Hrushevsky, D. Doroshenko also raised the importance of “Little Russian songs”, calling the preface to them a “literary manifesto” of Ukrainian populism.

Faithful to his methodological guidelines, M. Hrushevsky primarily focuses on the sources of M. Maksymovych's scientific views. In his opinion, the historical worldview of the first rector of Kyiv was most strongly influenced by antiquarian experiments of the 18th century. This is no accident, because, the researcher believed, the very circumstances of upbringing and family environment contributed to this. M. Maksymovych, a “descendant of the elder family”, a pupil of its “strongly churched representatives”, imbued with deep piety to these family elder-church traditions, had every chance to become “an improved successor to the work of the Ruban, Umansky, Bantysh-Kamensky”. However, thanks to the natural science education, which equipped him with the modern scientific method for that time, and the romantic-populist ideology, the professor was able to overcome the negatives of the antiquarian understanding of the past, albeit incompletely, to a large extent. Unlike his predecessors, he laid “certain sociological foundations” under antiquarian and ethnographic studies, which gave them dynamics and ensured the reality and duration of historiographical concepts. In this way, a populist approach was formed, which, as M. Hrushevsky emphasized, “passes like an electric current through its traditionalism and antiquarianism”.

M. Hrushevsky calls M. Maksymovych's great merit his unsurpassed intuition, which consisted in his understanding of the uniqueness of his position as the rector of the first higher school in the heart of Ukraine. It was this situation, the researcher is convinced, that forced the professor, along with natural sciences, to deal with humanitarian issues and actively write “on philological, historical-literary, ethnographic, historical, archaeological, archeographical topics.” However, in reality, not

even these studios in themselves were the main achievement of Maksymovych. The most valuable thing for the followers of his cause was his revival of the Kyiv tradition, that is, the clarification of the main issues of our past from the Ukrainian national point of view. Step by step, on the basis of scattered sources, facts and documents, “small microscopic observations”, as M. Hrushevsky wrote, during a long half-century of activity, the professor proved the thesis that the new Ukrainian language and literature developed organically from everyday life, history and language of Kyivan Rus. It is clear that for many reasons M. Maksymovych could not reproduce these theses in such detail and transparency, however, M. Hrushevsky emphasized, “when half a century later I took the courage to agree on these theses down to the last word... I only named those theses, those views, those comparisons that our first rector gave” (Грушевський, 1984: 138). According to the scientist, the pan-European tradition of ideologization and politicization of historiography also originated from M. Maksymovych, which for a long time made it the core not only of Ukrainian studies, but also of national ideology in general. It was this fact of the conceptual substantiation of scientific Ukrainian studies that allowed the researcher, despite the absence of any thorough historical study in the creative heritage of the professor, to call M. Maksymovych “one of the creators of Ukrainian historiography, and otherwise – of historical Ukrainian ideology.”

Determining M. Maksymovych’s contribution to Ukrainian historiography in a similar way, M. Hrushevsky dwells in detail on the professor’s “main merits” for Ukrainian humanitarian studies. “His first work,” – the researcher notes, – “was the defense of the antiquity, organicity, and independence of the Ukrainian language in opposition to common views of it as an innovation”. In the thirties of the XIX century the vision of the Ukrainian language as an artificial construct inspired by alleged Polish influences was quite widespread and authoritative. Arguing with Russian linguists, M. Maksymovich for the first time made an attempt to refute this view in several studies, first of all, in “History of Ancient Russian Literature”, in detail and with arguments, with a considerable supply of facts and in a completely scientific and methodical manner. He proposed his own linguistic taxonomy, according to which the Ukrainian language is one of the oldest in Europe. From this he made several important conceptual conclusions. The first concerned the belonging of the culture of Kyivan Rus to the Ukrainian people. The second asserted the independence of the Ukrainian ethnic

type, which found its end in the Cossack times, but traces its origins back to the ancient Kyiv era.

The researcher calls the creation of the main elements of the national historiographic scheme and the first attempts at its periodization the second major achievement of M. Maksymovich. As in the previous case, the evolution of M. Maksymovich’s historiographical ideas also took place in the process of lively polemics with Russian scientists. M. Hrushevsky revealed in detail the course of the professor’s famous discussion with O. Pogodin, calling it “the most brilliant apologia of Ukrainian independence”. The researcher noted that the arguments of the Kyiv rector in this debate, compared to his opponent, were much more grounded and to a large extent formed the further national tradition of considering this problem, finding a direct reflection in the works of M. Kostomarov and V. Antonovych.

The third point, which was emphasized by M. Hrushevsky, concerned M. Maksymovich’s studies on ancient Russian chronicles. According to the researcher, their motivation was the need to comprehensively substantiate the Ukrainian people’s belonging to the heritage of Kyivan Rus. He dwells in detail on the historical and literary works of the scientist, highly evaluating the scientific argumentation presented in them from the height of research in the 20s of the 20th century. M. Maksymovich’s conclusions about the Ukrainian character of Old Russian writing, M. Hrushevsky was convinced, had “tremendous significance for the integrity of Ukrainian tradition, for Ukrainian historiography, and Ukrainian ideology.”

D. Bagaliy also wrote about the epochal nature of M. Maksymovich’s creative heritage for national historiography. According to his conviction, the studies of the scientist were the beginning of the scientific development of Ukrainian history, and Maksymovich himself is like Nestor of the Kyiv school in Ukrainian historiography, who first raised questions about the history of Ukraine, starting from the Kyivan times. M. Hrushevsky’s brother Oleksandr also developed similar views on M. Maksymovich’s work (Грушевський, 1906: 5).

Investigating the domestic intellectual process of the first half of the 19th century, M. Hrushevsky noted the special restraining role of M. Maksymovych in it, which consisted in the latter’s constant efforts to keep the still young Ukrainian studies within the limits of scientific discourse. This turned out to be quite a challenge for several reasons. Firstly, there were strong mythologizing tendencies among Ukrainian researchers themselves, who, fascinated by the ideas of German romantics, tended to hyperbolize

the historical weight of some aspects of the national past. As an example, the scientist cited two series of critical articles by M. Maksymovich, directed against the excessive romanticization of Khmelnytskyi by M. Kostomarov and the beginnings of Cossacks by the young V. Antonovych. "These two series of articles, together with others, much smaller", – he noted, – "did a valuable service to the history of the Cossacks, turning it away from the fantastic fictions of the History of the Rus and "Zaporizhska Starina" back to the reliable ground of facts" (Грушевський, 1990: 28-44). Secondly, it turned out to be extremely difficult and dangerous for a high-ranking government official, such as M. Maksymovich, to oppose the consistent Russification policy of the tsarist government, which opened a university in Kyiv with the aim of overcoming Polish irredentism and spreading imperial ideas and values. However, according to M. Hrushevsky, the professor, to a large extent, managed to neutralize these negative factors for the development of scientific Ukrainian studies. The researcher explained this with M. Maksymovich's fundamental natural worldview, which resulted in a deep understanding of the necessity and priority of detailed scientific studies (Грушевський, 1984: 137).

Despite the high assessment of M. Maksymovich's legacy, perhaps the most favorable of the entire pantheon of domestic historiography, M. Hrushevsky also dwells on the weak points of his scientific activity. These shortcomings were determined by the general mood of that era and consisted, first of all, in the scientist's social conservatism and his romantic worldview. The professor's studies were also influenced by the low level of historical science at that time, which was just beginning to free itself from antiquarian ideas and discover the methods of archeography and achievements of other social disciplines. However, despite the noted shortcomings, M. Hrushevsky emphasizes the need to "underline the organic connections of his [M. Maksymovich] work with newer Ukrainian studies". He traces in detail the influence of the Kyiv professor's ideas not only on the works of M. Kostomarov, O. Lazarevsky, M. Dragomanov, and V. Antonovych, but also on the historiography of the first third of the 20th century. Summing up his research on M. Maksymovich's contribution to Ukrainian culture, M. Hrushevsky joins the statement of M. Dragomanov, who, paraphrasing Pushkin's characterization of M. Lomonosov, called the first Kyiv rector "an entire learned historical and philological institution".

M. Hrushevsky's studies on the work of M. Maksymovich were, in fact, the first scientific attempts to determine the leading ideas and

theoretical foundations of his activity in the broad historiographical context of the 19th and the first third of the 20th centuries. The scientist's assessments significantly influenced the study of the work of the first rector of Kyiv by further historical science. Modern researchers of the legacy of M. Maksymovich write about the great authority of the opinions of the Lviv professor. So, for example, N. Boyko notes that M. Hrushevsky's scientific substantiation of the historical foundations of the scientist, in fact, began in the 20s of the 20th century turning to the historical legacy of M. Maksymovich, realizing the need for a scientific analysis of his views on Ukrainian history in the context of their significance for the development of historical science in Ukraine.

Among the romantic historians who made a significant contribution to the formation of national historiography, M. Hrushevsky also singled out the figure of Panteleimon Kulish – to a certain extent the antagonist of M. Maksymovich in understanding the methods and directions of national and cultural construction. According to the researcher, these were they who presented two opposite vectors of the evolution of Ukrainian studies, identifying the tendency of bifurcation in the understanding of the ways of progress of the Ukrainian cause. Unlike M. Maksymovich, the eccentric and controversial figure of P. Kulish attracted the close attention of researchers of domestic cultural life from the very first steps of his work. At the same time, assessments of his activities were as controversial as the personality of the historian and writer. So, for example, I. Franko's historical views of P. Kulish caused sharp rejection. Defending the socio-economic and political interests of broad sections of the Ukrainian people, placing hope in the people as the main force of national revival, the writer criticized P. Kulish's sharp attacks on Cossacks and Haidamats, his elevation of the role of the Polish nobility and Russian kings in the history of Ukraine. He accused P. Kulish of scientific dilettantism and political doctrinaireism, and even considered his creative and public activity to be a manifestation of the weakness of the national spirit.

M. Dragomanov gave a more balanced assessment of P. Kulish's work. He emphasized the significant contribution of the historian to the development of Ukrainian culture, to the cause of national revival, and spoke against the one-sidedness of the assessments of his views. Criticizing the latter's negative views on certain periods of Ukrainian history, M. Dragomanov still noted certain positives in his work. In a letter to M. Pavlyk, the researcher wrote, that he is one of the Ukrainophiles hitting the point of universal, human culture, which lifts up our people. That is,

M. Dragomanov emphasizes one of the leading features of P. Kulish's work, which was the desire for proportionality, a combination of national and universal values in the past and modern life of Ukraine.

V. Antonovych also condemned Kulish's vacillation and adaptability, thus testifying that his own civic creed was somewhat different, although, perhaps, outwardly, the scientist's behavior did not always seem firm and unshakable. In particular, he wrote to Poznansky: "I don't agree with your optimistic views of Kulish. You probably haven't read his latest works: "History of the Unification of Russia", an article about the Cossacks in "Russian Archive", "Rural poetry", etc. In addition, this turn is illustrated by a handwritten document – a request to the Minister of Internal Affairs, to whom he sends the "History of the Reunification of Russia" as proof of his loyalty and asks to allow him to finish his official career" (Бужинський, 1928: 106). In an earlier letter to Feofan Lebedyntsev, V. Antonovych called Kulish "the two-faced Pantyushka Kulysh" (Грушевський, 1990: 36).

It was in this, mostly negative, tradition regarding the creative heritage of P. Kulish that the studios of M. Hrushevsky, dedicated to his work, appeared. For the first time, the researcher considered the ideas of P. Kulish as a historian in the seventh and eighth volumes of "History of Ukraine-Rus". He analyzed the place of P. Kulish's historical works in the context of the formation of the scientific development of the history of Ukraine. Among them, the historian highly rated the article "The First Period of the Cossacks from its Beginnings to Hostilities with the Lyakhs" and the monograph "History of the Unification of Rus", despite the fact that, in the researcher's opinion, the latter was imbued with excessive subjectivism. M. Hrushevsky called these works the most valuable and significant achievements of Kulish the historian and emphasized that, unlike the previous historiography, he highlighted the process of the formation of the Ukrainian Cossacks on a broad social background without the mythological distortions of the "History of the Rus" (Грушевський, 1995: 566-567).

In his review of the development of Ukrainian studies in the 19th century, M. Hrushevsky noted that P. Kulish, dissatisfied with the first monographs of M. Kostomarov, decided to reveal the history of the Cossacks in close connection with the entire structure of the life of the Ukrainian people. "History of the Unification of Rus", according to the scientist, with its criticism and broad interpretation of the history of the Cossacks against the background of Polish-Ukrainian relations, left far behind everything

that had been done until then on the history of the early Cossacks and, in particular, the review of the history of the Cossacks before Khmelnytsky, carried out M. Kostomarov in his monograph. At the same time, M. Hrushevsky noted the negative features of P. Kulish's "History" that distracted the Ukrainian public from the positive achievements of this work: one-sided coverage of certain problems of Ukrainian history, panegyrics in relation to the Polish cultural mission in Ukraine, and an increasingly hostile attitude towards the Cossacks, pretentious tone and rhetorical style. The following historical works of P. Kulish, M. Hrushevsky believed, were even more subjective and of little value from a scientific point of view. "These works then strengthened the negative attitude towards Kulish's activity in the field of history", the scientist noted, "but it must be admitted that it is not entirely deserved" (Грушевський, 1990: 36). It should be noted that similar views were expressed by other contemporary researchers of P. Kulish's work – M. Vasilenko, D. Bagaliy, D. Doroshenko, O. Hrushevskyi.

M. Hrushevsky continued his studies on the works of P. Kulish in the 20s. In the article "Social-Traditional Underpinnings of Kulish's Work" written before the thirtieth anniversary of the writer's death, he gave a vivid description of Kulish as a historian, revealed the main features of his work, applying the "social-psychological approach" as a method of historical-scientific research for the first time in Ukrainian historiography. Noting the "History of the Unification of Russia" as a valuable work from a scientific and research point of view, the researcher considered that the author spoiled it with his "manhood before the cultural mission of the Polish magnate" (Грушевський, 1927: 32). Using a socio-psychological approach, M. Hrushevsky linked the basis of P. Kulish's historical views and their evolution with his social origin from the state of impoverished peasant Cossacks. In his work, the scientist saw the ideology of "wealthy crimson" – farmers, like the author of the "Chronicle of the Seer". According to the historian, the main contradiction of his views arose from the fact that P. Kulish belonged to the Cossack-lordly class, which preserved its national-cultural and state traditions. This is "the antithesis of the tradition of one's class with the democratism of the Ukrainian peasantry and military blackness, which was the basis of our revival." From the point of view of M. Hrushevsky, P. Kulish, with his pronounced character, very clearly crystallized this antithesis, "contradiction", "characteristic antinomy" of Ukrainian life: "the cultural and state tendency with social and socialist demands of the Ukrainian

demos...” (Грушевський, 1927: 10). To the historical synthesis of these trends, P. Kulish, according to M. Hrushevsky, had an “organic inability.” At the same time, he recognized the great “indisputable intuition” of the writer, with the help of which he highlighted many topical problems of Ukrainian history. It is from such socio-psychological positions, the scientist is convinced, that P. Kulish’s activity as a historian should be studied. It should be noted that in the 1930s, following M. Hrushevsky and referring to his works, D. Bagaliy also applied the socio-psychological method to the study of the writer’s work. Similarity to the evaluations of “kulish creativity” expressed by M. Hrushevsky is also noted in the works of other historiographers of the 20th century. – O. Hrushevsky, P. Klepatsky and D. Doroshenko, who repeatedly referred to the views of their predecessor (Грушевський, 1919). In general, modern researchers of the heritage of P. Kulish emphasize that M. Hrushevsky in his writings managed to cover the life and work of the historian and writer in detail and objectively, significantly softening the assessments of his predecessors.

Conclusions. M. Hrushevsky’s studies on Ukrainian romantic historiography and its main representatives were, in fact, the first attempt of this kind. The predecessors of the scientist focused exclusively either on the individuality of historians or on the general trends in the development of historical thought in the first half of the 19th century, which led to a certain one-sidedness in understanding both of these aspects of historiographical analysis. The researcher for the first time comprehensively singled out the ways of formation of Ukrainian historical science, traced European influences on this process, reflected the role of historians in the peculiarities of its course, constantly trying to determine the psychological motivation of their work and focusing on the specifics of mutual relations. All this, on the one hand, created new theoretical and methodological dimensions in the national historical-scientific discourse, set the tone for the next generations of researchers of Ukrainian intellectual life. On the other hand, it prompted a deep research reflection both on one’s own work and on the contemporary historiographical process and the awareness of one’s place in it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бужинський М. Листи В. Б. Антоновича до Б. С. Познанського. *Україна*. 1928. № 5. С. 95–108.
2. Грушевський А. С. М. А. Максимович (1804–1873). Из украинской историографии XIX в. *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук*. 1906. Т. XI. Кн. 1. С. 375–416.
3. Грушевський М. «Малоросійські пісні» Максимовича і століття української наукової праці. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1–4. С. 132–147.
4. Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси*. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. Т. 7. 628 с.
5. Грушевський М. Розвиток українських досліджень у XIX столітті і вияви у них основних питань українознавства. *Український історик*. 1990. № 1–4. С. 28–44.
6. Грушевський М. Соціально-традиційні підоснови Кулішевої творчості. *Україна*. 1927. № 1. С. 9–39.
7. Грушевський М. Сто літ українського народництва. *Первісне громадянство та його пережитки на Україні. Науковий щорічник за 1927 рік*. 1928. Вип. 1–3. С. 4–8.
8. Грушевський О. Історичні погляди П. О. Куліша. *Літературно-науковий вістник*. 1919. Кн. 7–9. С. 77–93.
9. Тельвак Вікторія. Проблема періодизації української історіографії у працях Михайла Грушевського. *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2002. Вип. VI. С. 395–06.
10. Тельвак Вікторія. Термін «історіографія» та предмет історії історичної науки у спадщині Михайла Грушевського. *Український історичний збірник*. 2003. Вип. 5. С. 404–423.
11. Тельвак Вікторія. Михайло Грушевський – дослідник української історіографії (теоретико-методологічний аспект). *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2011. Вип. XIV–XV. С. 264–273.
12. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. *Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії*. Київ-Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
13. Тельвак Віталій. Теоретичні проблеми історії у творчій спадщині М. С. Грушевського-рецензента (1894–1914 рр.). *Київська Старовина*. 2001. № 5. С. 157–166.
14. Тельвак Віталій. *Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття)*. Нью-Йорк-Дрогобич, 2002. 236 с.
15. Тельвак Віталій. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
16. Тельвак В. В. Науково-популярні праці Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях початку XX століття. *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2006. Вип. X. С. 348–358.
17. Тельвак Віталій. *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)*. Київ – Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.

REFERENCES

1. Buzhynskiy, M. (1928). Lysty V. B. Antonovycha do B. S. Poznanskoho [Letters of V. B. Antonovych to B. S. Poznanskoyi]. *Ukraina*. № 5. S. 95–108. [in Ukrainian].

2. Hrushevskiy, A. S. (1906). M. A. Maksymovych (1804-1873). Yz ukraynskoï ystoriyohrafyy XIX v. [M. A. Maksymovich (1804–1873). From the Ukrainian historiography of the 19th century]. *Yzvestyia Otdelenyia russkoho yazyka y slovesnomy Akademyi nauk*. T. XI. Kn. 1. S. 375–416. [in Ukrainian].
3. Hrushevskiy, M. (1984). «Malorossiiskii pesny» Maksymovycha i stolittia ukraïnskoï naukovoï pratsi [Maksymovich's "Malorossiiskie pesni" and a century of Ukrainian scientific work]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. № 1–4. S. 132–147. [in Ukrainian].
4. Hrushevskiy, M. (1995). *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy [History of Ukraine-Rus']*. Kyiv. T. 7. 628 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Hrushevskiy, M. (1990). Rozvytok ukraïnskykh doslidzhen u KhIKh stolitti i vyiavy u nykh osnovnykh pytan ukraïnoznavstva [The development of Ukrainian studies in the 19th century and their discovery of the main issues of Ukrainian studies]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. № 1–4. S. 28–44. [in Ukrainian].
6. Hrushevskiy, M. (1927). Sotsialno-tradytsiini pidosnovy Kulishevoi tvorchosti [Socio-traditional underpinnings of Kulish's creativity]. *Ukraina*. № 1. S. 9–39. [in Ukrainian].
7. Hrushevskiy, M. (1928). Sto lit ukraïnskoho narodnytstva [One hundred years of Ukrainian nationalism]. *Pervisne hromadianstvo ta yoho perezhytty na Ukraini. Naukovyi shchorichnyk za 1927 rik*. Vyp. 1–3. S. 4–8. [in Ukrainian].
8. Hrushevskiy, O. (1919). Istorychni pohliady P. O. Kulisha [Historical views of P. O. Kulish]. *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk*. Kn. 7–9. S. 77–93. [in Ukrainian].
9. Telvak, Viktoriia. (2002). Problema periodyzatsii ukraïnskoï istoriografii u pratsiakh Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [The problem of periodization of Ukrainian historiography in the works of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. *Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyyi zbirnyk*. Vyp. VI. S. 395–406. [in Ukrainian].
10. Telvak, Viktoriia. (2003). Termin „istoriografii” ta predmet istorii istorychnoi nauky u spadshchyni Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [The term “historiography” and the subject of the history of historical science in the legacy of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyyi zbirnyk*. Vyp. 5. S. 404–423. [in Ukrainian].
11. Telvak, Viktoriia. (2011). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy – doslidnyk ukraïnskoï istoriografii (teoretyko-metodolohichniy aspekt) [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy – researcher of Ukrainian historiography (theoretical and methodological aspect)]. *Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyyi zbirnyk*. Vyp. XIV–XV. S. 264–273. [in Ukrainian].
12. Telvak, Viktoriia, & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy yak doslidnyk ukraïnskoï istoriografii* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 334 s. [in Ukrainian].
13. Telvak, Vitalii. (2001). Teoretychni problemy istorii u tvorchii spadshchyni M. S. Hrushevskoho-retsenzenta (1894-1914 rr.) [Theoretical problems of history in the creative heritage of M. S. Hrushevskiy, reviewer (1894–1914)]. *Kyivska starovyna*. № 5. S. 157–166. [in Ukrainian].
14. Telvak Vitalii. (2002). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorychnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia)* [Theoretical and methodological foundations of the historical views of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy (late 19th-early 20th centuries)]. Niu-York-Drohobych. 236 s. [in Ukrainian].
15. Telvak, Vitalii. (2010). Hrushevskoznavstvo: metodolohichni problemy postupu [Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress]. *Kraieznavstvo*. № 3. S. 29–35. [in Ukrainian].
16. Telvak, V. V. (2006). Naukovo-populiarni pratsi Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v istoriografichnykh dyskusiiakh pochatku XX stolittia [Mikhajlo Hrushevskij's popular science works in the historiographic discussions at the beginning of XXth century]. *Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyyi zbirnyk*. Vyp. X. S. 348–358. [in Ukrainian].
17. Telvak, V. (2008). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia)* [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]. Kyiv – Drohobych. 494 s. [in Ukrainian].