

УДК 94(477)(092)

DOI: 10.31651/2076-5908-2025-1-61-67

Mykhailo SABINSKYI

PhD (History), Security Service of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6059-4646>

e-mail: mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com

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

Olga VLADYGA

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of Lviv Professional College of Computer Technologies and Building, Lviv, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164>

e-mail: olhavladyha@gmail.com

HRUSHEVSKY THE HISTORIAN IN THE DISCUSSIONS OF DIASPORA INTELLECTUALS OF THE 1970s AND 1980s

Abstract. *The goal of the article is to reconstruct the reception of the historiographic work of M. Hrushevsky in Ukrainian foreign socio-humanitarian studies of the 1970s-1980s. The research methodology applies the principles of historicism and objectivity, as well as general scientific and special-historical methods of historiographical research. Scientific originality of the article consists in elucidating the peculiarities of the process of historiographical understanding of the legacy of Hrushevsky the scientist by Ukrainian intellectuals abroad during the 1970s and 1980s. Conclusions. Summarizing the study of the process of historiographic understanding of the scientific heritage of M. Hrushevsky in diasporic socio-humanitarian studies during the 1970s and 1980s, we should first of all note the clear specialization of the discourse of Hrushevsky studies. It was caused by Lyubomir Vynar's first attempts to theorize the multifaceted studies dedicated to the author of "The History of Ukraine-Rus" and to determine the current directions of historiographic research. As a result, there was a noticeable increase in the number and expansion of the problems of scientific research works, in which attempts were made to comprehensively understand the selected plot on the basis of the available range of sources and with the use of current methodological tools. The range of such problems was determined by the available source materials, in search of which American and Western European researchers intensively studied the collections of archives and libraries on both sides of the Atlantic. As a result, a number of innovative works appeared, many of which have not lost their scientific value in the future. On the other hand, the objective limitation of the range of available documents resulted in the fragmentation of the Hrushevsky scholarly discourse, and hence the impossibility of creating panoramic historiographical studies. Despite this, it is the work of foreign researchers in the 1970s and 1980s that enabled the dynamic progress of mainland Hrushevsky studies after the declaration of Ukrainian independence.*

Keywords: *M. Hrushevsky, historiographical heritage, Ukrainian foreign historiography, L. Vynar, reception.*

Михайло САБІНСЬКИЙ

кандидат історичних наук, Служба безпеки України, м. Київ, Україна

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789>

e-mail: mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com

Світлана БІЛА

кандидатка історичних наук, доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету ім. І. Франка, м. Дрогобич, Україна

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789>

e-mail: bilasvitlana24@gmail.com

Ольга ВЛАДИГА

кандидатка історичних наук, викладачка історії Львівського вищого професійного училища комп'ютерних технологій та будівництва, м. Львів, Україна

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164>

e-mail: olhavladyha@gmail.com

ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ-ІСТОРИК В ДИСКУСІЯХ ДІАСПОРНИХ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛІВ 1970–80-х рр.

Анотація. *Мета* дослідження полягає у реконструкції реценції історіографічного доробку М. Грушевського в українській закордонній соціогуманітаристиці 1970–80-х рр. **Методологія дослідження** передбачає використання принципів історизму й об'єктивності, а також загальнонаукових і спеціально-історичних методів історіографічного дослідження. **Наукова новизна** статті полягає у з'ясуванні особливостей процесу історіографічного осмислення спадщини Грушевського-вченого українськими закордонними інтелектуалами протягом 1970–80-х рр. **Висновки.** Підсумовуючи дослідження процесу історіографічного осмислення наукової спадщини М. Грушевського в діаспорній соціогуманітаристиці протягом 1970–80-х рр., першочергово відзначимо чітку спеціалізацію грушевськознавчого дискурсу. Вона була викликана першими спробами Любомира Винара теоретизувати присвячені автору «Історії України-Руси» різнопланові студії й визначити актуальні напрямки історіографічного пошуку. Відтак відбулося помітне зростання кількості й розширення проблематики науково-дослідних праць, в яких здійснювалися спроби цілісного осмислення обраного сюжету на підставі наявного кола джерел та із застосуванням актуального методологічного інструментарію. Коло таких проблем визначали доступні джерельні матеріали, в пошуках яких американські й західноєвропейські дослідники інтенсивно опрацьовували колекції архівів і бібліотек по обидва боки Атлантики. У підсумку з'явилася низка новаторських праць, чимало з яких надалі не втратили наукової цінності. З іншого боку, об'єктивна обмеженість кола доступних документів мала наслідком фрагментарність грушевськознавчого дискурсу, а відтак і неможливість створення панорамних історіографічних студій. Незважаючи на це, саме доробок закордонних дослідників 1970–80-х рр. уможливив динамічний поступ материкового грушевськознавства після проголошення української незалежності.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, історіографічна спадщина, українська закордонна історіографія, Л. Винар, реценція.

Problem statement. Wide commemoration of the century since the birthday of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in 1966 significantly strengthened and sustained the attention of the Ukrainian foreign community to the multifaceted legacy of the prominent historian. This was evidenced by numerous multi-genre publications, the number of which increased significantly during the years of commemoration of successive anniversaries (1976 and 1986) or memorial dates (1984) of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. The major part of such posts had a distinct popular science character and were designed to overcome numerous historiographical stereotypes formed during the Liberation Struggle, explaining to the reader the multifaceted national service of M. Hrushevsky. Along with such journalistic Hrushevskiana, there were also works of a research nature, aimed at a deep understanding of the legacy of a prominent intellectual. They were created on the basis of a constantly growing source base and were based on the methodological achievements of Western socio-humanitarian studies. We will focus on this Hrushevskiana research, which is focused on understanding the intellectual work of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” below.

The goal of the article is to reconstruct the reception of the historiographic work of M. Hrushevsky in Ukrainian foreign socio-humanitarian studies of the 1970s–1980s.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Today, diaspora Hrushevskiana has a considerable literature. Its authors found out a little about the contribution of foreign intellectuals in 1968–1989 in rethinking the creative heritage of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. Thus, Alla Atamanenko briefly highlighted this problem in her monograph on the Ukrainian Historical Society [2, p. 503–527]. In turn, the diasporic discourse of theoretical Hrushevskiana was investigated by Vitaly Telvak in a series of works on the methodological views of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” [17–20; 22–23]. Peculiarities of understanding of scholarly practices by diaspora intellectuals of M. Hrushevsky was found out by V. Telvak and V. Pedych [25]. However, in the writings of these and other authors, the discussions on Hrushevsky studies that took place during 1968–1989 are not fully reproduced. This determines the relevance of the topic of our research.

Presentation of the main material. As expected, the focus of scientific Hrushevskiana studies of the twenty years under study was the multifaceted historiographical heritage of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. At the same time, Ukrainian intellectuals abroad paid the most attention to the further understanding of M. Hrushevsky's historical scheme. It is important that representatives of all generations and ideological orientations of Ukrainian historians in exile were united in recognizing the outstanding conceptual merits of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. For example, such honored Ukrainian historians and younger contemporaries of M. wrote about this in many works. Hrushevsky as O. Ogloblin and N. Polonska-Vasylenko. Another representative of the older generation, Mykola Chubaty, noted in the work “Ukrainian historical science”: “M. Hrushevsky with his historical scheme of the History of Eastern Europe as early as 1904 clearly defined what belongs to the History of Ukraine and what does not. Hrushevsky's historical scheme was accepted by all Ukrainian historians in their homeland as binding” [27, p. 6].

The historiosophical innovation of M. Hrushevsky was no less highly valued by representatives of the middle generation. Thus, the first head of the Department of History of Ukraine at Harvard University, O. Prytsak emphasized that “the important fact was that Hrushevsky, when the time came (1904), had the sense of measure, dignity and courage to appear as a knight (and not a rebel) with a presentation of the justification of his scheme in the official publication of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, and that in the Ukrainian language” [14, p. 101–102]. Mykola Andrusiak, somewhat older than him, fully shared this vision, who drew attention to the incorrectness of M. Hrushevsky in his allegedly uncritical fondness for populism. According to the scholar’s apt observation, “his scheme of separating the history of Ukraine from the “all-Russian” history and his leadership of the newest Ukrainian state, separated from Moscow, made him a Ukrainian historian and nationalist-statesman who was irreconcilable with Muscovites... Therefore, he should be considered a Ukrainian national historian-statesman” [1, p. 20].

Another representative of the middle generation of Ukrainian historians in exile, O. Dombrovsky devoted to the theoretical construct of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” an investigation under the telling title “Eternally relevant scheme of the history of Ukraine”. In it, he emphasized not only the scientific, but also the social value of the prominent scientist’s conceptual proposal, which affirms the historical identity of Ukrainians both during the tsarist era and in the communist state. Explaining to the reader the essence of the innovative proposal of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”, O. Dombrovsky noted: “M. Hrushevsky showed that the historical process of the Ukrainian-Russian South had its own style of historicism and crystallized completely independently of the historical process of the Finno-Moscow North through deepening differentiation as a result of the action of diametrically different anthropogeographic and geopolitical factors of the Eastern European South and North” [5, p. 2].

Along with the problems of the conceptual heritage of M. Hrushevsky, an in-depth study of selected subjects of his historiographic work continued. Thus, a thoughtful understanding of early historical issues in the works of M. Hrushevsky was continued in the studied period by the well-known antiquarian scholar O. Dombrovsky. In particular, he devoted special attention to the interpretation of Herodotus’ testimony about the Scythians in the “History of Ukraine-Rus”. On the conviction of the historiographer, M. Hrushevsky showed a remarkable knowledge of the sources and literature of the subject and a highly developed intuition of a historian-researcher in solving controversial problems on the basis of real data of the source material. If there are no such real data, noted O. Dombrovsky, a distinguished historian, takes into account the possibilities of a sociological, ethnographic, geographical and, finally, historical nature and puts forward possible hypotheses based on the critical considerations of a historian experienced in the methodology of research work [7, p. 68].

In other investigations, O. Dombrovsky tried to find out the theoretical features of the early historical reconstructions of the prominent scientist. In particular, he paid special attention to the specificity of the author’s interpretation of the “History of Ukraine-Rus” of the geographical factor. The researcher rightly pointed out that in the ethnocentric system of historicism in M. According to Hrushevsky, the geographical factor is the second most important after the ethnic factor. The historiographer rightly associates this priority with the influence of the positivists Henry Bokl and his teacher V. Antonovych. On the example of early historical reconstructions of M. Hrushevsky O. Dombrovsky convincingly demonstrated that “how the sociologist-historian showed us in the first volume of his capital “History” how to use individual variants of the geographical factor in the interpretation of phenomena, events and facts of the early historical process on the territory of Ukraine” [6, p. 110].

In the end, O. Dombrovsky offered the reader his own attempt at a complete reconstruction of the theoretical model of the outstanding historian based on the materials of the first volume of his great work. At the same time, he emphasized that “the methodological page of the ancient and early historical section of the History of Ukraine-Rus by M. Hrushevsky is characterized by its properties” [9, p. 65]. Among the mentioned properties, the historiographer attributed the dominance of critical and analytical methods, which enabled the prominent scientist to skillfully summarize a relatively modest range of sources and offer the reader such an image of the prehistoric age of our past that has not lost its relevance even today [9, p. 73; 16, p. 11–39; 21, p. 17–34].

Along with the development of classic historiographical plots, the studied period brought a number of original works based on the problem of Hrushevsky studies. Thus, the well-known historian and economist Mykola Chirovsky made a comprehensive attempt to find out the peculiarities of the discursive practices of M. Hrushevsky as a researcher of the Ukrainian economy. At the beginning of his research, the historiographer rightly noted that against the background of the ever-growing quantity and quality of Hrushevskiana, “the paucity of literature about him as a researcher of the development of the Ukrainian

national economy is striking...” [26, p. 1403]. On the contrary, says M. Chirovsky, it is in the “History of Ukraine-Rus” that the genesis of the economic practices of our people from the earliest times to the end of the 17th century is most fully presented in literature in all their historical diversity. The researcher is also attracted by the methodological page of the historical and economic studies of M. Hrushevsky. On the conviction of M. Chirovsky, the distinguished historian interpreted economic relations equally, as interdependent, with other processes – cultural, spiritual, social and political [26, p. 1405].

Another original historiographic plot, developed for the first time in the period under study, was the clarification of the peculiarities of historical portraiture in the legacy of M. Hrushevsky. Thus, Teodor Matskiv recreated the reception of the image of Hetman Ivan Mazepa in the works of M. Hrushevsky. The researcher rightly pointed out that, among other things, with his study, he aimed to undermine the thesis of statist historiography about the allegedly consistently critical attitude of a prominent historian towards representatives of the national elite. Depicting the event and historiographical context of the problem, T. Matskiv convincingly showed the complete correctness of the historian when interpreting the policy of the distinguished hetman [11, p. 122]. It should be noted that the conclusions of T. Matskiv are fully shared by modern researchers of the problem [24, p. 171, 360].

No less innovative problem “M. Hrushevsky and the Kyiv scientific tradition” was updated by L. Vynar in his report to Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences on October 11, 1986. as part of the broad celebration by foreign intellectuals of the 125th anniversary of the Kyiv academic tradition. At the same time, the researcher noted that this topic can be considered in three main aspects: 1) contribution of M. Hrushevsky in the development of scientific life in Kyiv in different periods of his activity; 2) the historian’s scientific work devoted to Kyiv, or his Kyiv studies; 3) coverage and analysis by a historian of the Kyiv scientific tradition, in particular his interpretation of the role of Kyiv in the historical development of the Ukrainian cultural and scientific process. The most detailed in his report L. Vynar focused on the third component of the topic, in which he also briefly discussed the scientific activity of the historian in Kyiv in the 1920s [3, p. 4].

The studied period brought a deepening of the problems of receptive Hrushevskiana. Yes, to the plot of critical remarks by I. Franko addressed the “History of Ukraine-Rus” by O. Dombrovsky [8, p. 122–131]. Traditionally focusing on early historical topics, the historiographer applied his earlier research and compared Franko’s criticism of the translation and interpretation of M. Hrushevsky’s testimony of Herodotus about the Scythians with the state of modern knowledge in this field. As a result, the scientist came to a well-argued conclusion that Kamenyar was more skilled than his younger colleague in translating and artistically processing Herodotus’ stories. Instead, the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus” demonstrated a much more modern understanding of the theoretical foundations of historiography than his brilliant friend [20].

In the end, the studied twenty years brought the first attempt at a panoramic monographic study of the historiographical heritage of the creator of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. The author of this studio was, quite expectedly, the founder of Hrushevsky studies L. Vynar. His work was published on the occasion of commemorating the half-century of the death of M. Hrushevsky first on the pages of the Munich “Suchasnist” and later in a modified version in a separate book [3]. The author himself was aware of the importance of his study, which became a thorough summation and thoughtful rethinking of the entire previous tradition (including the author’s own studies) of researching the historiographic heritage of M. Hrushevsky. “To a certain extent, this is pioneering work,” he emphasized to his readers.

The architecture of the book provided for the coverage of selected research subjects in the introductory part, five chapters and a number of appendices of the source and bibliographic plan. In the first chapter (“Life path and scientific and organizational activity”), the author briefly characterized the main biographical facts of the hero of his study. At the same time, he emphasized the influence of V. Antonovych in science and O. Konysky in public work as a beginning historian, mentioned the importance for Ukrainian studies of the activities of the historical school of the Lviv and Kyiv periods, depicted the figure of the scientist against the background of the era of the Liberation Struggle, characterized the period of emigration lasting several years, therefore focused on the actor’s return to Ukraine and the flourishing of historical science under his leadership during 1924–1930 up to the total pogrom of Ukrainian humanitarianism and the tragic epilogue of one of its creators. The second chapter – “Notes on the historiographic heritage of Hrushevsky” – contains a detailed description of the historical scheme of the outstanding scientist in the context of Ukrainian national historiography, as well as his “History of Ukraine-Rus” and other significant historiographical texts. In the third part – “Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the statist direction in Ukrainian historiography” – the author clarifies the features of the historiosophical and ideological confrontation

between the “populist” M. Hrushevsky and historians-statesmen (V. Lypinsky, S. Tomashivsky, I. Krevetsky, D. Doroshenko and B. Krupnytsky). The fourth chapter, “Historical school of M. Hrushevsky and its importance” is divided into two subsections about the Lviv and Kyiv historical schools. In them L. Vynar finds out the personal composition and characteristics of one and the other school. Therefore, in the fifth part – “The pogrom and destruction of Hrushevsky’s school of history” – the author paints a picture of the gradual implementation by the communist authorities of the plan to completely cleanse the intellectual space of Soviet Ukraine from competing discourses, which ended with the mysterious death of the historian in the Caucasus. In the appendices of L. Vynar reprinted his article “The usual scheme of “Russian” history and the case for a rational structure of the history of the Eastern Slavs”, and also provided the reader with “Bibliographic sources for the study of the life of M. Hrushevsky” and “Selected editions of L. Vynar about M. Hrushevsky”.

The analyzed monograph, published in a reduced “free” format for easier distribution in Ukraine, aroused considerable interest among the reading public and fellow historians. The latter unanimously noted that the author, as the most authoritative Hrushevsky expert, gave a study that was innovative in terms of the issues raised and extremely thorough in terms of the source level of their study. In his review, O. Dombrovsky noted: “We should congratulate the work of our historian Lubomir Vynar as another asset on the path of his tireless and long-term studies in the domain of Hrushevskiana. For that, he deserves the honorary title of a worthy representative-follower of the spiritual school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky at the further stages of the development of Ukrainian national historiography” [10, p. 4; 12, p. 5–9; 13, p. 7–10].

In the studied period, the interpretation of the work of Hrushevsky the literary critic was also updated. Thus, for the first time in Hrushevsky studies, thanks to Bohdan Romanenchuk, a comprehensive analysis of the historical-literary and literary heritage of the prominent historian was carried out [15]. Already at the beginning of his exploration, the researcher rightly noted that “the glory of M. Hrushevsky as the greatest and most prominent historian of Ukraine completely overshadowed his significance as a literary figure.” Next, the author consistently reconstructs the creative roles of the scientist as a writer, literary critic and literary historian. The literary critic also refers to the literary legacy of M. Hrushevsky. Assuming minor factual errors (for example, asserting that the young man wrote under the pseudonym Mykyta, not Mykhailo Zavoloka), B. Romanenchuk comprehensively clarified the peculiarities of the literary discourse of the youthful, and therefore mature prose of the prominent historian. At the same time, he devoted special attention to understanding the ideological foundations of historical fiction by M. Hrushevsky, in particular, his works such as “Khmelnysky in Pereyaslav” and “Yaroslav Osmomysl”.

After all, B. Romanenchuk refers to the legacy of M. Hrushevsky as a literary critic. Using numerous examples, the researcher shows the originality and insight of the historian’s literary observations, which were fully accepted by his authoritative colleagues who studied contemporary Ukrainian literature. He also addresses the problem of the conceptual foundations of the literary discourse of the author of “History of Ukraine-Rus”, proving the eclectic nature of the theory he constructed with many examples. Finally, the researcher also raised a little-known problem of the reception of artistic and literary criticism of M. Hrushevsky in the intellectual space of the first third of the 20th century, showing the considerable influence of his ideas and observations.

Conclusions. Summarizing the study of the process of historiographic understanding of the scientific heritage of M. Hrushevsky in diasporic socio-humanitarian studies during the 1970s and 1980s, we should first of all note the clear specialization of the discourse of Hrushevsky studies. It was caused by Lyubomir Vynar’s first attempts to theorize the multifaceted studies dedicated to the author of “The History of Ukraine-Rus” and to determine the current directions of historiographic research. As a result, there was a noticeable increase in the number and expansion of the problems of scientific research works, in which attempts were made to comprehensively understand the selected plot on the basis of the available range of sources and with the use of current methodological tools. The range of such problems was determined by the available source materials, in search of which American and Western European researchers intensively studied the collections of archives and libraries on both sides of the Atlantic. As a result, a number of innovative works appeared, many of which have not lost their scientific value in the future. On the other hand, the objective limitation of the range of available documents resulted in the fragmentation of the Hrushevsky scholarly discourse, and hence the impossibility of creating panoramic historiographical studies. Despite this, it is the work of foreign researchers in the 1970s and 1980s that enabled the dynamic progress of mainland Hrushevsky studies after the declaration of Ukrainian independence.

Список літератури

1. Андрусак М. Михайло Грушевський як історик – народник і державник. *Записки НТШ*. 1978. Т. СХСІV. С. 7–20.
2. Атаманенко А. Українське історичне товариство: ідеї, постаті, діяльність. Острого, 2010. 672 с.
3. Винар Л. Найвидатніший історик України Михайло Грушевський (1866–1934). У 50-ліття смерті. Мюнхен, 1985. 120 с.
4. Домбровський О. М. Грушевський і київська наукова традиція. *Свобода*. 1986. № 214. С. 4.
5. Домбровський О. Вічно актуальна схема історії України. *Свобода*. 1985. № 26. С. 2.
6. Домбровський О. Географічний фактор в ранньоісторичній схемі «Історії України-Руси» М. Грушевського. *Український історик*. 1984. Ч. 1-4. С. 103–110.
7. Домбровський О. Геродотова Скитія в Історії України-Руси М. Грушевського. *Український історик*. 1968. Ч. 1-4. С. 60–68.
8. Домбровський О. Критичні завваги І. Франка до «Історії» М. Грушевського. *Український історик*. 1970. Ч. 1-3. С. 122–131.
9. Домбровський О. Методологічні основи дослідів над ранньою історією України М. Грушевського. *Український історик*. 1969. Ч. 1-3. С. 65–73.
10. Домбровський О. Нове надбання на полі українськоп історіографіп. *Свобода*. 1987. № 16. С. 4.
11. Мацьків Т. Гетьман Іван Мазепа в працях М. Грушевського. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1-4. С. 111–122.
12. Пиріг Р., Тельвак В. Михайло Грушевський: життєпис на тлі доби. Херсон: ОЛДІ-ПЛЮС, 2021. 572 с.
13. Пиріг Р., Тельвак В. Михайло Грушевський: біографічний нарис. Київ: Либідь, 2016. 576 с.
14. Прицак О. Чому катедри українознавства в Гарварді? Кембридж, 1973. 225 с.
15. Романенчук Б. Михайло Грушевський як письменник і літературознавець. *Альманах провидіння на 1969 рік*. Філадельфія, 1969. С. 107–129.
16. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Михайло Грушевський як дослідник української історіографії. Київ; Дрогобич, 2005. 334 с.
17. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
18. Тельвак В. Грушевськіана на сторінках «Українського історичного журналу» (1991–2010 рр.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2012. Вип. 22. С. 483–498.
19. Тельвак В. Вивчення історико-теоретичної спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (1939–1990 рр.). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. 2000. Вип. 35–36. С. 354–366.
20. Тельвак В. Проблема «Франко-Грушевський» в українській історіографії. *Український історик*. 2006–2007. № 4/1–2. С. 183–199.
21. Тельвак В. Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець ХІХ – початок ХХ століття). Нью-Йорк; Дрогобич, 2002. 236 с.
22. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
23. Тельвак В. Монографічна грушевськіана: спроба узагальнення. *Гуржіївські історичні читання*. 2013. Вип. 6. С. 104–107.
24. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець ХІХ – 30-ті роки ХХ століття). Київ; Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.
25. Тельвак В., Педич В. Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського. Львів, 2016. 440 с.
26. Чирівський М. Михайло Грушевський як дослідник українського господарства. *Визвольний шлях*. 1968. Кн. ХІ–ХІІ. С. 1403–1417.
27. Чубатий М. Українська історична наука (її розвиток та досягнення). Філадельфія, 1971. 53 с.

References

1. Andrusiak, M. (1978). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a historian is a populist and statesman. *Zapysky NTSH [Notes of SSS]*, CXCIV, 7–20 [in Ukrainian].
2. Atamanenko, A. (2010). Ukrainian historical society: ideas, figures, activities. Ostroh [in Ukrainian].
3. Vynar, L. (1985). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi (1866–1934), the most outstanding historian of Ukraine. On the 50th anniversary of death. Miunkhen [in Ukrainian].
4. Dombrovskyi, O. (1986). M. Hrushevskyi and the Kyiv scientific tradition. *Svoboda [Freedom]*, 214, 4 [in Ukrainian].
5. Dombrovskyi, O. (1985). An eternally relevant scheme of the history of Ukraine. *Svoboda [Freedom]*, 26, 2. [in Ukrainian].
6. Dombrovskyi, O. (1984). The geographical factor in the early historical scheme of “History of Ukraine-Rus” by M. Hrushevskyi. *Ukrainiyskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1–4, 103–110. [in Ukrainian].

7. Dombrovskiy, O. (1968). Herodotus' Scythia in M. Hrushevsky's History of Ukraine-Rus. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1–4, 60–68. [in Ukrainian].
8. Dombrovskiy, O. (1970). I. Franko's critical comments on M. Hrushevsky's "History". *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1–3, 122–131. [in Ukrainian].
9. Dombrovskiy, O. (1969). Methodological foundations of research on the early history of Ukraine by M. Hrushevsky. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1–3, 65–73. [in Ukrainian].
10. Dombrovskiy, O. (1987). A new acquisition in the field of Ukrainian historiography. *Svoboda [Freedom]*, 16, 4 [in Ukrainian].
11. Matskiv, T. (1984). Hetman Ivan Mazepa in the works of M. Hrushevsky. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 1–4, 111–122. [in Ukrainian].
12. Pyrig, R., Telvak, V. (2021). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: biography against the background of the times. Kherson [in Ukrainian].
13. Pyrig, R., Telvak, V. (2016). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: biographical essay. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
14. Pritsak, O. (1973). Why departments of Ukrainian studies at Harvard? Cambridge [in Ukrainian].
15. Romanenchuk, B. (1969). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a writer and literary critic. *Providence Almanac for 1969*, 107–129. Philadelphia [in Ukrainian].
16. Telvak, V. V., Telvak, V. P. (2005). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a researcher of Ukrainian historiography. Kyiv; Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
17. Telvak, V. V., Telvak, V. P. (2021). Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical journal]*, 5, 4–16 [in Ukrainian].
18. Telvak, V. (2012). Hrushevskiana on the pages of the "Ukrainian Historical Journal" (1991–2010). *Istoriografichni doslidzhennya v Ukrayini [Historiographic research in Ukraine]*, 22, 483–498 [in Ukrainian].
19. Telvak, V. (2000). Study of the historical and theoretical heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in the historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora (1939–1990). *Bulletin of Lviv University. Historical Series*, 35–36, 354–366 [in Ukrainian].
20. Telvak, V. (2006–2007). The "Franko-Hrushevsky" problem in Ukrainian historiography. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 4/1–2, 183–199 [in Ukrainian].
21. Telvak, V. (2002). Theoretical and methodological foundations of the historical views of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi (late 19th – early 20th centuries). NY; Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
22. Telvak, V. (2010). Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress. *Krayeznavstvo [Local studies]*, 3, 29–35 [in Ukrainian].
23. Telvak, V. (2013). Monographic Hrushevskiana: an attempt at generalization. *Hurzhiivski istorychni chytannia [Gurzhi's historical readings]*, 6, 104–107 [in Ukrainian].
24. Telvak, V. (2008). Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s). Kyiv; Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
25. Telvak, V., Pedych, V. (2016). Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky. Lviv [in Ukrainian].
26. Chyrovskiy, M. (1968). Mykhailo Hrushevskyi as a researcher of the Ukrainian economy. *YzvolNnyy shlyakh [The path of liberation]*, XI–XII, 1403–1417. [in Ukrainian].
27. Chubaty, M. (1971). Ukrainian historical science (its development and achievements). Philadelphia [in Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редакції / Received: 20.03.2025

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 21.04.2025