

# ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ ТА МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ

УДК 94(477) (092)

DOI: 10.31651/2076-5908-2024-1-47-55

**Svitlana BILA**

*Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History), Docent at the World History and Special Historical Disciplines Department, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789>  
e-mail: [bilasvitlana24@gmail.com](mailto:bilasvitlana24@gmail.com)

**Viktoriia TELVAK**

*Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History), Docent at the World History and Special Historical Disciplines Department, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X>  
e-mail: [viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com](mailto:viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com)

**Hryhorii BONDARENKO**

*Postgraduate Student of the World History and Special Historical Disciplines Department, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5939-9738>  
e-mail: [gregsergbond@gmail.com](mailto:gregsergbond@gmail.com)

## HISTORIOGRAPHIC IMAGES OF MYKOLA KOSTOMAROV IN THE CREATIVE HERITAGE OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the article is the elucidation of the features of the historiographical discourse of Hrushevsky, who was the expert on M. Kostomarov's studies. The methodological basis of the work is an interdisciplinary approach. At the same time, methods of philosophical, general-scientific and specific-historical character are applied as well. Particular emphasis is placed on the structural and functional system analysis of historiographical facts and the method of critical analysis of documentary material. The scientific novelty of the article consists of a special analysis of the historiographical studies of M. Hrushevsky, devoted to the intellectual biography of M. Kostomarov. Conclusions.* Summarizing M. Hrushevsky's reflection about M. Kostomarov, let's 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 attitude, the historiographical works of M. Hrushevsky, dedicated to his outstanding predecessor ("Kostomarov and modern Ukraine", "Ukrainian historiography and Mykola Kostomarov. In memory of M. Kostomarov on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death", "From the journalistic writings of Kostomarov", "Kostomarov and modern Ukraine", etc.), fall back from the previous apologetic tradition in his

*perception and appear as attempts at intellectual biography, which inherent not so much admiration for the greatness of the researched figure, but an effort to show it 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. This methodological approach of M. Hrushevsky turned out to be extremely fruitful and to a large extent explains the long-term popularity of his observations in regard to M. Kostomarov, which have not lost their influence even today.*

**Keywords:** *M. Hrushevsky, M. Kostomarov, historiographic images, Ukrainian historiography, reception.*

#### **Світлана БІЛА**

*кандидатка історичних наук, доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, м. Дрогобич, Україна*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789>  
e-mail: [bilasvitlana24@gmail.com](mailto:bilasvitlana24@gmail.com)

#### **Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК**

*кандидатка історичних наук, доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, м. Дрогобич, Україна*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X>  
e-mail: [viktoriateltvak75@gmail.com](mailto:viktoriateltvak75@gmail.com)

#### **Григорій БОНДАРЕНКО**

*аспірант кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, м. Дрогобич, Україна*  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5939-9738>  
e-mail: [gregsergbond@gmail.com](mailto:gregsergbond@gmail.com)

### **ІСТОРИОГРАФІЧНІ ОБРАЗИ МИКОЛИ КОСТОМАРОВА У ТВОРЧІЙ СПАДЩИНІ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО**

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* полягає у з'ясуванні особливостей історіографічного дискурсу Грушевського-костомарознавця. **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 аналізі історіографічних студій М. Грушевського, присвячених інтелектуальній біографії М. Костомарова. **Висновки.** Підводячи підсумки костомарознавчій рефлексії М. Грушевського, насамперед звернемо увагу на її провідну рису, що є визначальною для духу всієї історіографічної спадщини вченого. Це – розуміння пріоритетності інтересів науки, втілене у відомому гаслі самого видатного дослідника – *petini credere*, проголошеному ним на зорі наукової кар'єри та послідовно застосовуваному на практиці. Завдяки такій критичній поставі, історіографічні праці М. Грушевського, присвячені його видатному попереднику («Костомаров і новітня Україна», «Українська історіографія і Микола Костомаров. Пам'яті М.Костомарова в двадцять п'яти роковини його смерті», «З публіцистичних писань Костомарова», «Костомаров і новітня Україна» та ін.), відступають від попередньої апологетичної традиції у його сприйнятті, й постають спробами інтелектуальної біографії, яким притаманне не стільки захоплення величию досліджуваної постаті, скільки намагання показати її в контексті процесів і подій українського дев'ятнадцятого століття, виявити та пояснити читачеві не лише видатні досягнення, але й нерідко прикрі прорахунки. Такий методологічний підхід М. Грушевського виявився надзвичайно плідним та значною мірою пояснює тривалу популярність його костомарознавчих спостережень, що не втратили своєї впливовості й до сьогодні.

**Ключові слова:** *М. Грушевський, М. Костомаров, історіографічні образи, українська історіографія, реценція.*

**Problem state.** Mykola Kostomarov was, without exaggeration, a cult figure for the young generation of Ukrainian intellectuals, whose creative career began at the turn of the 19th century. A leading representative of romantic culture, he symbolised the formation of the academic discourse of Ukrainian studies and the first modern practices of public resistance to tsarism. This, in fact, caused close attention to his biography by almost all active participants of the national revival, who knowingly or unwittingly imposed their own intellectual genealogy on the ideas of the author of “Books of the Life of the Ukrainian People”. According to sources, Mykhailo Hrushevsky was no exception, whose lectures from his high school years until his exile in Moscow necessarily contained the texts of M. Kostomarov. Moreover, it was M. Hrushevsky who offered the first comprehensive attempt in Ukrainian historiography of an intellectual portrait of his outstanding predecessor, depicted both in many special investigations and in general essays.

**Analysis of recent publications.** The historiographic heritage of M. Hrushevsky, however, and his studies on the intellectual biographies of significant Ukrainian historians have attracted the attention of researchers for a long time. To one degree or another, about Kostomarov knowledge of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus’” such researchers of his works as Dmytro Doroshenko [1, p. 175–199], Dmytro Bagaliy [2, p. 279–293], Yuriy Pinchuk [3] and others wrote. Today, most of the historiographer’s attempts to reproduce the biography of the outstanding romantic are discussed in several works by Viktoria Telvak and Vitalij Telvak [4–6]. However, in the works of these and other researchers, M. Hrushevsky’s Kostomarov knowledge is 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 the elucidation of the features of the historiographical discourse of Hrushevsky, who was the expert on M. Kostomarov’s studies.

**Presenting main material.** M. Hrushevsky’s attention to the creative heritage of M. Kostomarov was one of his most traditional historiographic intentions. Since Tiflis times, a significant part of the scientist’s historical and scientific reflection was devoted to the life and activities of the outstanding romantic. M. Hrushevsky explained this by the exceptional position of M. Kostomarov in Ukrainian culture, and the symbolism of his figure in the evolution of Ukrainian historiography. Attention to the personality of M. Kostomarov was also stimulated by the lack of thorough studies of his work, and by the general belief of domestic historiographers of that time that “Kostomarov’s scientific heritage has not yet been fully developed.” [7, p. 161].

“Historian, publicist, ethnographer and poet” – this is how the researcher characterized the breadth of M. Kostomarov’s creative personality. [8, p. 148]. According to the scientist, the formation of the scientific views of the outstanding writer took place under the significant influence of several scientific trends – romanticism and ethnography, which were extremely popular in the 1830s. It was this “combat science”, as noted by M. Hrushevskyi, that stimulated, on the one hand, the formation of the historian’s populist views, and on the other hand, determined the peculiarities of his scientific reflection. “Kostomarov,” wrote his researcher, “with the help of ethnography, thinks to find a way for history to the intimate centres of people’s life, to understand its “spiritual side”, which should be the task of a historian.” [9, p. 217]. M. Hrushevsky is convinced that in the historiographical situation of that time, the use of the ethnological component of historical studies significantly expanded the subject of studying the past and was extremely useful for our science – “a big step forward in comparison with the old historiography.” This happened because of a few reasons. First, “it killed its antique character.” Secondly, expanding the subject of historical research led to the expansion of its perspectives and tasks – “taking it beyond the narrow limits of “Little Russian” historiography”, which focused exclusively on Cossack times.

It is noteworthy that M. Hrushevsky, despite the innovative spirit of many scientific ideas of M. Kostomarov, does not oppose his historical views to the Ukrainian historiography of that time, but on the contrary, according to his evolutionist preferences, tries to depict the drag of the domestic historiographical process (personified for him by M. Maksymovich, I. Sreznevsky, P. Kulish, M. Drahomanov), in which the outstanding historian is a significant, but, above all, an integral link. Therefore, M. Kostomarov’s ethnographic passions – his historical creed, as M. Hrushevsky wrote – “truly very well reveal to us the main motives of the new direction not only of Kostomarov himself but of the entire group of historians.”

In more detail, the researcher focused on the ethnographic studies of M. Kostomarov in the preface to their reprint, carried out as part of the publishing project of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in the 1920s. Examining the ethnographic texts of M. Kostomarov and the scientific discussion about them, M. Hrushevsky concludes that “the declaration of ethnography as a serious helper of history, and monuments of folk poetry as precious historical material, was a very serious not only scientific but also public merit.” [10, p. XVI–XVII]. This is explained by the fact that for a long time, the representatives of official science did not recognize ethnography, considering it an amateur business. In addition, a certain social factor was also at work here – the “social-revolutionary significance of the ethnographic research” that was undesirable for the official, which implicitly offered other scientific values, different from those of state security. As a result, the researcher asserts: “As an assistant and collaborator of the historian, the ethnographer gained scientific authority, ethnography became a science. And with that, the populist approach of ethnography received a certain sanction”.

The last opinion is quite important in view of the interpretation of populism by M. Hrushevsky himself and its subsequent modification. In the end, the researcher fully supports the ethnographic credo of M. Kostomarov and expresses his own vision of this problem: “As we can see, the concept is clear: the obligatory union of history with ethnography – cooperation from which the historian does not dare to avoid, imposes on him the task of studying the nation, researching its experiences, its demands, what it sets in the sphere of public and political life. Ethnography as a collaborator and assistant should facilitate the historian’s path to people’s experiences, moods, desires and regrets. She is a spokeswoman for people’s needs and demands, who conveys them to the historian. Working under the protectorate of history, as its assistant, she must connect it with the masses, their needs and demands. The revolutionary task of history lies on it” [10, p. XX]. It is clear from this extensive quote that M. Kostomarov’s ethnographic concepts significantly influenced the formation of M. Hrushevsky’s scientific outlook. The great historian himself drew attention to this circumstance. Summing up his studies on the ethnography of M. Kostomarov and his contemporaries, the researcher wrote: “Ethnographic studies of the first half of the 19th century were actually of great importance, that the living facts of modern national life recalled and refreshed the forgotten notions of the Ukrainian ethnographic territory, united in the present, united in the past” [9, p. 218].

M. Hrushevsky also for the first time proposed a periodization of the life and creative path of an outstanding predecessor. He singled out three main periods. The first is the formation of scientific and literary views of the scientist: the formation of his historical concept, literary tastes, and key ideas about Ukrainianness. At the beginning of the scientific work, M. Hrushevsky writes about the significant influence on the formation of Kostomarov, the historian of the Kharkiv romantic circle, and personally, Professor M. Lunin. During this time, the dissertation was defended, and the first literary and historical works were written.

What followed was, according to the researcher’s expression, the “central five-year period” – 1859–1864. “This was the peak of Kostomarov’s energy and creativity,” the scientist noted. The mentioned period was extremely eventful: the reading of the first public lecture at the university in November 1859, which was a great success and “created an unprecedented audience for him”; public dispute with O. Pogodin in March 1860; the beginning of active archeographic publishing activity; the appearance of the first program articles, “which introduced the power of new ideas, made – one might say – a complete turn in the historical thinking of the Eastern Slavs”; controversy about university reform; leaving the university, etc.

The third period is the last twenty years of M. Kostomarov’s life and activity. The researcher practically does not stop at this day – “the journalism of the last two decades of Kostomarov’s life does not richly add to what he put forward in his apogee”, – notes M. Hrushevsky. [11, p. VI–VII].

As already mentioned, M. Hrushevsky proposed a multi-level assessment of M. Kostomarov’s legacy. On the one hand, the researcher considered him an outstanding historian and noted that he significantly influenced not only the formation of the scientific image of our historiography but also the formation of the scientific outlook of M. Hrushevsky himself and the evolution of his concept of the history of Ukraine. M. Kostomarov, according to the firm conviction of the scientist,

is the “founder of the new Ukrainian historiography”, a figure who symbolizes a qualitative break in Ukrainian studies – the transition to a scientific paradigm.

M. Kostomarov’s indisputable scientific discovery, according to M. Hrushevsky, was the justification of the national and historical separation of Ukrainians from Russians in the works “Two Russian Nationalities” and “Demons of Southern Russian History”. The historian, the scientist notes, for the first time he drew attention to the fundamental mental differences of the two neighbouring peoples while emphasizing “that the social order that developed in the Ukrainian lands freely and without coercion is the old true Slavic order” [8, p. 156]. Further domestic historiography, which worked in this direction, the researcher believes, only developed the ethnological observations of the professor.

M. Hrushevsky is convinced that thanks to the ethnographic component, M. Kostomarov for the first time was able to formulate a thesis about the continuity of the Ukrainian historical process from the earliest times to the 19th century and thereby bring our science beyond the restrictive framework of Cossack historiography. “Contrary to official Russian historiography [...],” the researcher noted, “Kostomarov [...] emphasized the organic connection with the Kyiv period of the later Lithuanian-Polish and Cossack era of Ukrainian life, instead he saw a decisive break, a gap between the old Russian way of life and the Moscow way of life and explained it by the influence of Tatarshchyna” [9, p. 220]. The logical consequence of M. Kostomarov’s historical scheme, emphasized by M. Hrushevsky, was the two principles of his scientific creativity – federalism and people’s rights.

The first was that the historian put “the land at the basis of the political relations of ancient Rus, and he saw the federal principle in the political connection of the lands.” The second – contrary to the official imperial historiography, which defended the traditionality of the monarchical idea, put the ideal of people’s rule to the fore. The last principle was substantiated with particular detail in the “Northern Russian People’s Laws”. In contrast to the established views of Russian historiography, which saw in Ukrainian life the Old Russian way of life corrupted by Polish influences and the consequences of Polish rule, and in Great Russian life as a continuation of old Kyivan traditions, M. Kostomarov, on the contrary, considered the Moscow system to be the result of a fundamental change of the old orders, and their organic continuation saw in Ukrainian life. This continuation turned out to be so healthy and viable that the future Slavic republic had to rely on these principles of people’s law and federalism, only, of course, modernizing these principles to the requirements of the time. “Kostomarov,” the researcher emphasized, “in this way applied the gradual ideas of his time to the historical evolution and in the light of them translated the construction of the history of the Eastern Slavs, especially Ukrainians” [9, p. 222].

Separately, M. Hrushevsky wonders about the secret of the incredible popularity of M. Kostomarov’s works both in the Ukrainian and in the Russian environment. The reason for such success, according to the researcher, was the democratic priorities of the historian, around which the most diverse national and political groups united. “This was a common hatred of the autocrat and bureaucracy,” M. Hrushevsky explains in his thesis, “which was opposed by free public self-activity; to the aristocracy and social privileges, which were opposed by democratic and social equality; to centralism and state violence, which was opposed by federalism with some anarchist colouring” [8, p. 149].

Along with the social pathos of M. Kostomarov’s texts, in the growth of the popularity of his works, according to M. Hrushevsky, the features of their stylistics were of considerable importance. First of all, the researcher draws attention to the original combination of “pious Christian form” and “revolutionary fervour” in the historian’s writings, which formed a kind of “revelation” literature, thanks to which the promoted ideas acquired a special status. According to M. Hrushevsky, M. Kostomarov adopted this tradition from the Polish romantics. Such stylistic features, the scientist wrote, were caused by an objective impossibility for a professor of political struggle and propaganda. Therefore, “Kostomarov conducted this work mainly under the guise of a historian-artist, appealing more to the emotional than the intellectual side of his listeners and readers” [8, p. 167]. With this fact, M. Hrushevsky explains the weaknesses in the historian’s writings: the lack of a “solid sociological base”, “historical analysis”, “methodological processing

of sources” and “a clear construction of the socio-historical process”. It is from this point of view that the researcher urges us to evaluate “his historical work”.

On the other hand, from the standpoint of the tasks facing our Clio in the second half of the 19th century, M. Hrushevsky rather unfavourably characterized the professional level of most of M. Kostomarov’s historical monographs, created in a romantic conceptual style, and therefore “hopelessly outdated.” The scientist believes that the main flaw of the professor’s historical concept was the “superficial narrative character”, when the leading ideas and currents of social life disappeared behind the kaleidoscope of external trifles, the images of prominent people were vaguely outlined, and the most important factor – the people, whose historical role the scientist absolutized, disappeared completely. obliterated by an excess of external wealth of facts. “The historical tragedy of the Ukrainian people, experienced by them [...]”, – noted M. Hrushevsky, – was obscured by external dramatic details, and even the essence of the political conflict between Ukraine and Poland, which was at the root of it, was not presented with adequate clarity. And the cultural, household and social side of the process remained completely outside the scope of the study” [12, p. 35].

For example, M. Hrushevsky’s evaluations of M. Kostomarov’s works, formulated in relation to “Mazepa”, are quite typical. The researcher notes that the only positive aspect of the work is the new documentary material analyzed in it for the first time. However, conceptually, this studio does not meet the requirements for lighting both the events of that time and the figure of Mazepa himself. The researcher lists the shortcomings of the work: “The author drowned in the actual story, the scientific perspective is lost behind him, the important things are not visible in the details, the reader does not naturally bear any understanding of relations of that period of time, political and social struggles and directions, and regarding the person of Mazepa himself, the author took a traditional on the Russian soil and admitting that Mazepa did not stand for any political idea, that he was a complete egoist and a “lie incarnate”, with this completely negative characterization he paved the way to understanding the real Mazepa” [13, p. 20]. We have deliberately given such a long quotation since the rhetoric of this criticism is inherent in almost all statements of the historian regarding the works of M. Kostomarov.

It should be noted that the mentioned criticism was distinguished by M. Hrushevsky’s reviews not only of M. Kostomarov’s works on the Ukrainian past but also of his works on the history of Russia. Thus, about the monograph dedicated to Novgorod and Pskov, the scientist noted: “The glorious work of Kostomarov, which had such an important significance in the development of the historiography of ancient Rus in general, neither in terms of the material the author had nor in terms of the study method, no longer meets the needs of modern science” [14, p. 23]. M. Hrushevsky writes quite critically about the “opportunistic practice” of M. Kostomarov – the attempt to “reconcile the government with Ukrainianism”, to achieve more favourable conditions for the development of the Ukrainian cause. Despite the sincere, albeit naive hopes of the scientist, the researcher calls Kostomarov’s ideas on this matter a “false note” of his work. Evaluations of M. Kostomarov’s “tactless” nationalist speeches against Jews and Poles are also negative. M. Hrushevsky offers an interesting term to define these loyalist-nationalist “snippets” of M. Kostomarov – “Byzantism” [11, p. V].

For M. Hrushevsky, what are the weak points of M. Kostomarov’s creativity? “The late historian, being far ahead of his time in the demands he placed on historical research, could not always keep up with them,” the researcher noted [9, p. 225]. He writes about the impossibility of one person, even one as gifted as M. Kostomarov, or a whole generation of researchers, to carry out a radical revolution in the historical consciousness of society: “The road from the historical worldview of the old “Little Russian” historiography to newer views was long and difficult, connected with a severe breakdown of views and habits rooted in different ages.” [9, p. 223]. The consequences of this were determined by the weak points of the historian’s historical concept: some dependence on the old historiographic scheme, narrative style, abuse of the biographical approach to historical material, pessimism in the political future of Ukrainians, lack of historical perspective, etc.

Studying the thematic and stylistic diversity of M. Kostomarov’s legacy, M. Hrushevsky proposed a hypothesis about the gap between the theory and practice of historical research in the

historian's writings. "The ideas promulgated by the late historian," the scientist noted, "were ahead not only of his time, but also of his own work as a historian, and in many points remain unsurpassed even now. One of the direct communicants of Cyril and Methodius's ideas – this culminating point of Ukrainian national self-consciousness, he only partially managed to realize them in his historical work, and bequeathed far more to the generations of his successors" [9, p. 225].

M. Hrushevsky also paid a lot of attention to M. Kostomarov's views on the problem of statehood. The researcher explained the scientist's anti-state pathos with several points: the general populist orientation of his historical concept, opposition to the Russian and Polish states as means of historical exploitation of Ukrainians, a principled discussion with contemporary Russian historians who fetishized the state-building factor of historical evolution. "With the people against the state" – this is how the scientist characterizes the scientific credo of M. Kostomarov [8, p. 168]. Note that M. Hrushevskyi does not give the evaluation characteristics of the professor's views on the state, he only explains the motivation of his scientific work, noting that such historical ideas were traditional for the entire populist historiography.

It is with M. Kostomarov, according to M. Hrushevskyi, that the tradition of demonstrating an active public position by means of historical scientific and literary creativity originates. Thus, the place of the author of "Bohdan Khmelnytskyi" in national culture is determined for the scientist, first of all, by his innovative "historical and political ideology" of "Ukrainian revival and liberation", and the significance of his historical and literary work is that it "was from beginning to end a totally public action" [8, p. 148]. The most famous works of the scientist, such as "The Revolt of Stenka Razin", "The Personality of Ivan the Terrible", and "The Beginning of the Unified State", the researcher calls "campaign literature", which made a great impression both with the power of talent, deep conviction, artistic embodiment, and the very idea of historical justification. These works, according to M. Hrushevsky's conviction, served the task of social-revolutionary agitation, and the next generations of revolutionary youth were brought up on them.

Using the example of M. Kostomarov's creative heritage, the scientist vividly demonstrates the important social significance of the ideas accumulated by historians. It is noteworthy that these ideas, having received citizenship in society, quickly create their own hermeneutic circle, producing numerous meanings, and sometimes acquire a completely different weight than their creators thought about it. A similar fate befell, for example, most of M. Kostomarov's historical and political ideas. "It is true," noted M. Hrushevsky, "that Kostomarov, for example, against his intentions, by the power of the revolutionary ideology that was at the basis of his work [...] – became the ideologist of this revolutionary populism, and especially his "The Revolt of Stenka Razin" "had a great impact as a propaganda work for the youth – as an image of the people's revolutionary potential" [15, p. 6]. Precisely because of such heightened social pathos of the historical and literary works of the "Ukrainian Ranke", as well as thanks to his preaching of "the individuality of the Ukrainian nationality and its unlimited right to its free development", the researcher wrote, M. Kostomarov "was and is the father of New Ukraine" [8, p. 1].

Along with the scientific understanding of the legacy of M. Kostomarov, M. Hrushevsky also contributed to a great extent to the popularization of the works of the outstanding scientist, which due to the significant dispersion in "less accessible editions [...] were beyond the scope of research and the characteristics of his work and his time" [11, p. V]. So, it was on the initiative of M. Hrushevsky and under his direct leadership that the publication of the creative heritage of M. Kostomarov was planned in the second half of the 1920s. Unfortunately, for known reasons, only the first two volumes of this series appeared, in which the most important ethnographic, journalistic and scientific and polemical works of M. Kostomarov were published. At the same time, both collections – "Scientific journalistic and polemical writings of Kostomarov" and "Ethnographic writings of Kostomarov" – were revealed with thorough scientific investigations of the Kyiv academician.

**Conclusions.** Summarizing M. Hrushevsky's reflection about M. Kostomarov, let's 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 attitude, the historiographical works of M. Hrushevsky, dedicated to his outstanding predecessor (“Kostomarov and modern Ukraine”, “Ukrainian historiography and Mykola Kostomarov. In memory of M. Kostomarov on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death”, “From the journalistic writings of Kostomarov”, “Kostomarov and modern Ukraine”, etc.), fall back from the previous apologetic tradition in his perception and appear as attempts at intellectual biography, which inherent not so much admiration for the greatness of the researched figure, but an effort to show it 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. This methodological approach of M. Hrushevsky turned out to be extremely fruitful and to a large extent explains the long-term popularity of his observations in regard to M. Kostomarov, which have not lost their influence even today.

### Список літератури

1. Дорошенко Д. Огляд української історіографії. Київ: Вид-во “Українознавство”, 1996. 257 с.
2. Багалій Д. Вибрані праці: у 6 т. Т. 2: Джерелознавство та історіографія історії України. Харків: Золоті сторінки, 2001. 662 с.
3. Пінчук Ю., Гириневич Л. Про оцінку М. С. Грушевським науково-публіцистичних і полемічних праць М. І. Костомарова. *Український історичний журнал*. 1992. № 4. С. 112–123.
4. Тельвак Вікторія, Тельвак Віталій. Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії. Київ; Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
5. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
6. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу. *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
7. Грушевський О. Маловідома стаття Костомарова з 1846 р. *Записки НТШ*. 1907. Т. LXXIX. С. 161–164.
8. Грушевський М. Костомаров і новітня Україна. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1–4. С. 148–170.
9. Грушевський М. Українська історіографія і Микола Костомаров. Пам’яті М. Костомарова в двадцять п’яти роковини його смерті. *Літературно-науковий вісник*. 1910. Т. L. Кн. V. С. 209–225.
10. Грушевський М. Етнографічне діло Костомарова. *Етнографічні писання Костомарова*. Київ, 1930. С. I–XXIII.
11. Грушевський М. З публіцистичних писань Костомарова. *Науково-публіцистичні і полемічні писання Костомарова. За редакцією академ. Михайла Грушевського*. К.: ДВУ, 1928. С. III–XXI.
12. Грушевський М. Розвиток українських досліджень у XIX столітті і вияви у них основних питань українознавства. *Український історик*. 1990. № 1–4. С. 28–44.
13. Грушевський М. Рец. на: Уманец Ф. М. Гетьман Мазепа. *Записки НТШ*. 1898. Т. XXI. С. 20–23.
14. Грушевський М. Нові розвідки з історії давньої Русі. *Записки НТШ*. 1897. Т. XVIII. С. 1–24.
15. Грушевський М. Місія Драгоманова. *Україна*. 1926. № 2–3. С. 3–28.

### References

1. Doroshenko, D. (1996). *Overview of Ukrainian historiography*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
2. Bagaliy, D. I. (2001). *Selected works: In 6 volumes, Volume 2: Source studies and historiography of the history of Ukraine*. Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].
3. Pinchuk, Y., Hyrynevych, L. (1992). About M. S. Hrushevskyi’s assessment of the scientific journalistic and polemical works of M. I. Kostomarov. *Ukrainskyi istorichnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical magazine]*, 4, 112-123. [in Ukrainian].
4. Telvak, Viktoriia, & Telvak, Vitalii. (2005). *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography*. Kyiv-Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
5. Telvak, V.V., Telvak, V.P. (2021). Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects. *Ukrainskyi istorichnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical magazine]*, 5, 4-16. [in Ukrainian].



6. Telvak, V. (2010). Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress. *Kraieznavstvo [Local history]*, 3, 29-35. [in Ukrainian].
7. Hrushevsky, O. (1907). A little-known article by Kostomarov from 1846. *Zapysky NTSh [Notes of the SSS]*, LXXIX, 161-164. [in Ukrainian].
8. Hrushevskyi, M. (1984). Kostomarov and modern Ukraine. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1-4, 148-170. [in Ukrainian].
9. Hrushevskyi, M. (1910). Ukrainian historiography and Mykola Kostomarov. In memory of M. Kostomarov on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death. *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk [Literary and scientific herald]*, L, V, 209-225. [in Ukrainian].
10. Hrushevskyi, M. (1930). Ethnographic work of Kostomarov. *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova [Kostomarov's ethnographic writings]*, Kyiv, I-XXIII. [in Ukrainian].
11. Hrushevskyi, M. (1928). From the journalistic writings of Kostomarov. *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova. Za redaktsiieiu akadem. Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Scientific journalistic and polemical writings of Kostomarov. Edited by academician Mykhailo Hrushevskyi]*, Kyiv, III-XXI. [in Ukrainian].
12. Hrushevskyi, M. (1990). The development of Ukrainian studies in the 19th century and their discovery of the main issues of Ukrainian studies. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1-4, 28-44. [in Ukrainian].
13. Hrushevskyi, M. (1898). Review: Umanets F. M. Hetman Mazepa. *Zapysky NTSh [Notes of the SSS]*, XXI, 20-23. [in Ukrainian].
14. Hrushevskyi, M. (1897). New intelligence on the history of ancient Rus. *Zapysky NTSh [Notes of the SSS]*, XVIII, 1-24. [in Ukrainian].
15. Hrushevskyi, M. (1926). Mission Drahomanov. *Ukraina [Ukraine]*, 2-3, 3-28. [in Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редакції / Received: 16.04.2024

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 03.06.2024