
ІСТОРИЯ

UDC 930.25:82-6:027.7(438)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/70-1-1>**Svitlana BILA,***orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789**Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History),**Associate Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines**Drohobych State Pedagogical University of Ivan Franko**(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) bilasvitlana24@gmail.com***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 State Pedagogical University of Ivan Franko**(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com***Olga VLADYGA,***orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164**Ph. D. in History,**History Teacher**Lviv Professional College of Computer Technologies and Building**(Lviv, Ukraine) olhavladyha@gmail.com*

UKRAINIAN NEO-ROMANTICISM IN HISTORIOGRAPHICAL REFLECTION OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI

The purpose of the article is to clarify the differences in the interpretations of the social functions of historical science by M. Hrushevsky and V. Lypynsky, which were revealed by their participation in the discussion of "History of Ukraine-Rus" by M. Arkas. 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. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the reconstruction of the discussion between M. Hrushevsky and V. Lypynsky on the social functions of historical science. Conclusions. The axiological convictions of M. Hrushevsky and V. Lypynsky turned out to be important for domestic historiography not only in the context of the methodological debate at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, they remain unanimous also in relation to modern trends in world historiography. Criticizing the extremes of historical relativism, scientists from different countries emphasize the researcher's social responsibility for his work. Neo-romanticism did not become widespread in Ukrainian historiography at the beginning of the 20th century. The reaction of researchers to his revelations strengthened the conviction about the need to raise the role of science in public life, to spread scientific knowledge among the general population. Science and scientific knowledge serve society to a greater extent when they provide a true picture of the events and phenomena of the past than when they try to "retouch" history. Ukrainian neo-romanticism quickly forced professional historians to abandon the schematically simplified understanding of social functions and the purpose of their discipline. History, they argued, claiming the high title of science, should give a comprehensive image of the past, and not adapt it to certain turns of the political situation.

Key words: *M. Hrushevsky, V. Lypynsky, neo-romanticism, social functions of historical science, Ukrainian historiography.*

Світлана БІЛА,*orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789**кандидатка історичних наук,**доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін**Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка**(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) bilasvitlana24@gmail.com*

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*

Ольга ВЛАДИГА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164

кандидат історичних наук,

викладач історії

Львівського вищого професійного училища комп'ютерних технологій та будівництва
(Львів, Україна) *olhavladyha@gmail.com*

УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ НЕОРОМАНТИЗМ В ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНІЙ РЕФЛЕКСІЇ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО

Мета дослідження полягає у з'ясуванні відмінностей бачення М. Грушевським та В. Липинським соціальних функцій історичної науки, які оприявила дискусія довкола "Історії України-Русі" М. Аркаса. 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 реконструкції дискусії М. Грушевського та В. Липинського стосовно соціальних функцій історичної науки. У підсумку відзначено, що аксіологічні міркування М. Грушевського та В. Липинського є вагомими для української історіографії не лише в контексті теоретичної полеміки на зламі XIX–XX ст., вони є актуальними і для сучасних світових історіографічних тенденцій. Піддаючи критиці крайнощі історичного релятивізму, дослідники багатьох країн акцентують соціальну відповідальність вчених за свою творчість. Неоромантизм не отримав помітного розповсюдження в українській історіографії на початку XX ст. Реакція вчених на його прояви утвердила переконання про потребу збільшення ролі науки у громадському житті, поширення наукових знань у середовищі широких верств населення. Історія та історичні знання значно більше служать громадськості, коли вони дають дійсну картину явищ і подій минулого, ніж коли пробують «підретушувати» минуле. Український неоромантизм доволі швидко спонукав професійних істориків зректися спрощеного та схематичного тлумачення соціальних функцій і завдань власної дисципліни. Історія, наголошували вони, змагаючись за високе звання науки, має давати стереоскопічний образ минулого, а не узгоджувати його з тими чи іншими поворотами політичної ситуації.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, В. Липинський, неоромантизм, соціальні функції історичної науки, українська історіографія.

Problem state. One of the intellectual innovations of the modern era, which appeared at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, was the neo-romantic theory. To a certain extent, its variant in Ukrainian historiography was the statist direction with its elitism, the priority of national-political ideology over science, the heroization of history, and the hyperbolization of the personal factor. It was the historians-statesmen, starting with V. Lypinsky, in contrast to the scientific-positivist instructions of the followers of M. Hrushevsky's school, who put the needs of a strengthening national organism to the fore when studying the past. Therefore, the main task was declared to be the formation and awakening of national self-awareness through the demonstration of "glorious" events of the national history, focusing attention on its "heroic" periods. The implementation of such an approach to the study of the past led to the distortion of its true image, since "calm"

periods of history remained outside the study, and insufficient attention was also paid to the economic and social and cultural life of the people. Excessive politicization of historical science contributed to the resuscitation of old and the emergence of new historical myths that were supposed to keep the national feeling in tone. These myths, fulfilling their short-term "awakening" role, later firmly "settled" in the mass consciousness as persistent historiographical stereotypes, the negative effects of which are still felt today. Note that neo-romantic conceptuality was generally a characteristic feature of the historiographies of enslaved peoples (Зашкільняк, 1997: 112). Thus, the modern Polish historiographer Jerzy Maternicki notes: "The years 1900–1918 are characterized in the history of Polish historiography by the dominance of the neo-romantic direction, the beginnings of which go back to Poland at the end of the 19th century." (Maternicki, 1982: 7). The neo-romantic theory

reduced the scientific value of historical works and led to the mythologizing of the past. Neo-romanticism, which has spread significantly in European historiography, is today studied in detail by historians. This applies to both general socio-political and methodological factors that caused its emergence. But for modern Ukrainian historiography, it is particularly relevant that his followers put forward two important and interrelated methodological problems: the social function of history and the relationship between science and political ideology. Solving these problems has always troubled researchers of the past, and also divided them into opposing camps. They were necessarily forced to ask the question and give an answer to it: should historical knowledge serve to deepen objective knowledge about social processes, or should it serve the current interests of society at this stage of its evolution? How to understand the relationship between science and society, how should science serve it? Is history a science in the narrow sense of the word? Ukrainian neo-romanticism gave them its answers. Let's try to understand what these answers were and why they turned out to be unstable.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

The events connected with the publication of "History of Ukraine-Rus" by M. Arkas and the discussion surrounding it are quite fully researched by modern historians V. Ulyanovsky (Ульяновський, 1996), I. Hurych (Гирич, 1996), V. Telvak (Тельвак, 2002a: 162–163; Тельвак, 2002b; Тельвак & Тельвак, 2005: 253–254; Тельвак, 2008: 131–134; Тельвак, 2010; Тельвак & Тельвак, 2021) and others. Scientists have studied in detail the circumstances in which M. Arkas wrote this work, analyzed the ideological positions of his critics and supporters, evaluated the book itself as a phenomenon of Ukrainian historiography. However, the emphasis on the socio-political resonance of the work, the study of the event only in the context of the confrontation between M. Hrushevskyi and his ideological opponents made another, historiographical, context secondary. However, he, in our opinion, is the most interesting. After all, the fact that it is not a book (in this case, "History of Ukraine-Rus" by M. Arkas – a usual popular work of a compilative nature), but the discussion around it, started a new historiographical phenomenon. Below, we will focus on the historiographical effect of the mentioned discussion in the context of the formation of Ukrainian neo-romanticism.

The purpose of the article is to clarify the differences in the interpretations of the social functions of historical science by M. Hrushevskyi and V. Lypynskyi, which were revealed by their participation in the discussion of "History of Ukraine-Rus" by M. Arkas.

Presenting main material. At the end of the 19th century positivism with its respect for real facts and critical method had a very strong position in domestic historiography (Тельвак, 2000a; Тельвак, 2000b). Thus, as early as 1895, regarding the work of V. Kotsovsky, M. Hrushevskyi, in the spirit of positivist skepticism, noted: "I paid most attention to the methodological side of the work; as the tone, they say, makes the music, so the science begins with the method, that is why this aspect deserves special attention. Everyone in scientific work must clearly distinguish a fact from a guess or unsubstantiated information; a factual conclusion can be made only on the basis of facts; on conjectures and contradictory information, you can build only a hypothesis, which can only be put as a hypothesis, with a reserve, and which can only gain credibility after a long check with new dates" (Грушевський, 1895b: 10). New methods that entered historiography from sociology, psychology, ethnology and other sciences were adapted on the same positivist ground with its most important asset – a critical approach to analysis at all stages of research. Even one of the founders of the neo-romantic trend in Ukrainian historiography, V. Lypynsky, in solidarity with the scientific views of M. Hrushevskyi, wrote to the last about the publication of the next volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus": "Many, sincere thanks for sending me your "Story"! A wonderful book – not to mention the content – in its structure, form and appearance! I can't help but share with you my impression, which I got after reading your "History". Accept it, Mr. Professor, as a disgusting person for whom the road is our past and everything that aims to spiritually resurrect it, to show it in the light of science." (Листування Михайла Грушевського, 2001: 293–294) (underlined by us – author).

At the turn of the XIX–XX centuries in Ukrainian intellectual circles, there was an urgent need to write a popular scientific history of Ukraine. Old textbooks, such as the work of O. Yefimenko, no longer met the requirements of the historical science of that time. This was also mentioned by M. Hrushevskyi, who from the beginning of the 90s of the XIX century planned to write a popular history of Ukraine, he even wanted to start his creative journey with such a story, as he noted in his autobiography (Грушевський, 1906: 206). We will casually mention that the historian's archive contains a draft of such a work entitled "On Antiquity and the Most Ancient Times of Our People", dated 1894. But the Russian-language "Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People" intended for an educated reader first appeared in print, which survived until the outbreak of the First World War, three editions (1904, 1906 i

1911 years). In 1907, the professor's popular, richly illustrated pamphlet "About Old Times in Ukraine" was also published. But this book by M. Hrushevskyi was too concise, and he planned to immediately start work on a larger illustrated story, which was known to a wide circle of his acquaintances, who helped to find artists to illustrate it. In general, emphasizing the importance of publishing a popular scientific history of Ukraine in the native language, the professor wrote in the preface to "Illustrated History of Ukraine": "I don't know if I need to interpret how I understood its task, because after looking at this book, everyone who understands will think about it. I wanted to give our citizens a book written in an easy and accessible way, enlivened by images of the past life, fragments of our old creativity, our literature... I wanted not to limit myself to only the superficial history of rulers and wars, but also to show how the people lived, in which direction their public and cultural life developed." (Грушевський, 1990: 3; Тельвак, 2006). V. Lypynsky was also aware of the vital necessity of publishing a popular scientific Ukrainian-language history of Ukraine. In a letter to M. Hrushevskyi, he wrote: "Now, it seems to me, is such a time that the popularization of history is one of the most important cultural and political tasks, and since new layers are pouring into Ukrainianism, which are not familiar with previous Ukrainian literature, then such [...] thing is very, very necessary" (Грушевський, 1906: 304).

That is why a lot of public attention was focused on the appearance of the first popular work – the book by M. Arkas, and the discussion around it caused such a significant resonance. It was this discussion, in our opinion, that witnessed the emergence of a new direction in the Ukrainian historiographic topos, statist in its ideology, and marked the beginning of the functioning of neo-romanticism in the national historical science. Since, as we mentioned above, the "case of M. Arkas" is covered quite fully in the literature, we will dwell only on those points that interest us in terms of the mentioned topic.

First of all, we note that M. Hrushevskyi's review of M. Arkas's book should be considered in the general context of the criticism of neo-romantic conceptualism, which was carried out by the scientist in the pages of scientific periodicals, starting from the end of the 19th century. "We must resolutely condemn any manifestation of ignorance and disregard for scientific requirements," writes M. Hrushevskyi, "whether it comes from compatriots or foreigners who undertake to write about Ukrainian affairs" (Грушевський, 1902: 16–17). The researcher lists the signs of neo-romantic conceptualism: recognition of the action of providential forces in history, "hero cult", "methodi-

cal jumps", "non-scientific terminology" (Грушевський, 1895a: 25–28). According to the scientist, the fight against mythologizing lies on the path of critical study of sources – "and all romanticism will dissipate like a dream" (Грушевський, 1897: 15). The main reason for mythologizing, M. Hrushevskyi believes, lies in the dilettantism of the historian, his neglect of scientific requirements. "Salon interpretation of science", focusing only on the tastes of the public, the professor warns, turns a scientist into a writer and publicist (Грушевський, 1907: 218–220). That is why M. Hrushevskyi examines the works of researchers with such attention and affection, written taking into account the "scientific nature, objectivity and caution of the method" (Грушевський, 1898: 6–8).

A critical attitude to our past, according to M. Hrushevskyi, is also necessary in view of the initial stage of the formation of national historiography; due to the fact that the mechanisms and tradition of combating mythologizing have not yet developed. The scientist poses the problem of the historian's professional and ethical responsibility to society for his work.

The first historian to read M. Arkas's "History of Ukraine-Rus" was V. Lypynskyi. We learn about his reaction to the book from a letter to the author of the work. The letters are written in an elevated, almost panegyric tone. It does not contain any serious comments on the content or design of the book, only it is noted that "the same small mistakes that are sometimes encountered do not harm the content of the book at all and, most importantly, do not spoil the general impression, do not harm [...] its spirit". On the contrary, V. Lypynskyi noted that he was attracted by the content and external aspect of the work, its stylistic form, vernacular language, "simple, nuclear, lapidary" style. Writing about the meaning of the book, the scientist highlighted first of all its important educational and social function. "When reading your book," noted V. Lypynskyi, "I kept in mind that it is as you say in the preface: 'The history of one's people should be popular and accessible to everyone,' and precisely, applying such an assessment to it, one can say, that your "History" completely meets its purpose" (Ульяновський, 1996: 211–212).

M. Hrushevskyi, after reading the work of M. Arkas, asked V. Lypynskyi to write a review of it, which was published on the pages of the Literary and Scientific Herald. Here the approach should have been somewhat different – the review required, first of all, a meticulous professional assessment, which, among other things, was weighed by a prominent historian of Ukraine before publication. So, V. Lypynskyi had to give a specific analysis of the content of the work, which was done. However, the reviewer still did not

consider it necessary to talk only about the scientific value or fallibility of the book. He again, although not as broadly as in the letter, emphasized the cultural and national significance of the publication.

V. Lypynsky generally gave a positive assessment of M. Arkas's book. Among its advantages, the reviewer mentioned simple language; easy, popular form of presentation; successful use of historical legends and folklore; a calm objective tone reminiscent of a chronicle style; clear periodization and division into small sections. The critic especially noted the great love for the Ukrainian people, who adopted the book, "this feeling is transmitted to the reader as well, it awakens national consciousness and national self-respect in him".

The reviewer's critical remarks were limited to pointing out numerous redundant dates and facts that have little relevance to the history of Ukraine; uneven description of events (for example, only 20 lines are devoted to the evolution of the peasantry for the years 1687–1764); the artificiality of the periodization of the history of Ukraine (for example, the Scythian-Sarmatian period is difficult to single out as an independent one in the history of the Ukrainian people; the division of Kyiv and Galicia, Lithuanian and Polish periods, etc.); very cursory and superficial remarks about the social evolution of Ukrainians; too schematic coverage of the Ukrainian revival. V. Lypynsky noted that the author "does not have any coherent view of the entire historical evolution of the Ukrainian people." The book does not clearly mention even the beginnings of our history, and the terms "Russian" and "Ukrainian" are constantly confused. The critic pointed to the unscientific nature of the futuristic description of possible variants of historical events ("what if, etc."). The amount of blood and sheer massacre in the description of the events of the XVII-XVIII centuries was also unpleasant. Harmful for the "spreading of the feeling of national unity among the broad circles of the Ukrainian people" was the opposition between Naddniprovyanshchyna and Halychyna. V. Lypynsky also listed in detail all minor errors, elementary errors and inaccuracies in the text, illustrations and maps (Липинський, 1908). The main significance of the book, the scientist emphasized, was that it performed an important educational and social function. V. Lypynsky also listed in detail all minor errors, elementary errors and inaccuracies in the text, illustrations and maps (Липинський, 1908). The main significance of the book, the scientist emphasized, was that it performed an important educational and social function.

M. Hrushevskyi was not satisfied with the vision of the social role of historiography proposed by

V. Lypynsky, and he added his remarks to his review. The professor bypassed the external influence of the book and the very fact of its appearance as a national and cultural phenomenon, having analyzed its internal content, main idea, and illustrative content. Apparently, scientific criticism of doctrines is strictly principled (Тельвак, 2001). Of course, M. Hrushevskyi could not ignore the review of the book by M. Arkas for many reasons: it was the first Ukrainian history of the foreign history of Ukraine to be seen, as there was a wide outcry; the professor has prepared an extensive course on local history, as well as an illustrative textbook; As a scientist, he has always opposed amateurism. At the beginning of the review, the scientist stated that M. Arkas's book cannot be ignored due to its wide circulation. So, he rightly believed, it "will be a book of wisdom on Ukrainian history for many Ukrainians" for a long time. However, written by a non-professional, with numerous, often elementary inaccuracies and inexcusable mistakes, such a "History of Ukraine", according to the critic, "will become a sad reminder of the carelessness or inconsistency of our intelligentsia, which fed the broad masses of its people, eager for self-knowledge, so unfortunate – and from a scientific point of view and from a national and simply from an educational and pedagogical point of view, a product like the book of Dr. Arkas".

M. Hrushevskyi set rather high, but fair requirements for popular works, which had the task of enlightening and educating the people. Such a book, according to his firm conviction, could only be written by a specialist well acquainted with the subject, who, in addition, would have the talent of popularization and concise presentation of the main, essential things. Such a book, like any other scientific work, should be carefully thought out and planned.

M. Arkas's book was distinguished by a huge number of errors – not only small ones, "but falsehoods, terrible oversights, simply wild expressions and views in a scientific textbook." M. Hrushevskyi cited numerous examples to prove this, concluding his review with the question: "So why did this textbook of Ukrainian history become a source of endless nonsense? ... To really not know, is it better than these notes, remarkable for their poverty, incompleteness of content and mass of factual errors, – complete silence, with which the author passed the writing movement of the end of the 16th century and the beginning. 17th century".

The most significant shortcoming of the concept of the reviewed work, according to M. Hrushevskyi, was the lack of consideration of national relations and the bringing to the fore of political history – the

“ascension” to the thrones of various monarchs, the course of their reigns, endless wars and treaties. All this is laid out dryly, palely, with a lot of unnecessary dates and trivial information. The presentation itself is uninteresting, inconvenient and primitive – the main points are not explained, the main directions and trends are not analyzed, instead, a lot of material that does not relate to Ukrainian history is given. The reviewer’s conclusions are rather harsh: “The book is not worthy of giving the reader an idea even about the superficial history of Ukraine, which the author deals with... the previous Ukrainian generations appear as some kind of historical underpants, who rush around without a goal or reason, without understanding the situation, without any leading jokes... This is a story without history, without cultural, social, and political content... a more understanding reader could gather from this book a very sad (and incorrect) idea about the historical past of our people, its historical, political, and cultural value”.

M. Hrushevskiy expressed surprise at how such a weak book, “harmful from a scientific, educational, and national point of view,” is praised and distributed among the masses, giving a surrogate instead of good intellectual nourishment. In his opinion, this is evidence of great indifference in the interpretation of the social functions of historical science and a lack of self-respect. At the end, the scientist noted that M. Arkas “is undeniably imbued with ardent love for his people and their past”, that he knows him “as a man who is sincerely loyal to Ukraine and does not doubt for a moment his good intentions”, but for writing a valuable book for the people “good intentions alone are not enough” (Грушевський, 1908b: 318–324). With his review, the scientist also emphasized an old opinion that he maintained throughout his life: there is no place for dilettantism in science, popularization should follow scientific research, and not the other way around. Explaining his uncompromisingness and scientific principles, M. Hrushevskiy emphasized in a letter to E. Chikalenko that his critical remarks were presented exclusively “in the interest of a historian” (Ульяновський, 1996: 216–217).

The reviews by M. Hrushevskiy and V. Lypynskiy caused a long discussion in journalism and scientific literature. Opponents of the Lviv professor emphasized that since the work of M. Arkas is popular, the requirements for it should be much more loyal than for scientific work. Some even convinced that the people will not “swallow” a refined scientific popular book, and precisely such work – “rough grinding” – will help to form national self-awareness. Thus, R. Pisnyachevskiy asserted that M. Arkas’s book fully corresponds to the level of the reader who

uses only “the manna porridge of a light, pragmatic storyteller.” He noted that the author who writes the history of Ukraine in the same vernacular language and publishes it so cheaply will receive the same popular gratitude as M. Arkas. R. Pisnyachevskiy wrote that when the professors produce a better historical popular work, M. Arkas’s book will be put on the shelf, and besides, the author “is ready to accept a certificate of cultural poverty for this, even from the hands of a respected professor!”. The publicist quoted a perceptive letter of a peasant book carrier with an assessment of M. Arkas’s book (Пісняхевський, 1908).

Another reviewer – V. Bidnov – noted the great popularity of the work among the common people, on whom it had a great influence and awakened national consciousness. The critic wrote that the author “definitely did a great service to our national movement; scientific and artistic flaws did not prevent it (the book – author) from exerting its influence on the circles among which the book was distributed. The experience of our days gives us vivid evidence that it is not science that captures citizenship, but something else, the opposite of the first (Біднов, 1919: 50). E. Chykalenko, B. Grinchenko, B. Stepanenko, G. Khotkevich and others also wrote to the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” about the great national and cultural role of M. Arkas’s book and its significant contribution to raising national self-awareness.

M. Hrushevskiy proved the falsity of the vision of the social functions of history expressed by V. Lypynskiy on the pages of the Literary and Scientific Herald. He was convinced that every mistake in this kind of literature turns into a persistent historiographical stereotype that will be difficult to overcome in the future. The scientist wrote that M. Arkas’s book might not have deserved such attention if it had not been so actively advertised and made “perhaps the most popular book on Ukrainian history”. But the people need true views of the past. According to M. Hrushevskiy, one cannot adapt to human tastes and a low general level – one must “be ashamed of blindness and not treat them with wealth, hoping for that blindness”. The scientist again criticized the book’s “endless gibberish” and gross errors (incorrect concepts about Ukrainian territory, lack of cultural history, misinterpretation of social processes, complete disregard of Ukrainian revival, elements of state loyalty); bloody color and endless carnage; dryness, schematic presentation; overloading with secondary material.

Evaluating the popularity of the book among the people and the good reviews, the reviewer noted that “they read it with pietism, they may cry, but the ques-

tion is big – what views on their past, on the historical tasks of their people, do they take from it.” M. Hrushevskiy stated that there is no desired ideology and national concept of covering the history of Ukraine in M. Arkas’s book. A lie is not enlightenment, the historian is convinced. The effects of bloody revenge cannot serve to raise the national feeling. “Our task cannot be to take care only of stimulating the national instinct at all costs, by all means,” emphasized M. Hrushevskiy. “Nationalism for nationalism’s sake cannot be our goal.” If you insist that the main thing in a popular book should be “nationalistic effects”, and not scientific truth and progressive ideology, then no professional historian will want and will not be able to write a popular history of Ukraine. For a professional, spreading the results of his many years of work to the masses “can be an extremely expensive thing – the pinnacle of scientific work.” Adapting the book to the people’s requests, such as the usual legends about the Yeruslani Lazarevichs, artificially lowering the level of culture is “a mortal sin against the interests of one’s people.” Meanwhile, wrote M. Hrushevskiy, we continue to lump “farm giants” with specialists, and this “immeasurably discredits Ukrainianness in the eyes of the people...”. Meanwhile, wrote M. Hrushevskiy, we continue to lump “farm giants” with specialists, and this “immeasurably discredits Ukrainianness in the eyes of the people...”. By artificially lowering the level of Ukrainian culture to the level of the grassroots, they alienate from it those “more educated strata”, to whom they later turn in vain with their appeals. This is a great harm to Ukrainianism and it must be fought no matter what, “and to stand in the position of popular culture means irrevocably sending your intelligentsia to the pastures of a foreign culture and joining in the “domestic tour” for the benefit of the “blind buckwheat brothers”; means to nail to the Ukrainian culture with your own hands this brand of inferior, masculine, inauthentic – the very brand that generations of fighters of the Ukrainian revival tried to remove from it” (Грушевський, 1908а: 121–136).

Continuing the discussion, V. Lypynskiy also presented his vision of the problem of the social role of history. Responding to V. Pisnyachevskiy’s criticisms in a special article on the pages of the Kyiv “Rada”, the historian emphasized that this book contains many mistakes from the point of view of science, but it is not a scientific work, but only a popular essay. The main value of “History” by M. Arkas lies in its national and cultural significance. V. Lypynskiy noted: “I consider the appearance of this history to be a phenomenon in our national life definitely encouraging, and useful for the cause of national revival, although

I personally do not fully sympathize with its chaotic ideology and with some features and tendencies that are unsympathetic to me”. According to the historian, M. Arkas’s book testified to the growth of national self-awareness and became a transition from the ideology of “patriotic histories” to the ideology of modern conscious Ukrainianism. National revival cannot be only elitist or intellectual, it must touch the whole nation. Its lower strata, i.e. the overwhelming majority, are not ready for something more serious. That is why the book by M. Arkas “...does and will continue to do for a long time... the work is beneficial for this revival” is among them (Липинський, 1908: 1).

So, in the reviews of M. Hrushevskiy and V. Lypynskiy on M. Arkas’s “History of Ukraine-Rus” by M. Arkas, for the first time in Ukrainian historiography, the methodological difference between classical scientific ideas about historical science and new neo-romantic approaches to it was clearly noted. It is noteworthy that the discussion revolved around the social roles of historiography, because Ukrainian intellectuals faced the primary task of activating the “national instinct”, as M. Hrushevskiy wrote. In this discussion, two views on the problem of the functioning of historical science in society were clearly defined. The first, positivist, implemented in the writings of M. Hrushevskiy, advocated the priority of strict scientific requirements over any political and ideological intentions. The second, neo-romantic, presented by the views of V. Lipinsky and his associates, on the contrary, understood the national and political-ideological moment as defining, sense-making in the reconstruction of the past. We will not evaluate the mentioned concepts, since the historiography is dominated by the opinion about the priority of the theoretical vision of M. Hrushevskiy in the Ukrainian intellectual tradition (Тельвак, 2002а: 162–163; Тельвак, 2002б; Зашкільняк, 1999). We should only note that the discussion that began contributed to the development and self-reflection of the national Clio, encouraged historians to delve into the theoretical foundations of their science, thereby introducing the Ukrainian Clio into the European historiographical space.

Undoubtedly, the refusal of the neo-romantics to unconditionally adhere to the criteria of scientificity and the subordination of science to political interests played a certain role in the national unity of Ukrainian society and the formation of national self-awareness. However, neo-romanticism contributed not only to the spread, but also to the entrenchment of a number of historical myths in the public consciousness, the displacement of which was quite difficult. As it turned out, the idealization of national history, which

at first glance promotes the growth of patriotism, has a more far-reaching and long-lasting consequence of the spread of attitudes of national exceptionalism and xenophobia. The development of both Ukrainian and other historiographies testifies and constantly reminds that science must maintain a certain distance from politics and ideology, perform its own social functions, providing first of all scientific knowledge based on a critical approach to any historical facts, logical analysis and methodological reflection. It is worth recalling the words of M. Hrushevskiy, who at the end of the 19th century proclaimed: "Science is constant skepticism" (Грушевський, 1994: 13).

Conclusions. The axiological convictions of M. Hrushevskiy and V. Lypynskiy turned out to be important for domestic historiography not only in the context of the methodological debate at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, they remain unanimous also in relation to modern trends in world historiography.

Criticizing the extremes of historical relativism, scientists from different countries emphasize the researcher's social responsibility for his work. Neo-romanticism did not become widespread in Ukrainian historiography at the beginning of the 20th century. The reaction of researchers to his revelations strengthened the conviction about the need to raise the role of science in public life, to spread scientific knowledge among the general population. Science and scientific knowledge serve society to a greater extent when they provide a true picture of the events and phenomena of the past than when they try to "retouch" history. Ukrainian neo-romanticism quickly forced professional historians to abandon the schematically simplified understanding of social functions and the purpose of their discipline. History, they argued, claiming the high title of science, should give a comprehensive image of the past, and not adapt it to certain turns of the political situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Біднов В. Що читати по історії України (Коротенька історіографія України). Кам'янець-Подільський, 1919. 51 с.
2. Гирич І. Ще до проблеми «Аркас і Грушевський». *Історія, історіософія, джерелознавство. Історичний збірник*. 1996. С. 221–231.
3. Грушевський М. [Рецензія] Papée Fr. Polska i Litwa na przelomie wiekow srednich. Tom 1. Kr., 1903. *Записки НТШ*. 1907. Т. LXXIX. С. 218–220.
4. Грушевський М. [Рецензія] Potkanski K. Krakow przed Piastami. Краків, 1898. *Записки НТШ*. 1898. Т. XXVI. С. 6–8.
5. Грушевський М. [Рецензія] Prochaska Antoni Dr. Dazenia do unii cerkiewnej za Jagvelly... *Записки НТШ*. 1897. Т. XX. С. 15–16.
6. Грушевський М. [Рецензія] Statut Litewski drugiej redakcyi... Краків, 1900... *Записки НТШ*. 1902. Т. L. С. 16–17.
7. Грушевський М. [Рецензія] Иловайский Д. Смутное время Московского государства... *Записки НТШ*. 1895а. Т. VI. С. 25–28.
8. Грушевський М. [Рецензія] Коцовський В. Історично-літературні заметки до «Слова» о полку Ігоревом. Львів, 1893. *Записки НТШ*. 1895б. Т. V. С. 8–10.
9. Грушевський М. Вступний виклад з давньої історії Русі, виголошений у Львівському університеті 30 вересня 1894 р. *Михайло Грушевський і Західна Україна. Доповіді й повідомлення наукової конференції*. Львів, 1994. С. 5–14.
10. Грушевський М. До рецензії д. Липинського. *Літературно-науковий вістник*. 1908б. Т. XLIII. Кн. VIII. С. 318–324.
11. Грушевський М. Ілюстрована історія України. К., 1990. 524 с.
12. Грушевський М. На українські теми. Ще про культуру і критику. *Літературно-науковий вістник*. 1908а. Т. XLIV. С. 121–136.
13. Грушевський М. С. Автобіографія, 1906. *Великий Українець: Матеріали з життя та діяльності М. С. Грушевського*. К.: Веселка, 1992. С. 197–214.
14. Зашкільняк Л. Методологічні погляди Михайла Грушевського. *Україна модерна*. 1999. Ч. 2–3. С. 233–253.
15. Зашкільняк Л. О. Історична концепція М. Грушевського в контексті східноєвропейської історіографії. *Вісник ЛДУ. Серія історична*. 1997. Вип. 32. С. 110–119.
16. Липинський В. М. Аркас. Історія України-Русі. С.-Петербург, 1908. *Літературно-науковий вістник*. 1908. Т. XLIII. С. 307–318.
17. Липинський В. Ще в справі «Історії України» М. Аркаса. *Рада*. 1908. № 199. С. 1.
18. Листування Михайла Грушевського. Т. 2. Київ-Нью-Йорк: УІТ, 2001. 413 с.
19. Піснячевський В. Маленький фельетон з хвиль життя. *Рада*. 1908. № 192. С. 3.
20. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
21. Тельвак В. Історико-теоретичні дослідження в грушевськознавстві (90-ті рр. ХХ ст.). *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: Наукові записки ДДПУ*. 2000б. Вип. 5. С. 163–174.
22. Тельвак В. Методологічні основи історичних поглядів М.С.Грушевського (кінець ХІХ – початок ХХ століття). *Київська Старовина*. 2002б. № 2. С. 3–28.
23. Тельвак В. Проблеми історико-теоретичної спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (1939–1990 рр.). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. 2000а. Вип. 35–36. С. 354–366.
24. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець ХІХ – 30-ті роки ХХ століття). Київ-Дрогобич: «Вимір», 2008. 494 с.

25. Тельвак В. Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття). Дрогобич: «Вимір», 2002а. 236 с.
26. Тельвак В. Теоретичні проблеми історії в творчій спадщині М. Грушевського – рецензента. *Київська старовина*. 2001. № 5. С. 157–166.
27. Тельвак В. В. Науково-популярні праці Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях початку XX століття. *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2006. Вип. X. С. 348–358.
28. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
29. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. *Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії*. Київ-Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
30. Ульяновський В. Микола Аркас, «Історія України-Руси» і Михайло Грушевський. *Історія, історіософія, джерелознавство. Історичний збірник*. 1996. С. 161–221.
31. Maternicki J. *Historiografia polska XX wieku. Cz.1: Lata 1900–1918*. Wrocław etc., 1982. 256 s.

REFERENCES

1. Bidnov, V. (1919). *Shcho chytaty po istorii Ukrainy (Korotenska istoriografii Ukrainy) [What to read about the history of Ukraine (Short historiography of Ukraine)]*. Kamianets-Podilskiy. 51 s. [in Ukrainian].
2. Hurych, I. (1996). Shche do problemy “Arkas i Hrushevskiy” [Even before the “Arkas and Hrushevskiy” problem]. *Istoriia, istoriosofia, dzhereloznavstvo. Istorychnyi zbirnyk*. S. 221–231. [in Ukrainian].
3. Hrushevskiy, M. (1895a). [Review] Ylovaisky D. Smutnoe vremia Moskovskoho gosudarstva... [D. Plovayskyi. The Troubled Time of the Moskovskii Gosudarst...]. *Zapysky NTSz*. T. VI. S. 25–28. [in Ukrainian].
4. Hrushevskiy, M. (1895b). [Review] Kotsovskiy V. Istorychno-literaturni zametky do “Slova” o polku Ihorevom. Lviv, 1893 [Kotsovskiy V. Historical and literary notes to “Slova” about Igor’s regiment. Lviv, 1893]. *Zapysky NTSz*. T. V. S. 8–10. [in Ukrainian].
5. Hrushevskiy, M. (1897). [Review] Prochaska Antoni Dr. Dazenia do unii cerkiewnej za Jagvelly... [Prochaska Antoni Dr. Jagvelly’s quest for church union...]. *Zapysky NTSz*. T. XX. S. 15–16. [in Ukrainian].
6. Hrushevskiy, M. (1898). [Review] Potkanski K. Krakow przed Piastami. Краків, 1898 [Potkanski K. Krakow before the Piasts. Krakiv, 1898]. *Zapysky NTSz*. T. XXVI. S. 6–8. [in Ukrainian].
7. Hrushevskiy, M. (1902). [Review] Statut Litewski drugiej redakcyi... Krakow, 1900... [Lithuanian Statute of the second editorial office... Krakow, 1900...]. *Zapysky NTSz*. T. L. S. 16–17. [in Ukrainian].
8. Hrushevskiy, M. (1907). [Review] Papee Fr. Polska i Litwa na przelomie wiekow srednich. Tom 1. Kr., 1903 [Papee Fr. Poland and Lithuania at the turn of the Middle Ages. Volume 1. Kr., 1903]. *Zapysky NTSz*. T. LXXIX. S. 218–220. [in Ukrainian].
9. Hrushevskiy, M. (1908a). Na ukraïnski temy. Shche pro kulturu i krytyku [On Ukrainian topics. Also about culture and criticism]. *Literaturno-naukovyï vistnyk*. T. XLIV. S. 121–136. [in Ukrainian].
10. Hrushevskiy, M. (1908b). Do retsenzii d. Lypynskoho [To the review by Dr. Lypynsky]. *Literaturno-naukovyï vistnyk*. T. XLIII. Kn. VIII. S. 318–324. [in Ukrainian].
11. Hrushevskiy, M. (1990). *Iliustrovana istoriia Ukrainy [Illustrated history of Ukraine]*. Kyiv. 524 s. [in Ukrainian].
12. Hrushevskiy, M. (1992). Avtobiohrafia, 1906 [Autobiography, 1906]. *Velykyi Ukrainets: Materialy z zhyttia ta diialnosti M. S. Hrushevskoho*. Kyiv: Veselka. S. 197–214. [in Ukrainian].
13. Hrushevskiy, M. (1994). Vstupnyi vyklad z davnoi istorii Rusy, vyholoshenyi u Lvivskim universyteti 30 veresnia 1894 r. [Introductory lecture on the ancient history of Rus’, delivered at Lviv University on September 30, 1894]. *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i Zakhidna Ukraina. Dopovidi y povidomlennia naukovoï konferentsii*. Lviv. S. 5–14. [in Ukrainian].
14. Zashkilnyak, L. (1999). Metodolohichni pohliady Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Methodological views of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. *Ukraina moderna*. Ch. 2–3. S. 233–253. [in Ukrainian].
15. Zashkilnyak, L. O. (1997). Istorychna kontseptsiiia M. Hrushevskoho v konteksti skhidnoievropeiskoi istoriografii [Historical concept of M. Hrushevskiy in the context of Eastern European historiography]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna*. Vyp. 32. S. 110–119. [in Ukrainian].
16. Lypynsky, V. (1908). M. Arkas. Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi. S.-Peterburh, 1908 [M. Arkas. History of Ukraine-Rus. S.-Peterburg, 1908]. *Literaturno-naukovyï vistnyk*. T. XLIII. S. 307–318. [in Ukrainian].
17. Lypynsky, V. (1908). Shche v spravi “Istorii Ukrainy” M. Arkasa [Also in the case of “History of Ukraine” by M. Arkas]. *Rada*. Ch. 199. S. 1. [in Ukrainian].
18. (2001). *Lystuvannia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]*. T. 2. Kyiv-New York. 413 s. [in Ukrainian].
19. Pisnyachevsky, V. (1908). Malenkyi felieton z khvyl zhyttia [A small feuilleton from the waves of life]. *Rada*. Ch. 192. S. 3. [in Ukrainian].
20. Telvak, V. (2000a). Problemy istoryko-teoretychnoi spadshchyny Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v istoriografii ukrainskoi diaspory (1939–1990 rr.) [Problem’s of the historical and theoretical heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in the historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora (1939–1990)]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna*. Vyp. 35–36. S. 354–366. [in Ukrainian].
21. Telvak, V. (2000b). Istoryko-teoretychni doslidzhennia v hrushevskoznavstvi (90-ti rr. XX st.) [Historical and theoretical studies in pear studies (90s of the XX century)]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: Naukovi zapysky DDP*. Vyp. 5. S. 163–174. [in Ukrainian].

22. Telvak, V. (2001). Teoretychni problemy istorii v tvorchii spadshchyni M. Hrushevskoho – retsenzenta [Theoretical problems of history in the creative heritage of M. Hrushevskiy – the reviewer]. *Kyivska starovyna*. № 5. S. 157–166. [in Ukrainian].
23. Telvak, V. (2002a). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorychnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia)* [Theoretical and methodological bases of historical views of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy (end of the XIX–beginning of the XX century)]. Drohobych. 236 s. [in Ukrainian].
24. Telvak, V. (2002b). Metodolohichni osnovy istorychnykh pohliadiv M.S.Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia) [Methodological foundations of historical views of M. S. Hrushevskiy (end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century)]. *Kyivska Starovyna*. № 2. S. 3–28. [in Ukrainian].
25. Telvak, V. (2008). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX– 30-ti roky XX stolittia)* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's creative heritage in the estimations of contemporaries (end of the XIX – 30s of the XX century)]. Kyiv–Drohobych. 494 s. [in Ukrainian].
26. Telvak, V. V., Telvak, V. P. (2021). Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy [Modern Hrushevsky studies: achievements, losses, prospects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. № 5. S. 4–16. [in Ukrainian].
27. Telvak, V. V. (2006). Naukovo-populiarni pratsi Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v istoriohrafichnykh dyskusiiakh pochatku XX stolittia [Mikhajlo Hrushevskij's popular science works in the historiographic discussions at the beginning of XXth century]. *Drohobytskyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*. Vyp. X. S. 348–358. [in Ukrainian].
28. Telvak, Viktoriia, & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy yak doslidnyk ukrainskoi istoriohrafii* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 334 s. [in Ukrainian].
29. Telvak, Vitalii. (2010). Hrushevskoznavstvo: metodolohichni problemy postupu [Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress]. *Kraieznavstvo*. № 3. S. 29–35. [in Ukrainian].
30. Ulyanovsky, V. (1996). Mykola Arkas, “Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy” i Mykhailo Hrushevskiy [Mykola Arkas, “History of Ukraine-Rus” and Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. *Istoriia, istoriosofia, dzhereloznavstvo. Istorychnyi zbirnyk*. S. 161–221. [in Ukrainian].
31. Maternicki, J. (1982). *Historiografia polska XX wieku. Cz.1: Lata 1900–1918* [Polish historiography of the 20th century. Part 1: The years 1900–1918]. Wrocław etc. 256 s. [in Polish].