

УДК 930(477)(092)“18/19”:930(100=161.2)

DOI 10.69550/3041-1467.7.333202

Mykhailo SABINSKYI

PhD (History), Security Service of Ukraine, 33 Volodymyrska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01601 (mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0001-6059-4646

Roman KRUCHAK

Postgraduate Student, Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (krb0679223597@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0009-0009-9929-8399

Hryhorii BONDARENKO

Postgraduate Student, Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (gregsergbond@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0009-0004-5939-9738

Михайло САБІНСЬКИЙ

кандидат історичних наук, Служба безпеки України, вул. Володимирська, 33, Київ, Україна, індекс 01601 (mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com)

Роман КРУЧАК

аспірант кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (krb0679223597@gmail.com)

Григорій БОНДАРЕНКО

аспірант кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (gregsergbond@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Sabinskyi, M., Kruchak, R., & Bondarenko, H. (2025). Teoretychna spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v osmyslenni ukrainykykh diaspornykh intelektualiv [The theoretical heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the understanding of Ukrainian diaspora intellectuals]. *Axis Europae*, 7, 28–39. doi: 10.69550/3041-1467.7.333202

Бібліографічний опис статті: Сабінський, М., Кручак, Р., Бондаренко, Г. (2025). Теоретична спадщина Михайла Грушевського в осмисленні українських діаспорних інтелектуалів. *Axis Europae*, 7, 28–39. doi: 10.69550/3041-1467.7.333202

TEORETYCHNA SPADSHCHYNA MYKHAILA HRUSHEVSKOHO V OSMYSLENNI UKRAINSKYKH DIASPORNYKH INTELEKTUALIV

Abstract. *The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the discussions that took place in Ukrainian foreign historiography around the theoretical legacy of M. Hrushevsky. The research methodology applies the principles of historicism and objectivity, as well as general scientific and special-historical methods of historiographical research. The scientific novelty of the article is to comprehensively reconstruct historiographical discussions around the historiosophical views of M. Hrushevsky among Ukrainian diaspora intellectuals. Conclusions.* In conclusion, we note the considerable interest of Ukrainian foreign historians in the conceptual heritage of M. Hrushevsky. This interest had both pragmatic and purely historiographical aspects. It was about the need to contrast the militant Soviet imperial rhetoric about the historical conditionality of the political unity of the Eastern Slavs with the Ukrainian-centric scheme, which would have a tradition of wide historiographical reception and proper source-scientific justification. And here is the scheme of M. Hrushevsky fully proved his instrumental suitability for the struggle against imperialists of all national varieties, just as the scientist himself did at the beginning of the 20th century. On the other hand, there was an urgent need to rethink the experience of the Liberation Struggle in the context of the new post-war world order and clarify the current national tasks. And here the concept of M. Hrushevsky became the starting point for such reflections, the evaluative vector of which was determined by the ideology professed by intellectuals. But despite some skepticism or even criticism of certain provisions of the scheme of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus", it was unanimously recognized as the most coherent justification of the historical continuity of our people. Understanding the conceptual legacy of the Great Ukrainian, diaspora historians gradually got rid of ideological invectives, thereby giving impetus to the institutionalization of Hrushevsky studies in the next period.

Keywords: M. Hrushevsky, theoretical heritage, diaspora intellectuals, Ukrainian historiography abroad, reception.

ТЕОРЕТИЧНА СПАДЩИНА МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В ОСМИСЛЕННІ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ДІАСПОРНИХ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛІВ

Анотація. *Метою статті є реконструкція дискусій, котрі відбувалися в українській закордонній історіографії довкола теоретичної спадщини М. Грушевського. Методологія дослідження передбачає використання принципів історизму й об'єктивності, а також загальнонаукових і спеціально-історичних методів історіографічного дослідження. Наукова новизна статті – всебічно реконструювати історіографічні дискусії довкола історіософських поглядів М. Грушевського в середовищі українських діаспорних інтелектуалів. Висновки.* У підсумку відзначено, що в середовищі українських закордонних істориків чималою була зацікавленість теоретичною спадщиною М. Грушевського. Така запитаність була зумовлена як прагматичними, так і суто історіографічними обставинами. Мовилося про потребу заперечити войовничу радянську імперську риторичку про одвічну політичну єдність східних слов'ян шляхом протиставлення їй україноцентричної схеми, яка б мала практику широкого історіографічного обговорення й адекватне джерелознавче узагальнення. І тут теоретична модель М. Грушевського продемонструвала свій інструментальний потенціал для протистояння з імперіалізмами всіх національних

відтінків, подібно до того, як це робив сам історик протягом перших десятиліть ХХ ст. З іншого боку, гострою була необхідність переосмислення періоду Визвольних змагань у контексті нових повоєнних реалій світу та визначення першочергових національних завдань. І в цьому випадку історіософія М. Грушевського стала вихідним моментом для такого осмислення, оціночний вектор якого зумовлювала обрана інтелектуалами ідеологія. Незважаючи на певний скепсис чи подекуди критику деяких складових концепції автора «Історії України-Руси», вона солідарно була атестована найбільш струнким узагальненням історичної тривалості нашої нації. Осмислюючи теоретичний доробок М. Грушевського, закордонні інтелектуали поступово відмовлялися від ідеологічної риторики, чим створили імпульс для інституціалізації грушевськознавчих студій у наступний період.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, теоретична спадщина, діаспорні інтелектуали, українська закордонна історіографія, реценція.

Problem Statement. In modern Hrushevsky studies, a fair conviction has been established that the traditions of scientific study of the life and activities of the Great Ukrainian were established in the post-war period by the efforts of those domestic intellectuals who were lucky enough to be on the other side of the “iron curtain” (Тельвак, 2010). With this in mind, a lot has been written today about the institutional, personnel and conceptual components of diasporic Hrushevsky studies. On the other hand, some plots of foreign Hrushevskiana continue to be elucidated rather fragmentarily, because in historiographical works the biographical discourse clearly dominates as opposed to the problematic one. In our investigation, we would like to draw attention to one of the undervalued, in our opinion, subjects of discussions of Hrushevsky studies in Ukrainian foreign historiography – the complex process of rethinking the historical concept of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” (Тельвак, Тельвак, 2021). At the same time, let’s turn to the little-known period of the post-war twenty years, because diaspora Hrushevskiana is usually studied from 1966, when the emergence of a new interdisciplinary direction of Ukrainian studies was announced.

The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the discussions that took place in Ukrainian foreign historiography around the theoretical legacy of M. Hrushevsky.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Diasporic Hrushevskiana today has an impressive historiography. It also found a place for clarifying the contribution of Ukrainian foreign historians to the rethinking of the theoretical legacy of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. In particular, Alla Atamanenko briefly outlined this problem in her monograph dedicated to the Ukrainian Historical Society (Atamanenko, 2010). The diaspora discourse of the theoretical Hrushevskiana was studied in the most detail today in Vitaliy Telvak’s monographs (Telvak, 2002b; Telvak, 2008a) and a his number of articles (Telvak, 2002a; Telvak, & Telvak, 2005; Telvak, 2006; Telvak, 2008a), and in article Mykola Haliv, Vasyl Ilnytskyi (Haliv, & Ilnytskyi, 2024). However, in these works, the authors, in accordance with their research task, focused on the methodological component of diasporic Hrushevskiana. Instead, the problem of the conceptual plan was touched upon mostly casually. Also, these and other researchers focused mostly on the literature of 1966 – 1989, referring fragmentarily to earlier publications (Pyrig, & Telvak, 2016; Pyrig, & Telvak, 2021). These circumstances determined the relevance of the topic of our research.

Presentation of the main material. In the first post-war years, Ukrainian historians in the free world faced the situation of aggressive imposition by Soviet social scientists of the imperial scheme of the Eastern European historical process. In it, as is known, the Ukrainian

past was completely dissolved in the all-Russian narrative, thus legitimizing the “naturalness” of Ukrainian lands being part of the Soviet state. In view of such an intellectual challenge, Ukrainian humanitarians abroad began to actively popularize the historical scheme of M. Hrushevsky, as the most modern model of our past, offering new arguments from his own research to support it.

In order to familiarize Western colleagues with the conceptual visions of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”, in 1952 in the “Annals” of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in the USA, for the first time, an English translation of the well-known work “The Conventional Scheme of “Russian” History and the Case for a Rational Structure of the History of the Eastern Slavs” was published (Hrushevsky, 1952). Considerable popularization of the conceptual ideas of M. Hrushevsky was also helped by the reprinting of the “History of Ukraine-Rus” during 1954 – 1958. The appearance of these works became a kind of impetus for the Ukrainian foreign historians themselves to rethink the historiosophical legacy of the Great Ukrainian, taking into account the new socio-political circumstances and intellectual challenges of the post-war years. However, for some time, such an understanding was on the sidelines of generalizing works about the prominent historian, which appeared in the second half of the 1940s – at the beginning of the 1950s.

For the first time in the studied period, specifically to the problem of the conceptual heritage of M. Hrushevsky addressed in his preface to the first volume of the republished “History of Ukraine-Rus” Borys Krupnytsky, a well-known representative of the statist direction. The appearance of the first volume became a remarkable event in the intellectual life of the Ukrainian diaspora, and the publishers timed it to the twentieth anniversary of the death of a prominent historian. Already at the beginning of his research, the author turned to the problem of the origins of the theoretical views of M. Hrushevsky, rightly pointing out the special significance of the influence of Volodymyr Antonovych. It was at his school, the researcher claims, that the young historian received “thorough methodological training” (Крупницький, 1954, с. I–II).

Moving on to the direct analysis of the historical concept of M. Hrushevsky, B. Krupnytsky called it “precious” at the very beginning, pointing to the innovative character and revolutionary influence of the “Normal scheme...” on Ukrainian historiography in the following decades. The historiographer demonstrates in detail to the reader the originality and logic of the historical thinking of the prominent historian, which made his model widely used among Ukrainian researchers of the past and over time gained more and more sympathizers among Russian intellectuals unencumbered by the imperial syndrome. “In this way, a great deal was accomplished, – concludes B. Krupnytsky. – M. Hrushevsky grounded and introduced into scholarly life the unique scheme of the history of the Ukrainian people in the whole space of its historical life in the territory inhabited by it, as one continuous and inseparable process. This scheme was accepted by all Ukrainian historians, old and new, populists and statesmen. [...] Thanks to Hrushevsky’s scheme, the main national line was determined” (Krupnytsky, 1954, p. XXIII).

Then B. Krupnytsky considers the functioning of the model of M. Hrushevsky in the Ukrainian intellectual space of the first half of the 20th century. In particular, drawing attention to the fact that the Lviv students of the scientist disagreed with him on many historiosophical issues, he emphasizes the complete approbation of the teacher’s historical scheme by Galician historians. Historians-statesmen in the interwar period also fully accepted this concept, while trying to fill it with new content in the spirit of conservative ideology. What’s more, the arguments set forth in the “Normal Scheme” found full acceptance in

the young Ukrainian Marxist historiography, whose representatives only tried to replace national accents with class-economic ones (Krupnytsky, 1954, p. XIV). With this in mind, the researcher certifies the model of Ukrainian history by M. Hrushevsky “a kind of flag of national awareness”, because it contained the tendency towards secession, separation, rather than rapprochement with Moscow, demanded by conscious Ukrainians. “It is this trend that has greatly captivated all circles of Ukrainian historians and non-historians [...]”, emphasizes B. Krupnytsky (Krupnytsky, 1954, p. XIV).

At the same time, the researcher notes, despite the real revolutionary nature and good theoretical and source validity of the historical model of M. Hrushevsky, she “paved only the first paths.” The historiographer emphasizes that the scheme of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” must be filled with “real content, today in the spirit of statism.” B. Krupnytsky substantiates his statement with the fact that Ukrainian statehood existed for a long time: in the Kyivan period, during the Galicia-Volyn principality, as a common tradition in the Lithuanian-Russian state, as a Cossack state, and as a modern attempt at Ukrainian statehood in 1917 – 1921. Undoubtedly, he admits that M. Hrushevsky is partially right. According to a researcher, there is no such gravity as the history of the people, but there is a sufficient connection. B. Krupnytsky emphasizes: “We feel connected to these old types of Ukrainian statehood.[...] We all come from the national-people scheme of M. Hrushevsky, but right now we are putting forward the moments of the state existence of Ukraine” (Krupnytsky, 1954, p. XXIII–XXIV).

Then B. Krupnytsky tries to solve the important problem of the hierarchy of driving forces of history in the concept of an outstanding scientist. Following his student Vasyl Gerasymuk, he notes that in the understanding of M. Hrushevsky Ukrainian historical life was filled with numerous social tensions, economic conflicts, cultural struggles, “legal difficulties” and changes. The historiographer certifies the scientist as a convinced evolutionist, for whom the historical process was filled with power and dynamics, which, he aptly adds, ultimately “corresponded to his own energetic nature”.

Touching upon the difficult issue of the leading drivers of the historical process, B. Krupnytsky quite justifiably points out that as a supporter of the positivist theory of factors, M. Hrushevsky did not give absolute priority to any of the factors, he believed that only in the complex they determined the course and content of the Ukrainian past. In view of this, the historiographer rejects the criticisms of M. Hrushevsky’s alleged fascination with historical materialism, claiming that he “didn’t like extreme views at all.” Moreover, says B. Krupnytsky, it is in the texts of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” that we notice a tendency to balance various historical factors. In particular, political and state life in the understanding of M. Hrushevsky, it is self-evidently a very important factor, but next to the political factor there are economic and cultural factors, which gain more or less importance, but in any case are not somewhere behind the political factor. It should be noted that modern studies on the historiosophical model of M. Hrushevsky fully confirm the correctness of these conclusions of B. Krupnytsky (Telvak, 2002, pp. 85–120).

Summing up his observations on the theoretical heritage of M. Hrushevsky, the historiographer, reiterates that the importance of his main idea about the durability and continuity of the Ukrainian historical process was enormous and remains so to this day. The very author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” B. Krupnytsky rightly certifies himself as an objective historian who never falsified the testimony of sources to suit any doctrine. At the same time, with his historical work, among his contemporaries, M. Hrushevsky contributed the most to the rapid growth of self-awareness among a wide circle of Ukrainians, their

transformation from an ethnographic community into a modern nation. “His historical trial and condemnation was based on a solid national Ukrainian ideology,” the historiographer emphasizes. – For him, as a Ukrainian patriot, Ukraine and its national and people’s interests were a self-evident starting point” (Krupnytsky, 1954, p. XXVII). Summarizing the observations of Hrushevsky studies by B. Krupnytsky, let’s pay attention to the absence of political rhetoric that was common in emigration at that time, when from the historical views of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” the logic of the defeat of the Liberation Struggle was necessarily deduced. With this academicism, the intelligence of an authoritative sympathizer of the ideology of the hetman camp differed favorably from the texts of some of his ideological colleagues.

The studio of Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, an outstanding representative of statist historiography, was marked by similar academicism, dedicated to understanding the conceptual foundations of modern Russian and Ukrainian historiography (Polonska-Vasylenko, 1964). Imposing on the observations of B. Krupnytsky, the researcher also emphasizes the special significance of the concept of M. Hrushevsky for the formation of the Ukrainian Clio of the 20th century, calling the article “Usual scheme...” “a turning point in Russian historiography.” At the same time, finding out the sources of conceptual inspirations of the outstanding historian, she rightly notes that the scheme of M. Hrushevsky could appear “only thanks to the experiments of predecessors, whose synthesis it is.” Analyzing in detail the historiographical logic of the scheme of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”, N. Polonska-Vasylenko emphasizes its slenderness and comprehensive source validity. Thanks to this, in a short time she became a classic model for Ukrainian humanitarians and won many sympathizers among their Russian and Western colleagues, prompting in some places to rethink established national historiographical concepts.

Discussions about the reasons for the defeat of the Liberation Struggle, which took place among the Ukrainian diaspora in the post-war period, could not help but influence the politicization of the historiographical, and indeed, the Hrushevsky studies discourse. An eloquent example here can be Lev Bilas’s brilliant intellectual essay “The Crisis of Our Image of History.” In it, certifying the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” as “the creator of the complete scheme of the historical process”, the researcher, at the same time, focuses on the allegedly “anti-state” orientation of his model. L. Bilas means the noticed M. Hrushevsky’s antinomy of the social system in the ancient Russian state, when the needs of the community often conflicted with the interests of the prince and his entourage. As is well known, the outstanding historian traces such a conflict of interests to further periods of the Ukrainian past, emphasizing its destructive influence on our nation. Exposure of this conflict, the author of the essay believes, had an unhelpful effect on the state-building intentions of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the era of the Liberation Struggle. Following other adherents of conservative ideology, he emphasizes: “Such a sharp opposition of “state” and “society” in the image of history perceived by our intelligentsia had great and mostly negative consequences” (Bilas, 2002, p. 31).

Investigating the intellectual genesis of the historical scheme of M. Hrushevsky, L. Bilas portrays him as an unconditional follower of Ukrainian populists, whose ideas he synthesized and most fully expounded in his well-known article on the scheme of Eastern European history. The historiographer justifiably explains the populist accents in the work of the outstanding historian, as well as his followers, with the negative experience of the long stay of Ukrainians in non-national states, whose elites consistently denied the very existence of Ukrainian identity. This negation, notes L. Bilas, had a harmful projection on its own statehood.

Similar to B. Krupnytsky, L. Bilas highlights the historical optimism of the scheme of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” as its leading feature. He emphasizes that the belief in “eternal progress” is the axis of his worldview, which determines the construction vector of other components of the historiosophical concept. Among them, the historiographer pays the most attention to the problem of the role of a prominent person in history and the relationship between the “hero” and society in general. L. Bilas writes: “[...] The highest values in the image of the history of Hrushevsky and the populists are the people, society, humanity, eternal progress, the dynamics of moving forward, a future in which general equality and freedom, self-government, democracy will be realized [...]” (Bilas, 2002, p. 39). In the end, the thinker comes to the interesting conclusion that “the key concepts of Hrushevsky’s image of history appeared as a consequence of the secularization of the Christian theology of history created by Eusebius of Caesarea, St. Augustine, Joachim of Fiore and Bossuet” (Bilas, 2002, p. 34). It should be noted that this observation was fully accepted by subsequent researchers of M. Hrushevsky’s historiosophy.

The most complete theoretical views of M. Hrushevsky was analyzed in his doctoral dissertation by another prominent representative of state historiography, Yaroslav Pelensky. In 1957 at the University of Munich, he defended his doctorate on the topic “Ukrainian national opinion in the light of the work of M. Hrushevsky and V. Lypinsky”, which was soon published in book format. Approaching the understanding of conceptual innovations M. Hrushevsky, Y. Pelensky noted that he faced two main historiographical challenges: 1) to synthesize the scheme of the Ukrainian past, based on the achievements of his predecessors, and 2) to fit the Ukrainian past into the Eastern European historical process. These tasks, rightly asserts the researcher, demanded the priority of “de-Russianization” of the Ukrainian historical narrative, just as in the second half of the 19th century. V. Antonovych carried out the “denationalization” of our past. “In order to embody the need for a universal history of Ukraine, – believes Y. Pelensky, he had to offer a significant scientific idea” (Pelensky, 2019, p. 33). This was done at that time by a professor from Lviv in the well-known article “The usual scheme of “Russian” history...”. The author of the dissertation devotes a lot of attention to the analysis of this text, which is significant for Ukrainian historiography, generally in solidarity with the outstanding historian.

Text by M. Hrushevsky, his researcher rightly notes, was significantly influenced by the positivist rationalist methodology. And that is why it was difficult for supporters of the old Russian historiographical concept, in which hypothetical constructions dominated source evidence, to argue with him. The Ukrainian historian himself put the scheme proposed by him into the basis of his own scientific creativity, thus proving its practical instrumentality. The heart of this scheme is proposed by M. Hrushevsky’s periodization of Ukrainian history, which according to Y. Pelensky, is “in force to this day”. We note that quite correctly analyzing the conceptual views of M. Hrushevsky, the researcher of his work did not avoid noticeable politicization of his historiographical discourse. In particular, completely correctly explaining the logic of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” in defining him as the main object of the Ukrainian historical process of the people and its social and cultural evolution, Y. Pelensky extrapolates this situation to the scientist’s political practice. Completely in the spirit of the hetman’s criticism of the activities of the head of the Central Rada at that time, he asserts: “Here, among other things, the anti-state trend in the political thinking of Mykhailo Hrushevsky himself is rooted” (Pelensky, 2019, p. 37).

Despite such frankly unscientific invective, Y. Pelensky extremely highly assessed the national and cultural significance of the “Normal scheme of “Russian” history...”. According

to his valid conviction, the epochal significance of M. Hrushevsky's role as a historian for the formation of Ukrainian national thinking lies in the fact that it was he who, first of all, examined and combined the history of Kyivan Rus and its statehood exclusively with Ukrainian history. Secondly, that it is the continuity of Ukrainian history from the time of Rus' through the Galicia-Volyn state, the era of the Cossacks until the 19th century made the main topic of his scientific research. And finally, thirdly, that he also provided evidence of the historical presence of the Ukrainian people and its institutions for the times of statelessness. Thus, M. Hrushevsky brought national thinking out of the realm of ahistoricity.

Also in his studio Y. Pelensky addressed in detail the important, but at that time, practically unknown problem of the reception of the historical scheme of M. Hrushevsky in the historiography of his time. The researcher once again pointed out that the positivist academic culture of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus" attracted a lot of sympathizers to his historical scheme, because it was practically devoid of the then popular nationalistic coloring. The historiographer cites examples that even representatives of German historiography, who were traditionally sympathizers of Russian historiosophy, in the persons of Otto Goech and Hans Koch, recognized the validity of the conceptual arguments of M. Hrushevsky. In the case of Ukrainian historians, the proposed scheme was generally accepted unanimously as the most complete synthesis of the theoretical searches of the classics of Ukrainian studies of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The most consistent validity of the historical scheme of M. Hrushevsky was supported by his Lviv students (M. Korduba, I. Krypyakevich, V. Gerasymchuk, etc.), who approved it as "the leading thread of Ukrainian scientific studies" (Korduba, 1932, p. 383). "New interpretations and new information appeared," writes Y. Pelensky, – however, the scheme continued to be a unifying factor for all modern Ukrainian historiography" (Pelensky, 2019, p. 41). This is evidenced by the fact that supporters of the statist historiosophy of Vyacheslav Lypinsky and the ideology of the hetman camp (for example, D. Doroshenko and B. Krupnytskyi) fully accepted the scheme of their political opponent. However, at the same time, they partly filled it with other ideological content and made other semantic accents.

Then I. Pelensky covers in detail the content of M. Hrushevsky's scheme from early historical times to the era of national revival in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Regarding each considered period, the researcher outlines the main historical actors, as well as the leading trends of social and cultural evolution. And in this part of the work, the historiographer tries to show the connection between the historical discourse of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus" and his social and political practice of the Socialist revolutionaries character. For example, we will cite the comment of Y. Pelensky regarding the well-known assessment of M. Hrushevsky of the events of Khmelnytsky as an impetus to the beginning of a new Ukrainian life: "This great optimism of progress and faith in the strength of the Ukrainian masses, which he expresses at the end of his last great historical work, were also the leading motives of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's political life and activity" (Pelensky, 2019, p. 77).

The most attention Y. Pelensky refers to the logic of prescribing M. Hrushevsky in his own scheme of the age of national revival of the 19th century. The historiographer fully agrees with the understanding of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus" of the importance of this district for the national self-awareness and public maturation of our people. At the same time, Y. Pelensky believes that the historian's love for the ideology of the community movement affected his own activities as an active politician during the Ukrainian revolution. Again imitating the rhetoric of ideological opponents of the chairman of the Central Rada, the historiographer notes: "His ideas about the possibility of replacing the state with other

forms of social life were utopian. Mykhailo Hrushevsky had no idea about the problems of power and real politics. State power, after all, was something fundamentally evil in his eyes” (Pelensky, 2019, p. 104). Of course, such emotional statements did not add anything to a better understanding of the conceptual ideas of the distinguished historian. What’s more, they gave themselves to the work itself. Pelensky flavor of a political pamphlet, distracting the reader from his apt historiographical observations.

At the end of the studied twenty years, works began to appear, the authors of which tried to avoid the rhetoric of the era of ideological confrontation, rightly emphasizing the need to de-ideologize the Hrushevsky studies discourse and study the legacy of the Great Ukrainian from an academic perspective in the broad intellectual context of that time. These researchers in 1963 created the Ukrainian Historical Society, which soon turned into a leading institution of Hrushevsky studies. Already in the first publications of the founders of UHS, Oleksandr Ohloblyn and Lyubomyr Vynar, the tradition of such de-ideologizing of the creative heritage of M. Hrushevsky, and his conceptual visions.

For example, let’s recall the well-known studio O. Ohloblyn “Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Ukrainian national revival”. In it, a younger colleague of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” asked a rhetorical question: “But have we, Hrushevsky’s contemporaries and heirs, fulfilled our duty of recognition, respect and gratitude to the memory of a great Ukrainian historian and a great Ukrainian citizen?” (Ohloblyn, 1964, p. 1). The answer of O. Ohloblyn is negative. In order to correct this situation and become worthy of the national feat of the Great Ukrainian, the historiographer insists, it is necessary to study his historical work in the contemporary intellectual context, as well as to avoid one-sidedness in assessments.

Touching upon the historical scheme of M. Hrushevsky, O. Ohloblyn recognizes it as one of the greatest achievements not only of the historian himself, but also of the entire Ukrainian studies of his time. The scientist demonstrates the innovation of the concept of a prominent historian, which consisted in a skillful combination of the ideas of the people, the territory he colonized, and the created political institutions. As a result, there was an elegant justification of the historical and political subjectivity of Ukrainians. Assessing the national significance of this intellectual rank, O. Ohloblyn emphasized: “[...] Hrushevsky left a great and terrible legacy for the enemies of Ukraine. It cannot be destroyed, defeated, or declared “ours”. This is Hrushevsky’s “History of Ukraine-Rus”, the cornerstone of Ukrainian historiography [...]. This is his scheme of the Ukrainian historical process. This is his historical idea of Ukraine - a synthesis of our history and the perspective of our future” (Ohloblyn, 1964, p. 5).

Conclusions. In conclusion, we note the considerable interest of Ukrainian foreign historians in the conceptual heritage of M. Hrushevsky. This interest had both pragmatic and purely historiographical aspects. It was about the need to contrast the militant Soviet imperial rhetoric about the historical conditionality of the political unity of the Eastern Slavs with the Ukrainian-centric scheme, which would have a tradition of wide historiographical reception and proper source-scientific justification. And here is the scheme of M. Hrushevsky fully proved his instrumental suitability for the struggle against imperialists of all national varieties, just as the scientist himself did at the beginning of the 20th century. On the other hand, there was an urgent need to rethink the experience of the Liberation Struggle in the context of the new post-war world order and clarify the current national tasks. And here the concept of M. Hrushevsky became the starting point for such reflections, the evaluative vector of which was determined by the ideology professed by intellectuals. But despite some skepticism or even criticism of certain provisions of the scheme of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”, it

was unanimously recognized as the most coherent justification of the historical continuity of our people. Understanding the conceptual legacy of the Great Ukrainian, diaspora historians gradually got rid of ideological invectives, thereby giving impetus to the institutionalization of Hrushevsky studies in the next period.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ І ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

Атаманенко, А. (2010). *Українське історичне товариство: ідеї, постаті, діяльність*. Острого: Вид-во Національного університету «Острозька академія».

Білас, Л. (2002). *Криза нашого образу історії*. Львів.

Галів, М., Ільницький, В. (2024). Грушевськіана на сторінках часопису «Визвольний шлях» (1948 – 1991). *Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*, 40, 111–127. DOI: 10.33402/ukr.2024-40-111-127

Крупницький, Б. (1954). Михайло Грушевський і його історична праця. *Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси*. Нью-Йорк: Книгоспілка, 1, I-XXX.

Оглоблин, О. (1964). Михайло Грушевський і українське національне відродження. *Український історик*, 2–3, 1–6.

Пеленський, Я. (2019). *Українська національна ідея у світлі творів Михайла Грушевського та В'ячеслава Липинського*. Київ: Наш формат.

Піріг, Р., Тельвак, В. (2016). *Михайло Грушевський: біографічний нарис*. Київ: Либідь.

Піріг, Р., Тельвак, В. (2021). *Михайло Грушевський: життєпис на тлі доби*. Херсон: Видавництво ОЛДІ-ПЛЮС.

Полонська-Василенко, Н. (1964). *Дві концепції історії України і Росії*. Мюнхен: Український Вільний Університет.

Тельвак, В. (2002a). Методологічні основи історичних поглядів М.С. Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття). *Київська Старовина*, 2, 3–28.

Тельвак, В. (2002b). *Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття)*. Дрогобич: «Вимір».

Тельвак, В. (2006). Постать Михайла Грушевського в польській історіографії (кінець XIX – XX ст.). *Український історичний журнал*, 5, 67–82.

Тельвак, В. (2008a). Діяльність Михайла Грушевського еміграційної доби в дискусіях першої половини 20-х років. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*, 18, 181–203.

Тельвак, В. (2008b). *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)*. Київ–Дрогобич: «Вимір».

Тельвак, В. (2010). Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу. *Краєзнавство*, 3, 29–35.

Тельвак, В. В., Тельвак, В. П. (2021). Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*, 5, 4–16.

Тельвак, Вікторія, Тельвак, Віталій. (2005). *Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії*. Київ–Дрогобич.

Hrushevsky, M. (1952). The Traditional Scheme of “Russian” History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the Eastern Slavs. *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States*, II, 2 (4), 355–364.

Korduba, M. (1932). Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung. *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte*, 6, 3, 290–384.

REFERENCES

- Atamanenko, A.** (2010). *Ukrainske istorychne tovarystvo: idei, postati, diialnist* [Ukrainian Historical Society: Ideas, Figures, Activities]. Ostroh: Vyd-vo Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia». [in Ukrainian].
- Bilas, L.** (2002). *Kryza nashoho obrazu istorii* [The Crisis of Our Image of History]. Lviv. [in Ukrainian].
- Haliv, M., & Ilnytskyi, V.** (2024). Hrushevskiana na storinkakh chasopysu «Vyzvolnyi shliakh» (1948 – 1991) [Hrushevskiy studies on the pages of the Journal “Vyzvolnyi shliakh”/“Liberation path” (1948 – 1991)]. *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist – Ukraine: Cultural Heritage, National Identity, Statehood*, 40, 111–127. DOI: 10.33402/ukr.2024-40-111-127
- Hrushevsky, M.** (1952). The Traditional Scheme of “Russian” History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the Eastern Slavs. *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States*, II, 2 (4), 355–364. [in English].
- Korduba, M.** (1932). Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung. *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte*, 6, 3, 290–384. [in German].
- Krupnytsky, B.** (1954). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i yoho istorychna pratsia [Mykhailo Hrushevsky and His Historical Work]. *Hrushevskiy M. Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy – History of Ukraine-Rus*. Niu-York: Knyhospilka, 1, I–XXX. [in Ukrainian].
- Ohloblyn, O.** (1964). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i ukrainske natsionalne vidrodzhennia [Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Ukrainian National Revival]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk – Ukrainian Historian*, 2–3, 1–6. [in Ukrainian].
- Pelensky, Ya.** (2019). *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia u svitli tvoriv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho ta Viacheslava Lypynskoho* [The Ukrainian National Idea in the Light of the Works of Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Vyacheslav Lypynsky]. Kyiv: Nash format. [in Ukrainian].
- Polonska-Vasilenko, N.** (1964). *Dvi kontseptsii istorii Ukrainy i Rosii* [Two Conceptions of the History of Ukraine and Russia]. Miunkhen: Ukrainskyi Vilnyi Universytet. [in Ukrainian].
- Pyrig, R., & Telvak, V.** (2016). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: biohrafichnyi narys* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: biographical essay]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
- Pyrig, R., & Telvak, V.** (2021). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: zhyttiepys na tli doby* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: biography against the background of the times]. Kherson [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V.** (2002a). Metodolohichni osnovy istorychnykh pohliadiv M.S. Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia) [Methodological foundations of the historical views of M.S. Hrushevsky (end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century)]. *Kyivska Starovyna – Kyiv Antiquity*, 2, 3–28. [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V.** (2002b). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorychnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia)* [Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's Historical Views (Late 19th – early 20th Century)]. Drohobych: “Vymir”. [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V.** (2006). Postat Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v polskii istoriografii (kinets XIX – XX st.) [The figure of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in Polish historiography (late 19th–20th centuries)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian historical journal*, 5, 67–82. [in Ukrainian].
- 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.]. *Istoriografi chni doslidzhennia v Ukraini – Historiographic research in Ukraine*, 18, 181–203. [in Ukrainian].

Telvak, V. (2008b). *Tvorchа 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: «Vymir». [in Ukrainian].

Telvak, V. (2010). Hrushevskoznavstvo: metodolohichni problemy postupu [Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress]. *Kraieznnavstvo – Local history*, 3, 29–35. [in Ukrainian].

Telvak, V. V., & Telvak, V. P. (2021). Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy [Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian historical journal*, 5, 4–16. [in Ukrainian].

Telvak, Viktoriia, & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi yak doslidnyk ukrainskoi istoriografii [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography]*. Kyiv–Drohobych [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 15 жовтня 2024 р.

Стаття рекомендована до публікації 30.05.2025.