UDC 930.25:82-6:027.7(438)
DOI https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/83-1-2

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
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) bilasvitlana24@gmail.com

Viktoriia 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
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) viktoriatelvak75@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

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY AS A RESEARCHER OF UKRAINIAN ROMANTICISM (THE EXAMPLE OF M. MAKSYMOVYCH)

The purpose of the article is a comprehensive study of the historiographical heritage of M. Hrushevsky as a researcher of the creative and public activities of Mykhailo Maksymovych. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the special appeal to the historiographical heritage of M. Hrushevsky as an interpreter of the life and activities of M. Maksymovych. Conclusions. Summing up the features of M. Hrushevsky's research of the scientific and public activities of M. Maksymovych, we will first of all point out its leading ideological emphasis, which, without a doubt, was decisive for understanding his entire intellectual heritage. This is a consistent affirmation of the high standards of scientific research, proclaimed by Hrushevsky in the famous slogan nemini credere at the dawn of his scientific career, and since then consistently implemented in historiographic practice. Thanks to this worldview of M. Hrushevsky, historiographical works dedicated to the outstanding Ukrainian romantic (A Century of Ukrainian Narodniks, Maksimovych's "Little Russian Songs" and a Century of Ukrainian Scientific Work, The Development of Ukrainian Studies in the 19th Century and the Identification of the Main Issues of Ukrainian Studies, etc.) break with the long-standing apologetic tradition in the attitude towards the legacy of M. Maksimovich, which prevailed throughout the 19th century. In contrast to them, M. Hrushevsky's explorations appear as sketches of intellectual biography, which are characterized not so much by admiration for the phenomenality of the person under study as by attempts to recreate his biography in the context of the phenomena and events of Ukrainian cultural life of that time, to understand and explain to contemporaries both outstanding achievements and sometimes painful mistakes. Given this peculiarity of the discourse of Hrushevsky-the historiographer, his Maksimovych-related legacy has not lost its cognitive value to this day.

Key words: *M. Hrushevsky, Ukrainian romanticism, M. Maksymovych, historiography, reception.*

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) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com

Святослав ЖУРАВЛЬОВ,
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

МИХАЙЛО ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ ЯК ДОСЛІДНИК УКРАЇНСЬКОГО РОМАНТИЗМУ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ М. МАКСИМОВИЧА)

Метою статті є всебічне опрацювання історіографічної спадщини М. Грушевського як дослідника творчої та громадської діяльності Михайла Максимовича. 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 спеціальному зверненні до історіографічної спадщини М. Грушевського, як інтерпретатора подій життя та діяльність М. Максимовича. Висновки. Підсумовуючи особливості дослідження М. Грушевським наукової та громадської діяльності М. Максимовича, першочергово вкажемо на її провідний світоглядний акцент, який, поза сумнівом, був визначальним для розуміння всієї його інтелектуальної спадщини. Це – послідовне утвердження високих стандартів наукового пошуку, проголошених видатним дослідником у відомому гаслі nетіпі credere ще на зорі наукової кар'єри, і відтоді послідовно впроваджуваному в історіографічну практику. Завдяки такій світоглядній настанові М. Грушевського, присвячені видатному українському романтику історіографічні праці («Сто літ українського народництва», «"Малороссійскія песни" Максимовича і століття української наукової праці», «Розвиток українських досліджень у XIX столітті і вияви у них основних питань українознавства» та ін.), поривають з тривалою апологетичною традицією у ставленні до спадщини М. Максимовича, що панувала протягом XIX ст. На відміну від них, розвідки М. Грушевського постають нарисами інтелектуальної біографії, яким властиве не так захоплення феноменальністю досліджуваної особистості, як спроби відтворити її життєпис в контексті явищ і подій українського культурного життя того часу, зрозуміти та пояснити сучасникам не тільки визначні досягнення, але й почасти дошкульні помилки. З огляду на таку особливість дискурсу Грушевського-історіографа, його максимовичезнавча спадщина й по сьогодні не втратила своєї пізнавальної цінності.

Ключові слова: *М. Грушевський, український романтизм, М. Максимович, історіографія, рецепція.*

Problem statement. Historiographer Hrushevsky's research covers the development of Ukrainian historical thought from the time of Kyivan Rus to the first third of the 20th century. However, the most relevant, in our opinion, are the scholar's studies on the works of the most prominent Ukrainian historians of the 19th and early 20th centuries. However, the most relevant, in our opinion, are the scholar's studies on the works of the most prominent Ukrainian historians of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This is due to several reasons. First, the specified period is extremely important in forming domestic historical science, which at that time was undergoing complex processes of institutionalization and professionalisation. Secondly, the interested view of M. Hrushevsky himself – an active participant in the historiographical process of the time – on the scientific heritage of his predecessors and contemporaries is valuable. Thirdly, it seems essential to determine the real contribution of the scientist to the research of the scientific output of prominent Ukrainian historians of the 19th century. The modern renaissance of biohistoriographical studies also strengthens the attention to the personal studies of M. Hrushevsky. Unfortunately, to date, we only have M. Hrushevsky's evaluation of the heritage of M. Kostomarov and V. Antonovych (Telvak, Telvak, 2005). The views of the outstanding scientist on the work of representatives of Ukrainian romantic historiography – A. Skalkovsky, I. Sreznevsky, M. Markovych, D. Bantysh-Kamenskyi, M. Maksymovych and P. Kulish – remain practically unknown. However, according to M. Hrushevsky's conviction, it was their works that marked the beginning of both scientific Ukrainian studies in

general and modern Ukrainian historiography in particular. Drawing the attention of colleagues to this problem, below we reconstruct the process of understanding the legacy of M. Maksymovych by the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus".

Analysis of sources and recent research. The historiographic heritage of M. Hrushevsky, as well as his studies on the intellectual biographies of significant Ukrainian historians, attracted the attention of researchers for a long time. To one degree or another, such researchers of his work as Dmytro Doroshenko (Doroshenko, 1996: 83–86) and Dmytro Bagaliy (Bagaliy, 2001: 185–190) wrote about the Maksymovych knowledge of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus". Today, most of the historiographer's attempts to reproduce the biography of the outstanding romantic are discussed in several works by Ruslan Pyrigr (Pyrig, Telvak, 2016; Pyrig, Telvak, 2021), as well as Victoria and Vitalij Telvak (Telvak, 2002a; Telvak, 2006b; Telvak, 2008a; Telvak, Telvak, 2021). However, in the texts of these and other researchers, M. Hrushevsky's studies of Maksymovych are considered only in the general context of his bio-historiographical studies, without the necessary personal specialization. This determined the relevance of the topic of our research.

The purpose of the article is to summarize M. Hrushevsky's evaluations of the scientific and journalistic heritage of one of the brightest representatives of domestic romantic historiography – M. Maksymovych in the general context of the development of Ukrainian historical and scientific studies at the end of the 19th – the first third of the 20th century.

Presentation of the main material. Personal involvement in the organizational and ideological development of Ukrainian historical science, and acquaintance with many figures of national culture, determined the noticeable personal focus of historiographical interests of M. Hrushevsky (Telvak, 2002b; Telvak, 2006a). Personalia, without a doubt, was the favourite form of the scientist's historical and historiographic work, which is connected with the traditionality of this genre in the Ukrainian studies of the 19th century. and features of the author's vision of the role of the individual in the spiritual being of the people (Telvak, 2008b; Telvak, 2010). Let us pay attention to the methodological aspect of M. Hrushevsky's personal studies (Telvak, 2001; Telvak, 2000a; Telvak, 2000b). Aware of the need for such a genre of historiographical research, the scientist foresaw several difficulties on the way to its implementation. The most important thing for him was the need for an objective study of the scientific heritage of representatives of Ukrainian historiography, an effort to avoid "traditional suggestion", as the researcher wrote when determining the characteristic features of their creative biography. Completely in the spirit of positivist objectivism, he emphasized: "[...] The task should not be the formation of a legend, not the development of an iconic figure, but the true, historical knowledge of a valid, living, real unit that reflected an era in itself and influenced its development" (Hrushevsky, 1984a: 160).

The researcher begins the analysis of M. Maksymovych's creative heritage with the general characteristics of the contemporary domestic historiographical movement, which took place under the influence of romantic ideology. An important step in the study of Ukrainian romantic historiography was the Russian-language work of M. Hrushevsky "Development of Ukrainian studies in the 19th century and their identification of the main issues of Ukrainian studies". Focusing on the problems of the development of Ukrainian studies, the scientist closely connects the activities of Ukrainian romantics with the earlier movement of the so-called "antiquarians" – collectors of historical monuments and materials of Ukrainian historiography and folklore. For the first time, M. Hrushevsky draws attention to the connection between Ukrainian romanticism and the process of cultural and national revival in Ukraine. He considers such directions in Ukrainian studies as ethnography and folkloristics to be the creative work of Ukrainian romantic historiography. The scientist's romantic historiography is represented by many names – O. Martos, A. Chepa, A. Skalkovsky, I. Sreznevsky, D. Lomykovsky, M. Berlinsky, O. and M. Markovichiv, M. and D. Bantysh-Kamensky. However, in the genre of historical-scientific portrait, only the creative personality of the most prominent figure of that era – M. Maksymovych – is depicted.

For M. Hrushevsky, the figure of M. Maksymovych in Ukrainian studies of the 19th–20th centuries. has always been iconic. The researcher dates the beginning of not only the ideology of populism in Ukrainian studies but also scientific Ukrainian studies in general, to 1827 – the time of the appearance of the latter's "Little Russian songs". 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" (Hrushevskyi, 1984b: 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 defined 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. In the efforts of M. Dragomanov at the end of the century to rid Ukrainian studies of dilettantism and provincialism, the researcher saw the continuation of the work of the first Kyiv rector, the usual modernization of his theoretical ideas. "[...] His preface, – the scientist summed up, – in its embryonic, undeveloped state, gave a very broad program, not only collecting but also research, of Ukrainian poetry and traditionalists: not only in the formal direction but also in a relatively – ethnological and sociological. Not all of it was appropriately felt, realized and transferred into practice – some remained for a long time without attention and arose again as problems of research at the end of the century, or finally in our time. But it is interesting to note how much of what is before us as a task of research was contained in the embryonic state already in that manifesto of Ukrainian populism in 1827" (Hrushevsky, 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 (Doroshenko, 1996: 83).

Faithful to his methodological guidelines, M. Hrushevsky, first of all, 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 by chance, because, according to the researcher, 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." This approach enlivened the ethnographic work of the predecessors with new interests and tasks, gave it a distinct public sound, thereby determining the deep interest of subsequent generations of researchers of domestic intellectual life in the creative heritage of the Romantics.

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 M. Maksimovich. The most valuable thing for the followers of his cause was his revival of the Kyivan tradition, that is, the clarification of the main issues of our past from the Ukrainian national point of view, or, as M. Maksymovych himself figuratively wrote, from "the hill of Andrew the Apostle", which he contrasted with the view "from the Moscow heights of Ivan the Great". 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 called those theses by name, those views, those comparisons that our first rector gave" (Hrushevsky, 1984b: 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 national science. "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 quite widespread and authoritative in Russian Slavic studies was the understanding of the Ukrainian language as an artificial construction inspired by Polish influences. Arguing with Russian linguists, M. Maksimovich 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 significant supply of facts and in a completely scientific and methodical way. He proposed his own linguistic taxonomy, dividing Slavic languages and dialects into two halves: eastern and western, and the eastern half into two sections – southern and northern. The southern branch in his system is represented in the Ukrainian language. Emphasizing the fact that the name "Russian language" became the second name of Russian, although it originally belonged to the Kyiv region, and in this sense is still used in Western Ukraine, M. Maksymovych stated that this name should be considered equivalent to the term "East Slavic", as a generic name for three languages – Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian. The division of this group into separate parts took place even in "ancient times". Further, the professor, on the basis of large-scale folklore, ethnographic and linguistic studies, proposed a hypothesis about the Kyiv Dnieper Ukraine region as the organizational center of the Ukrainian language. 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 Cossack times, but traces its origins back to the ancient Kiev era.

M. Hrushevsky 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. Maksymovych. As in the previous case, the evolution of M. Maksymovych'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." He noted the scientist's contribution to the development of several key scientific problems: the beginnings of the Ukrainian ethnos; the nature and consequences of the Tatar invasion of Kyiv region in the middle of the 13th century; migration processes in the Old Russian era; distinguishing between the Kyiv and Lithuanian-Polish eras of Ukrainian history. 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. Maksymovych's studies on ancient Russian chronicles. According to the researcher, their motivation was the need to comprehensively justify 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. Maksymovych'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."

It is clear that these moments do not exhaust the value of M. Maksymovych's historical studies. M. Hrushevsky also mentions other important scientific achievements of the scientist for the formation of national historiography: the study of the history of brotherhoods; studies on the Cossack language and Cossack chronicles; researches on Haidamachchyna; articles from the past of the Hetmanate that influenced the concepts of O. Lazarevsky's school; opinions about Ukrainian literature of the 19th century. etc. In all these works, the researcher noted, "precious love for national history, for the national underpinning of all these historical manifestations of its life, and, on the other hand, admiration for the historical process as a whole: its longness and continuity, which does not allow itself to be overwhelmed by inadequacies and with the incoherence of social relations so much as not to add positive manifestations of the living and constructive national element to all of that" (Hrushevsky, 1984b: 143). However, in his opinion, the most significant contribution of the Kyiv professor to the treasury of our culture was the proven originality and independence of the Ukrainian historical process. We note that quite similar to M. Hrushevsky's theses, D. Bagaliy also wrote about the epochal nature of Maksymovych's creative

heritage for national historiography. According to his conviction, the scientist's studies "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 Kyiv times" (Bagalii, 2001: 222). In line with the ideas of M. Hrushevsky, his brother Oleksandr (Hrushevskyi, 1906) also conducted the study of M. Maksymovych's work.

Investigating the domestic intellectual process of the first half of the 19th century, M. Hrushevsky noted the special controlling 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. Maksymovych, 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 Zaporozhian Antiquity back to the reliable ground of facts" (Hrushevsky, 1990: 30). It is interesting that D. Doroshenko also wrote about the "usefulness of the highly developed critical sense" of the first Kyiv rector for the formation of young national humanitarianism (Doroshenko, 1996: 85).

Secondly, it turned out to be extremely difficult and dangerous for a high-ranking government official, such as M. Maksymovych, 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 the fundamental natural worldview of M. Maksymovych, which resulted in a deep understanding of the necessity and priority of detailed scientific studies. "Maksymovych, a naturalist," noted the scientist, "completely transferred realistic, laboratory methods into his historical and philological work, which he translated under the guise of religious and official-patriotic phraseology" (Hrushevsky, 1984b: 137). That is why he was so highly valued by another outstanding Ukrainian historian-naturalist, V. Antonovych, naturally a physician in his scientific training.

Despite the high assessment of M. Maksymovych 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 social conservatism of the scientist 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. Maksymovych] 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.

It is notable that in many of his characterizations of M. Maksymovych's work, as well as other Ukrainian historians, M. Hrushevsky quite often refers to the assessments of M. Dragomanov, expressed by him in his obituary and a number of articles. Sometimes the researcher cites even significant quotes from the works of the latter, formulating his own attitude to the legacy of the first rector of Kyiv. So, for example, M. Hrushevsky fully agrees with M. Dragomanov's thesis regarding the defining ideas of M. Maksymovych's work – "the nation as the goal and subject of scientific research and cultural work, and the continuity of its historical tradition as the leading thread in any scientific orientation" (Hrushevsky, 1984b: 136). It is these ideas, emphasized M. Hrushevsky following M. Dragomanov, that pass not only through the fifty-year-old work of the outstanding scientist, but also through the hundred-year-old populist tradition inspired by him. To a large extent, thanks to M. Maksymovych, the slogan of this tradition became the thesis "everything from the people, through the people and for the people." "There were several moments in Maksymovych's scientific studies where he came close to this thesis," wrote M. Hrushevsky, "he gave several unusually valuable for his time and unforgettable in the history of Ukrainian science models of scientific investigation of issues from this position, thanks to them he became one from luminaries not only of historical and philological Ukrainian work, but also of the Ukrainian movement

in general" (Hrushevsky, 1984b: 136). Such a theoretical guideline of M. Maksymovych and his like-minded people, the researcher noted, led to thorough research of various aspects of the social and cultural evolution of the Ukrainian people from the beginning of its historical existence and caused the success of the national historiography of the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries.

Summing up his research on M. Maksymovych's contribution to Ukrainian culture, M. Hrushevsky joins the statement of M. Dragomanov, who, paraphrasing the Pushkin characterization of M. Lomonosov, called the first Kyiv rector "an entire learned historical and philological institution."

Conclusions. M. Hrushevsky's studies on the work of M. Maksymovych 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. Summing up the reception of M. Hrushevsky as a scholar of maxims, let us first of all pay attention to its leading feature, which, in our opinion, is decisive for the spirit of the scientist's entire historiographical legacy. This is the understanding of the priority of the interests of science, embodied in the well-known slogan of the most outstanding researcher – nemini credere, proclaimed by him at the dawn of his scientific career and consistently applied in practice. Thanks to such a critical stance, the historiographical works of M. Hrushevsky, dedicated to his outstanding predecessor ("Little Russian songs" by Maksymovich and a century of Ukrainian scientific work, "One hundred years of Ukrainian nationalism", "Development of Ukrainian studies in the 19th century and their revelation of the main issues of Ukrainian studies», etc.), deviate from the previous apologetic tradition in his perception, and appear as attempts at intellectual biography, which are characterized not so much by admiration for the greatness of the studied figure, but by an effort to show him in the context of the processes and events of the Ukrainian nineteenth century, to reveal and explain to the reader not only outstanding achievements, but also often unfortunate miscalculations (Тельвак, 2008). This methodological approach of M. Hrushevsky turned out to be extremely fruitful and largely explains the long-term popularity of his maximal scientific observations, which have not lost their influence even today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Багалій Д. І. *Вибрані праці: У 6 т. Т. 2: Джерелознавство та історіографія історії України*. Х.: Золоті сторінки, 2001. 455 с.
2. Грушевський А. С. М. А. Максимович (1804–1873). Из украинской историографии XIX в. *Известия Отделения русского языка и словестности Императорской Академии Наук*. 1906. Т. XI. В. 1. С. 375–416.
3. Грушевський М. "Малороссійскія песни" Максимовича і століття української наукової праці. *Український історик*. 1984b. № 1–4. С. 113–142.
4. Грушевський М. Костомаров і новітня Україна. *Український історик*, 1984a. № 1–4. С. 148–170.
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. Сто літ українського народництва. *Первісне громадянство та його пережитки на Україні. Науковий щорічник за 1927 рік*. 1928. С. 1–3, 3–8.
7. Дорошенко Д. *Огляд української історіографії*. К.: Вид-во "Українознавство", 1996. 241 с.
8. Пиріг Р., Тельвак В. *Михайло Грушевський: біографічний нарис*. Київ : Либідь, 2016. 455 с.
9. Пиріг Р., Тельвак В. *Михайло Грушевський: життєпис на тлі доби*. Херсон: Видавництво ОЛДІ-ПЛЮС, 2021. 464 с.
10. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
11. Тельвак В. Діяльність Михайла Грушевського еміграційної доби в дискусіях першої половини 20-х років. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні.* 2008a. Вип. 18. С. 181–203.
12. Тельвак В. Історико-теоретичні дослідження в грушевськознавстві (90-ті рр. XX ст.). *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: Наукові записки ДДПУ*. 2000b. Вип. 5. С. 163–174.
13. Тельвак В. Методологічні основи історичних поглядів М.С.Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття). *Київська Старовина*. 2002b. № 2. С. 3–28.
14. Тельвак В. Постать Михайла Грушевського в польській історіографії (кінець XIX–XX ст.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006a. № 5. С. 67–82.
15. Тельвак В. Проблеми історико-теоретичної спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (1939–1990 рр.). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. 2000a. Вип. 35–36. С. 354–366.
16. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ–Дрогобич: «Вимір», 2008b. 494 с.
17. Тельвак В. Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття). Дрогобич: «Вимір», 2002a. 236 с.
18. Тельвак В. Теоретичні проблеми історії в творчій спадщині М. Грушевського – рецензента. *Київська старовина*. 2001. № 5. С. 157–166.

19. Тельвак В. В. Науково-популярні праці Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях початку XX століття. *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2006b. Вип. X. С. 348–358.

20. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.

21. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. *Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії*. Київ-Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.

REFERENCES

1. Bagaliy, D. I. (2001). *Vybrani pratsi: U 6 t. T. 2: Dzhereloznavstvo ta istoriohrafiia istorii Ukrainy [Selected works: In 6 volumes, Volume 2: Source studies and historiography of the history of Ukraine]*. Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].

2. Hrushevskyi, A. S. (1906). M. A. Maksymovych (1804-1873). Yz ukraynskoi ystoryohrafyy XIX v. [M. A. Maksymovich (1804–1873). From the Ukrainian historiography of the 19th century]. *Yzvestyia Otdelenyia russkoho yazыka y slovesnosty Akademyy nauk*. T. XI. Kn. 1. S. 375–416. [in Ukrainian].

3. Hrushevskyi, M. (1928). Sto lit ukrainskoho narodnytstva [One hundred years of Ukrainian nationalism]. *Pervisne hromadianstvo ta yoho perezhytky na Ukraini. Naukovyi shchorichnyk za 1927 rik*. Vyp. 1–3. S. 4–8. [in Ukrainian].

4. Hrushevskyi, M. (1984a). Kostomarov i novitnia Ukraina [Kostomarov and modern Ukraine]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk – Ukrainian historian*, 1–4, 148–170. [in Ukrainian].

5. Hrushevskyi, M. (1984b). «Malorossiiskiia pesny» Maksymovycha i stolittia ukrainskoi naukovoi pratsi [Maksymovich's "Malorossiyskie pesni" and a century of Ukrainian scientific work]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. № 1–4. S. 132–147. [in Ukrainian].

6. Hrushevskyi, M. (1990). Rozvytok ukrainskykh doslidzhen u KhIKh stolitti i vyiavy u nykh osnovnykh pytan ukrainoznavstva [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].

7. Doroshenko, D. (1996). *Ohliad ukrainskoi istoriohrafii [Overview of Ukrainian historiography]*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

8. Pyrig, R., Telvak, V. (2016). *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: biohrafichnyi narys [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: biographical essay]*. Kyiv : Lybid, 455 s. [in Ukrainian].

9. Pyrig, R., Telvak, V. (2021). *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: zhyttiepys na tli doby [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: biography against the background of the times]*. Kherson [in Ukrainian].

10. Telvak, V. (2000a). Problemy istoryko-teoretychnoi spadshchyny Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v istoriohrafii ukrainskoi diaspory (1939–1990 rr.) [Problem`s of the historical and theoretical heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora (1939–1990)]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia istorychna.* Vyp. 35–36. S. 354–366. [in Ukrainian].

11. 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 DDPU.* Vyp. 5. S. 163–174. [in Ukrainian].

12. Telvak, V. (2001). Teoretychni problemy istorii v tvorchii spadshchyni M. Hrushevskoho – retsenzenta [Theoretical problems of history in the creative heritage of M. Hrushevskyi – the reviewer]. *Kyivska starovyna.* № 5. S. 157–166. [in Ukrainian].

13. Telvak, V. (2002a). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorychnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia) [Theoretical and methodological bases of historical views of Mykhailo Hrushevsky (end of the XIX-beginning of the XX century)]*. Drohobych. 236 s. [in Ukrainian].

14. Telvak, V. (2002b). Metodolohichni osnovy istorychnykh pohliadiv M.S.Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia) [Methodological foundations of historical views of M. S. Hrushevskyi (end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century)]. *Kyivska Starovyna.* № 2. S. 3–28. [in Ukrainian].

15. Telvak, V. (2006a). Postat Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v polskii istoriohrafii (kinets XIX–XX st.) [The figure of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in Polish historiography (late 19th-20th centuries)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal.* № 5. С. 67–82. [in Ukrainian].

16. Telvak, V. (2008a). Diialnist Mykhaila Hrushevskoho emihratsiinoi doby v dyskusiiakh pershoi polovyny 20-kh rokiv [The activities of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi during the emigration period in the discussions of the first half of the 20s.]. *Istoriohrafi chni doslidzhennia v Ukraini.* Vyp. 18. S. 181–203. [in Ukrainian].

17. Telvak, V. (2008b). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Mykhailo Hrushevsky's creative heritage in the estimations of contemporaries (end of the XIX – 30s of the XX century)]*. Kyiv–Drohobych. 494 s. [in Ukrainian].

18. Telvak, V. V., Telvak, V. P. (2021). Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy [Modern Hrushesky studies: achievements, losses, prospects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal.* № 5. S. 4–16. [in Ukrainian].

19. Telvak, V. V. (2006b). 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]. *Drohobytskyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*. Vyp. X. S. 348–358. [in Ukrainian].

20. Telvak, Viktoriia, & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi yak doslidnyk ukrainskoi istoriohrafii* [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography]. Kyiv-Drohobych. 334 s. [in Ukrainian].

21. Telvak, Vitalii. (2010). Hrushevskoznavstvo: metodolohichni problemy postupu [Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress]. *Kraieznavstvo*. № 3. S. 29–35. [in Ukrainian].