

UDC 930.25:82-6:027.7(438)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/56-2-4>**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 Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines**Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University**(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com***Vasyl PEDYCH,***orcid.org/0000-0002-8942-8374**Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History),**Associate Professor at Department of Social Sciences,**Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas**(Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine) pedychwasyl@gmail.com*

IDEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF OLD RUTHENIAN CHRONICLES IN THE HRUSHEVSKY HISTORIOGRAPHER'S RECEPTION

The article's target consists of a comprehensive clarification of the ideological and conceptual foundations of Old Ruthenian chronicles in the creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi. 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 Old Rus chronicles in Hrushevsky's works. The article has concluded that Hrushevsky singles out 2 rival directions in Old Rus historiography: religious-agiographic moralistic" and "military-heroic or military-chivalric". According to his conviction, the first historiographic trend had a more ancient tradition, originating from Byzantine and Western European models, and therefore determined the development of both Old Ruthenian culture in general and writing in particular. This was it that formed the "official" face of the origins of our historiography, initiating the corresponding stylistic and thematic canons. The second trend was formed by separation from the first as a result of the rapid evolution and diversification of the political and cultural forms of life of Kyivan Rus. In conclusion, we note that the works of M. Hrushevsky, devoted to the early period of our historiography, filled significant gaps in the contemporary Ukrainian Clio and led to further research in this field. They harmoniously complemented the theoretical concept of Ukrainian historiography created by him. Let's note that his ideas have not lost their value till nowadays. Modern researchers of Old Ruthenian chronicles actively use the creative assets of the professor, often arguing with his concepts. This once again proves the heuristic value of the creative heritage of an outstanding scientist for modern Ukrainian historiography.

Key words: *M. Hrushevsky, Ukrainian historiography, Old Ruthenian chronicles, 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

Василь ПЕДИЧ,

orcid.org/0000-0002-8942-8374

кандидат історичних наук,

доцент кафедри суспільних наук

Івано-Франківського національного технічного університету нафти і газу
(Івано-Франківськ, Україна) pedychwasy@gmail.com

ІДЕЙНІ ЗАСАДИ ДАВНЬОРУСЬКОГО ЛІТОПИСАННЯ В РЕЦЕПЦІЇ ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО-ІСТОРІОГРАФА

Мета дослідження полягає у всебічному з'ясуванні ідейних і концептуальних засад давньоруського літописання 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 мало-званої проблеми рецепції ідейних засад давньоруського літописання у творчій спадщині Грушевського-історіографа. У підсумку відзначено, що М. Грушевський у давньоруській історіографії виокремлює дві основні конкуруючі течії – “релігійно-агіографічну моралістичну” та “дружинно-героїчну або воєнно-лицарську”. На його переконання, перша історіографічна тенденція мала більш давню традицію, походячи від візантійських та західноєвропейських зразків, і тому визначала розвиток як давньоруської культури взагалі, так і писемності зокрема. Саме вона утворювала “офіційне” обличчя витоків нашої історіографії, започатковуючи відповідні стилістично-тематичні канони. Друга течія утворилася шляхом сепарації від першої внаслідок стрімкої еволюції та урізноманітнення політичних і культурних форм буття Київської Русі. Загалом, роботи М. Грушевського, присвячені ранньому періоду нашого історіописання, заповнили значні прогалини у тогочасній українській Кліо та спричинилися до подальших досліджень у цій галузі. Вони гармонійно доповнювали створену ним теоретичну концепцію української історіографії. Зауважено, що його ідеї не втратили своєї цінності й досі. Сучасні дослідники давньоруського літописання активно використовують творчі надбання професора, нерідко полемізуючи з його концепціями. Це вкотре доводить евристичну цінність творчої спадщини видатного вченого для сучасної української історіографії.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, українська історіографія, давньоруське літописання, ідейні засади, рецепція.

State of the issue. The significant expansion of the subject field of Hrushevsky's studies and the branching of its structure in recent years have led to a departure from narrativity and analytical documentaries. Researchers are increasingly focusing on the theoretical aspects of M. Hrushevsky's work – conceptual-historiosophical, methodological and historiographical. This makes it possible to raise research to a new qualitative level, to inscribe the scientist's heritage into the world's intellectual context of the 20th century, and thereby more adequately assess its importance for national culture. However, if the first two aspects already have respectable

literature and have waited to be developed at the monographic level, unfortunately, we cannot yet say the same about the historical-scientific component of M. Hrushevsky's work.

During the nearly one-hundred-year existence of Hrushevsky's studies, we have only a number of publications dedicated to the analysis of the personal concept of the scientist – his views on the heritage of outstanding Ukrainian historians of the 19th – early 20th centuries: M. Maksimovich, P. Kulish, M. Kostomarov, M. Dragomanov, V. Antonovych, O. Lazarevsky, V. Lypinsky. Such fragmentation does not allow, on the one hand,

to fully characterize the historiographic work of M. Hrushevsky, and on the other hand, to complete the design of the corresponding section of the disciplinary structure of Hrushevsky's studies. In view of this, in our opinion, the first priority should be the study of M. Hrushevsky's views on the process of evolution of national historical thought. After all, this will contribute to the creation of an appropriate historiographical context, which will allow a more adequate assessment of the various historical and scientific considerations of the scientist and combine them into a coherent conceptual model.

Studying the views of M. Hrushevsky on various periods of the formation of national historical thought, the scientist's intensified reflection on the origins of our historical tradition, which, according to his firm belief, begins in the Old Ruthenian era, attracts attention. This is understandable because the substantiation of the "Ukrainianness" of the Old Ruthenian heritage was the leading motive of the researcher's scientific creativity, the starting point of his historiography. The ancient Kyiv historiographical tradition is for M. Hrushevsky the starting point in the development of Ukrainian historical thought. Research on Ukrainian chronicles is one of the most notable historiographic intentions of M. Hrushevsky. Some of his publications, as well as common excursions in "History of Ukraine-Rus", and, especially, separate volumes of "History of Ukrainian Literature", are devoted to this problem. Given the fundamental nature of M. Hrushevsky's historiographical analysis of the national chronicles, we will focus on his study of church and religious influences on the beginnings of our historiographical tradition.

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 ideological foundations of Old Ruthenian chronicles 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 Old Ruthenian chronicles in the creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi.

Presenting main material. Faithful to his methodological preferences – increased attention to the genetic method, M. Hrushevsky considers the origins of the historical consciousness of Ukrainians in the global cultural context. According to the scientist, the beginnings of Ukrainian chronicles are quite similar to the firstling of the European historical tradition. Therefore, according to the researcher, the historical evidence "should be subject to historical criticism as well as the retellings of the legendary time of Roman history". The scientist considers the historical tradition to be a relatively late creation, even in the most conservative and "historic nations" such as Egypt and China. Also, in his opinion, the initial history – "these historical beginnings of even the most historical states are mostly very little historical" (Грушевський, 1921: 256). Such a situation was explained by the researcher as a class differentiation and the peculiarity of the formation of the first states, which lead to the creation of a special church-religious stratum, whose representatives dealt with the past of their own people to satisfy their spiritual interests. As a result of their purposeful activity, a "historical tradition" emerges, as a certain amount of information about the development of the political and social life of such a "historical people". At the time of placement, the creators of history had no idea about its beginnings and replaced specific information with "various guesses, hints, legends." Such a conscious construction of the past, the researcher is convinced, was carried out to suit the interests of the ruling class in the state.

According to the scientist, the study of the chronicle tradition in Ukrainian historiography at the beginning of the 20th century has undergone significant changes compared to the previous period. "Old archeography," he believes, "interpreted our chronicles only from the standpoint of historical sources in the narrow sense of the word: since they provide actual material about events. The cultural-historical aspect, that every copy, every text of any time is a cultural-historical fact and therefore has value for its time, was not realized by it" (Грушевський, 1993b: 326). Therefore, the researcher, taking into account his modern methodological approaches, focuses on the complex interpretation of chronicle texts.

Analyzing the Old Ruthenian historiography, M. Hrushevsky highlights two main competing trends – "religious-hagiographic moralistic" and "marriage-

heroic or military-chivalric” (Грушевський, 1993b: 68). According to his conviction, the first historiographic trend had a more ancient tradition, originating from Byzantine and Western European models, and therefore determined the development of both Old Ruthenian culture in general and writing in particular. This was it that formed the “official” face of the origins of our historiography, initiating the corresponding stylistic and thematic canons. The second trend was formed by separation from the first as a result of the rapid evolution and diversification of the political and cultural forms of life of Kyivan Rus. It was caused by the urgent needs of everyday life, had popularizing functions, and was intended for the formation of mass historical consciousness and pro-government ideological stereotypes.

What is the reason for such a powerful church and religious influence on the Old Ruthenian chronicles? Solving this issue, M. Hrushevsky once again demonstrated the multi-vector nature of his searches and the sociological orientation of methodological guidelines, trying to take into account as wide a range of factors as possible. First of all, according to M. Hrushevsky, this state of affairs is explained by the general ideological and mental peculiarities of the European Middle Ages, which were strongly influenced by the Christian worldview. This caused the prioritization of theological motives in all spheres of manifestation of spiritual life, the accumulation of its intellectual dimension in the hands of church ministers. “Our old historiography,” the scientist noted, “is so often conducted by spiritual hands or by such secular ones who were completely under the sway of the leading religious ideas of the era, it also so often approaches hagiography that it is not always possible to even draw any sharp line between them” (Грушевський, 1993a: 98).

Another reason for the influence of Christian motifs on the beginnings of Ukrainian historiography, M. Hrushevsky saw in the fact of the concentration of writing, and hence chronicles, in large monastic centers. And since the princely power was the most respected founder of the monasteries, this, the researcher believed, led to an interesting synthesis – the interweaving of religious events in the chronicles and the “social order” of the top of society to reflect current life accordingly. As an example, the researcher cites relevant places in the “Ipatiev Chronicle”. “These notes, as we can see, – he noted – adopted, on the one hand, by the church spirit, and on the other hand, by a great partiality in the illumination of events from the position of the Monomakh dynasty, may really come from the Vydubitskyi monastery, founded by Monomakh’s father” (Грушевський, 1993b: 11).

The power of Christian motifs in our chronicles was also explained by M. Hrushevsky by the influence on our culture of “models of Byzantine and Western European” historiography. The effort to reach the standards of the highly respected Roman culture prompted our chroniclers, the researcher noted, to instruct, often quite artificially, worldly events into the biblical background, to explain historical reality with metaphysical reasons. Such a tradition, the historian stressed, was preserved in Ukrainian chronicles until the Cossack era. “Our home-made Ukrainian knighthood, – wrote M. Hrushevsky, – which, according to Byzantine and Western European models, on the same Christian basis, on the same grounds as Western feudalism, under the same slogans of the struggle of Christianity against paganism, developed, as we can see, in our country in parallel with the Western, in similar but largely original forms, – it later served as a model and a source for that national knighthood, which later, with various changes and new additions, poured into the circulation of the Cossacks” (Грушевський, 1993b: 39).

Studying in detail the chronicles of different lands and periods, M. Hrushevsky noticed an interesting stylistic and thematic peculiarity. In his opinion, in the “calm” period of our history, Christian motifs in historiography play a secondary decorative role, giving way to pragmatic storytelling and secular themes. On the other hand, during various kinds of social cataclysms or periodical aggravation of the fight against the steppe people, philosophical reflexivity increases sharply and then metaphysical and religious motives begin to dominate again. As an example, M. Hrushevsky cites the analysis of the text of one of the largest chronicle collections, known as the “Kyiv Chronicle”. Due to the “calm” circumstances of writing, only this monument, according to the scientist, is characterized by “a little unanimous and organic character”. However, it is to this “diverse and meaningful composition” that the chronicle owes the absence of “dead” parts and various textual marginalia (for example, quotations from the Holy Scriptures and other church writings). The researcher defines the content of the chronicles as completely real and relevant: the story follows hot tracks and is mostly influenced by the immediate mood of current events. “As a document of life,” notes M. Hrushevsky, “this chronicle has few equals in medieval literature in general” (Грушевський, 1993b: 34). The scientist also explains the difference in the stylistic character of the two parts of the “Galician-Volyn Chronicle” as a factor of the difference in the circumstances of the creation of the chronicle (Грушевський, 1993b: 184).

The concentration of chronicles in the hands of the clergy led to another interesting peculiarity that characterizes the Old Ruthenian historical work,

especially in comparison with the historical tradition of peoples with a stronger written culture. This, according to M. Hrushevsky, is its total collectivity and anonymity. He emphasizes that “we do not have separate and independent historical works at all, but only what was included in larger historical collections or compilations, mostly heavily edited by their compilers” (Грушевський, 1993а: 100).

According to M. Hrushevsky, the work on the study of the Ukrainian past, which originated in Kievan Rus, was never interrupted, although it regressed during times of political and cultural ruin. “In history,” the researcher is convinced, “there are sad days, but there are no barren days” (Грушевський, 1995а: 4). Thus, the development of historical work in the researcher’s concept appears as a single, continuous process that has its ups and downs, which are closely related to historical circumstances. “Kyiv chronicles,” the scientist is convinced, “is, in a simple line, the predecessor of later Ukrainian historiography” (Грушевський, 1910: 212). Therefore, the stylistic and thematic features of the beginnings of our historiography, laid down in Old Ruthenian times, were largely transferred to the following periods of Ukrainian chronicles.

According to M. Hrushevsky, one of the most traditional intentions of domestic historiography, which had a significant influence until the end of the 18th century, was noticeable Christian fabulists. In contrast to most of the countries of Western Europe, where in the conditions of the birth of the Renaissance worldview, historical thought underwent active secularization, in Ukraine, which was under foreign rule, the historical tradition continued to develop within the framework of theological history. In the XIV-XVII centuries cathedrals and monasteries, the scientist is convinced, still play a predominant role in the chronicles. According to the researcher, old chronicles serve as models for contemporary chronographs. Giving a general description of national historical thought in the Polish-Lithuanian period of its existence, M. Hrushevsky noted: “Writing about modern events, the authors more than once following the records of the 11th-13th centuries in phraseology about the attacks of Polovtsians and Tatars; by their example, they engage in pious reflections about the signs of God’s anger and give way to a depressed mood in prayers, similar to those we read in Kyiv chronicles of the 11th-12th centuries. The language itself is close to the old church language, and in some places, the

poor grammar and spelling betray a scribe of the end of the 15th century” (Грушевський, 1995а: 207). And only the Cossack era, according to the researcher, by accelerating the processes of national self-awareness and calling the military elite to life, thereby giving impetus to the development of secular historiography.

Reflecting on the significance of the influence of the Christian worldview on Ukrainian chronicles, M. Hrushevsky is far from an unequivocal answer. On the one hand, an indisputable positive was the approximation of the beginnings of our historiographical tradition to European culture, which made it possible to quickly adapt its achievements. According to the scientist, it was very important to feel like “an equal member of the collective of Christian peoples, which bears the defence of Christian civilization against paganism” (Грушевський, 1993b: 247). On the other hand, such influences hindered the development of original historiographical culture, and the conditions of the weakening of civilizational contact with the West in the 14th-17th centuries led to the pattern and formalization of historical creativity. According to the professor, this pattern is most noticeable in the works of the Polish-Lithuanian era. Christian motifs finally emasculate the real foundations of the historical story, turning it into daily literature. M. Hrushevsky wrote: “Ultimately, the literary interest of these works is in the illustration of how firmly and unyieldingly this iconographic pattern of life held so that even the most acute impressions of modernity bounced off its carefully smoothed face” (Грушевський, 1993b: 191). However, the researcher emphasizes, such a peculiarity of the domestic historiographical tradition distinguishes it against the background of the development of the European Clio of that time.

Conclusions. In conclusion, we note that the works of M. Hrushevsky, devoted to the early period of our historiography, filled significant gaps in the contemporary Ukrainian Clio and led to further research in this field. They harmoniously complemented the theoretical concept of Ukrainian historiography created by him. Let’s note that his ideas have not lost their value till nowadays. Modern researchers of Old Ruthenian chronicles actively use the creative assets of the professor, often arguing with his concepts. This once again proves the heuristic value of the creative heritage of an outstanding scientist for modern Ukrainian historiography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури. Київ, 1993. Т. II. 264 с.
2. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури. Київ, 1993. Т. III. 285 с.
3. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури. Київ, 1995. Т. V. Кн. 1. 256 с.

4. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури. Київ, 1995. Т. VI. 712 с.
5. Грушевський М. Початки громадянства. Генетична соціологія. Відень, 1921. 328 с.
6. Грушевський М. Українська історіографія і Микола Костомаров. Пам'яті М. Костомарова в двадцять п'яти роковини його смерті. Літературно-науковий вістник. 1910. Т. L. Кн. V. С. 209-225.
7. Тельвак Вікторія. Проблема періодизації української історіографії у працях Михайла Грушевського. Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник. 2002. Вип. VI. С. 395-406.
8. Тельвак Вікторія. Термін „історіографія” та предмет історії історичної науки у спадщині Михайла Грушевського. Український історичний збірник. 2003. Вип. 5. С. 404-423.
9. Тельвак Вікторія. Михайло Грушевський – дослідник української історіографії (теоретико-методологічний аспект). Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник. 2011. Вип. XIV-XV. С. 264-273.
10. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії. Київ-Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
11. Тельвак Віталій. Теоретичні проблеми історії у творчій спадщині М. С. Грушевського-рецензента (1894-1914 рр.). Київська Старовина. 2001. №5. С.157-166.
12. Тельвак Віталій. Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX - початок XX століття). Нью-Йорк-Дрогобич, 2002. 236 с.
13. Тельвак Віталій. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу Краєзнавство. 2010. № 3. С. 29-35.
14. Тельвак В. В. Науково-популярні праці Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях початку XX століття. Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник. 2006. Вип. X. С. 348-358.
15. Тельвак Віталій. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ–Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.

REFERENCES

1. Hrushevskiy, M. (1993a). Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury [History of Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv. T. II. 264 s. [in Ukrainian].
2. Hrushevskiy, M. (1993b). Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury [History of Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv. T. III. 285 s. [in Ukrainian].
3. Hrushevskiy, M. (1995a). Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury [History of Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv. T. V. Kn. 1. 256 s. [in Ukrainian].
4. Hrushevskiy, M. (1995b). Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury [History of Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv. T. VI. 712 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Hrushevskiy, M. (1921). Pochatky hromadianstva. Henetychna sotsioloheia [The beginnings of citizenship. Genetic sociology]. Viden. 328 s. [in Ukrainian].
6. Hrushevskiy, M. (1910). Ukrainska istoriohrafia i Mykola Kostomarov. Pamiati M. Kostomarova v dvadtsiat piati rokovyny yoho smerti [Ukrainian historiography and Mykola Kostomarov. In memory of M. Kostomarov on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death]. Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk. T. L. Kn. V. S. 209-225. [in Ukrainian].
7. Telvak, Viktoriia. (2002). Problema periodyzatsii ukrainskoi istoriohrafii u pratsiakh Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [The problem of periodization of Ukrainian historiography in the works of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk. Vyp. VI. S. 395-406. [in Ukrainian].
8. Telvak, Viktoriia. (2003). Termin „istoriohrafia” ta predmet istorii istorichnoi nauky u spadshchyni Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [The term "historiography" and the subject of the history of historical science in the legacy of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. Ukrain'skyi istorichnyi zbirnyk. Vyp. 5. S. 404-423. [in Ukrainian].
9. Telvak, Viktoriia. (2011). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy – doslidnyk ukrainskoi istoriohrafii (teoretyko-metodolohichni aspekt) [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy – researcher of Ukrainian historiography (theoretical and methodological aspect)]. Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk. Vyp. XIV-XV. S. 264-273. [in Ukrainian].
10. 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].
11. Telvak, Vitalii. (2001). Teoretychni problemy istorii u tvorchi 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].
12. Telvak Vitalii. (2002). Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorichnykh 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].
13. Telvak, Vitalii. (2010). Hrushevskoznavstvo: metodolohichni problemy postupu [Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress]. Kraieznavstvo. № 3. S. 29-35. [in Ukrainian].
14. 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 XX th century]. Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk. Vyp. X. S. 348-358. [in Ukrainian].
15. Telvak, V. (2008). Tvorchyna spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 494 s. [in Ukrainian].