

# ДИСКУСІЯ

УДК 94(477)(092)

DOI: 10.31651/2076-5908-2025-2-182-189

**Vasyl PEDYCH**

*Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History), Docent at Department of Social Sciences, Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8942-8374>

e-mail: [pedychwasyl@gmail.com](mailto:pedychwasyl@gmail.com)

**Sviatoslav ZHURAVLOV**

*Candidate of Historical Sciences (Ph. D. in History), Junior researcher at the Department of source studies of Modern History of Ukraine, Mykhailo Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine*

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-4038>

e-mail: [zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com](mailto:zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com)

## DISCUSSION OF M. HRUSHEVSKY'S "HISTORY OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE" IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF 1920-1930S

**Abstract.** The purpose of the study is to reconstruct the process of understanding of M. Hrushevsky's historical and literary heritage in the scientific thought of his time. The methodological basis for the work is an interdisciplinary approach. The biographical method plays an important role, which involves the study of historical phenomena and processes through the prism of life and creative heritage of certain outstanding representatives of the era. In addition, the study implements methods of philosophical, general scientific and specific historical character. Particular emphasis is put on the structural and functional system analysis of historiographical facts, the comparative-historical method and the method of critical analysis of documentary material, based on the principles of objectivity and historicism. The study also used methods of periodization, classification and typology. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the special analysis of the problem of reception of M. Hrushevsky's historical and literary heritage in the scientific thought of his time. **Conclusions.** The lively discussion of «History of Ukrainian Literature» during the 20-30s demonstrated that this work has become an important phenomenon of Ukrainian humanism during the times of national revival. Alongside with the «History of Ukraine-Rus», it was recognized as the greatest creative achievement of M. Hrushevsky and the evidence of a powerful upsurge of national science. The criticisms and suggestions of a methodological nature expressed during the critical discussion contributed to the modernization of Ukrainian literary criticism and its emergence on new conceptual and thematic horizons. Polemic observations around the ideas expressed in the «History of Ukrainian Literature» during the interwar period, laid the traditions of the historical and literary Hrushevsky studies, and not during the post-war years only. As a source for further interpretations of the literary heritage of M. Hrushevsky, they are recognized by the researchers of our time.

**Key words:** M. Hrushevsky, «History of Ukrainian Literature», perception, review, historiography.

**Василь ПЕДИЧ**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри суспільних наук Івано-Франківського національного технічного університету нафти і газу, м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8942-8374>

e-mail: [pedychwasyl@gmail.com](mailto:pedychwasyl@gmail.com)

**Святослав ЖУРАВЛІОВ**

*кандидат історичних наук, молодший науковий співробітник відділу джерелознавства нової історії України Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства імені М. Грушевського НАН України*

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-4038>

e-mail: [zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com](mailto:zuravlovsvatoslav27@gmail.com)

## ОБГОВОРЕННЯ «ІСТОРІЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ» М. ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ 1920–30-х рр.

**Анотація.** Мета дослідження полягає у реконструкції процесу осмислення історико-літературної спадщини М. Грушевського в науці його доби. **Методологічне підґрунтя** роботи становить міждисциплінарний підхід. Важливу роль відіграв біографічний метод, що передбачає вивчення історичних явищ і процесів через призму життя та творчості окремих помітних представників епохи. Також у роботі використано методи філософського, загальнонаукового та конкретно-історичного характеру. Особливий акцент зроблено на структурно-

функціональному системному аналізу історіографічних фактів, порівняльно-історичному методі та методі критичного аналізу документального матеріалу, виходячи з принципів об'єктивності та історизму. У дослідженні було також використано методи періодизації, класифікації і типологізації. **Наукова новизна** статті полягає у спеціальному аналізі проблеми реценції історико-літературної спадщини М. Грушевського в науці його доби. **Висновки.** Жваве обговорення «Історія української літератури» протягом 20-30-х років, засвідчило, що ця праця стала важливим явищем української гуманістики доби національного відродження. Поряд з «Історією України-Руси», вона була визнана найбільшим творчим досягненням М.Грушевського та свідченням потужного злету вітчизняної науки. Висловлені в ході критичного обговорення зауваження та пропозиції методологічного характеру сприяли модернізації українського літературознавства, виходу його на нові концептуально-тематичні обрії. Полемічні спостереження довкола висловлених в «Історії української літератури» ідей, котрі прозвучали у міжвоєнний час, заклали традиції історико-літературної грушевськіани не лише у повоєнні роки. Як вихідні для подальших інтерпретацій літературознавчої спадщини М.Грушевського вони визнаються й дослідниками нашого часу.

**Ключові слова:** М. Грушевський, «Історія української літератури», реценція, рецензія, історіографія.

**The statement of the problem.** The historical memory of our society associates Mykhailo Hrushevsky with creation of two main works – “History of Ukraine-Rus’ and “History of Ukrainian Literature”. However, in fact, the later often appears in the shadow of its ten-volume counterpart and seems to be perceived as its peculiar satellite. The explanation lies in the fact that it is “History of Ukraine-Rus” that formulated ground-breaking theoretical-methodological principles, which later became the foundation of Ukrainian Humanities and all scientific works of Hrushevsky. Such imbalance leaves the peculiar perceptions of “History of Ukrainian Literature” of that time practically unknown. This knowledge gap hinders the comprehensive understanding of work’s importance for Ukrainian science of 20-30-ies, as well as makes tracking of modern Hrushevsky Studies historical-literary concepts vividly incomplete.

**Analysis of previous research.** Hrushevsky Studies researchers have analysed historical-literary works of Mykhailo Hrushevsky quite often. However, the peculiarities of their perception were only slightly highlighted in studies of Sergiy Bilokin [3] and Vitaliy Telvak [19, c. 261–267; 20–32]. As an independent object of research this issue has not been represented yet, which constitutes the topicality of our article.

**The purpose of the article** is to reconstruct the process of perception of Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s historical-literary works in the scientific context of his times.

**The statement of the main material.** “History of Ukrainian Literature” had a unique destiny. According to scientist’s autobiographical notes, an idea appeared at the beginning of XX ct., and first lines were written in exile in Symbirsk and Kazan, when Hrushevsky did not have the possibility to work on his “History of Ukraine-Rus” [5, c. 216]. The “Foreword” to the first volume of “History of Ukrainian Literature” states the following: “When my work on my historical course came to a halt, due to the war outbreak, I started thinking about publishing a review on Ukrainian literature. While being in prison in winter 1914/15, I prepared lecture notes of such a course and I began preparatory work. It was not easy, since neither Symbirsk, nor Kazan, nor Moscow where I finally stopped, had a good Ukrainian printing. And eventually, everything I managed to do vanished into the thin air in the fire of my home at the beginning of 1918. All in all, I went abroad having nothing but ideas in my mind”.

Hrushevsky had to recreate his work again literary from scratch. The unfavourable circumstances of his life in exile adversely “assisted” his work, as Hrushevsky did not have full unlimited access to archives and thus, he could not continue the “main” work of his life. The Viennese period of his life gave access to some literary sources and allowed the scientist to use materials of first volumes of “History of Ukraine-Rus” and finally begin his work on “History of Ukrainian Literature”. Describing the purpose of his literature study in broader context of Ukrainian spirituality, Hrushevsky wrote the following: “...By this work I wanted to include the broadest circles of Ukrainians to the circle of my and not only my observations and studies on the development of our spiritual life and one of its dimensions – the literary art. I wanted them to feel all the richness of emotions and feelings, this power and beauty that is preserved in our literary heritage” [6, c. 39–40].

As “History of Ukrainian Literature” appeared just before Hrushevsky’s return to the Motherland, the discussion of his work in Ukrainian and Western literature lasted during the Soviet period of his life. Lviv edition “Dilo” was the first to react on the first 3 volumes with the short note of Volodymyr Doroshenko. Characterising the progress of Ukrainian Literary studies of last decades of XIX – beginning of XX c., reviewer confidently stated that M. Hrushevsky’s new study “is definitely the best compilation of the history of Ukrainian literature”. Doroshenko substantiates his opinion not only by the authority of Ukrainian humanitarian, but also by the content of the first volumes. Doroshenko noted that original approach was skilfully combined with incredible erudition and professionalism [7]. We would like to mention that alongside with appreciation of the ground-breaking approach, Ukrainian intellectual circles noted that M. Hrushevsky excessively used social-economical approach while explaining phenomena of spiritual culture [33, c. 384–385].

Soviet Ukraine noticed the appearance of the first volumes of “History of Ukrainian Literature” as well. While analysing Hrushevsky’s new work, V. Koriak stated its belonging to the vivid representative of “bourgeois” science, who hid his class interests under the cover of proclaimed objectivity. At the same time, he positively evaluated methodological pages of first volumes, appreciating the consistent application of sociological approach in the research of prominent phenomena of historical-literary process. In this respect, as V. Koriak states, ““History of Ukrainian Literature” is closer to some extent to our understanding” [13, c. 85].

Shortly after M. Hrushevsky returned to Kyiv in 1924, a famous researcher of literature Volodymyr Peretz was one of the first to publish a review on three volumes. After characterising the achievements of Hrushevsky's predecessors, reviewer states that the concept of the work under study considerably differs from the present schematic researches of Ukrainian literary process. "This work ["History of Ukrainian literature"] researches from the different angle the path of the ancient Ukrainian-Rus literature and oral literary works, which naturally triggers a great interest and pleasure of a reader. And a reader seeks not for biographical data, not for "dry" list of facts, but for ideas that highlight the past of the literature" [16, c. 158].

An essential part of this critical review is devoted to analysis of a broad circle of methodological reflexions that M. Hrushevsky provided in the introduction to the first volume. While expressing his agreement with the need to establish the range of conceptual and terminological stages of historical-literary studies that the author offered, V. Peretz yet polemizes with their vision, often referring to his own works. "With these remarks concerning introductory paragraphs, – as reviewer notices, – I do not wish to lessen or devalue the importance of the new "History of Ukrainian Literature". All its main, principal part is written very skillfully" [16, c. 161]. Later Peretz discusses content and ideas of the work, especially noting its first volume that was "compiled following a completely new scheme". Reviewer mentions numerous innovative moments in Hrushevsky's study, concerning problematic, thematic and theoretical issues. While emphasizing on his objectivity in discussing dubious issues, V. Peretz drew readers' attention to some debatable points of first volume "History of Ukrainian Literature", but at the same time he expressed his excitement by author's work and wished him to continue the research on the literary process of the last centuries.

Mykhailo Markovskyy reviewed the following – fourth volume – of "History of Ukrainian Literature" on the pages of bibliographical entry of restored by Hrushevsky journal "Ukraine". He underlined that it is a rare "team work" of the experienced historian, source researcher and literature researcher that makes his study interesting, first of all methodologically: "The works of M. S. Hrushevsky always use this sociological approach, that at the end appears to be the only possible one to highlight literary phenomena truthfully" [14, c. 145]. The reviewer also highlights the originality of Hrushevsky's contemplations, his attempts to re-think the established facts from a new point of view, while using modern methodological tools.

M. Markovskyy concentrated on the analysis of extremely interesting (in his opinion) conclusions of the author, comparing them with already established concepts in science. He also appreciated the exhaustive analysis of scientific literature. The reviewer states that the majority of issues, tackled by the author, "need a closure, and even the narrowest in his/her outlook researcher should get rid of any doubts". Summarising his review, M. Markovskyy highly appreciated the professional level of the study by calling it "a valuable contribution into our scientific literature". Apart from this, he noted that the fourth volume is easy and approachable to read, and it can interest broader reader circles. "What makes the work of Hrushevsky truly important, – as summarizes Markovskyy, – is that the author managed to come closer the ordinary reader and stick to the scientific-popular method; his book can attract any reader and can be a pleasant reading" [14, c. 147].

First four volumes of "History of Ukrainian Literature" were also reviewed by Vyacheslav Kaminskyi on the pages of "Ethnografichnyi vistnyk" ("Ethnographical Herald"). Professional specification of the journal, where the review appeared, left an imprint on his review: the author concentrated on the ethnographical questions in Hrushevsky's works. Like V. Peretz, V. Kaminskyi dwells upon the innovative essence of "History of Ukrainian Literature" in methodological and problematic aspect as well as in relation with source material involved.

The reviewer appreciates the consistent application of sociological method, which allowed to link phenomena of literary process with historical context of their emergence and functioning, as well as to demonstrate the mutual connection of literary, social-political, and economical factors in Ukrainian intellectual culture [11, c. 146]. Such versatility of author's analysis, according to reviewer, allowed Hrushevsky to largely enrich traditional research of ethnographical element and to show its importance, which is especially important in the first and fourth volume. The mentioned volumes were in the spotlight of V. Kaminskyi, as he thoroughly analysed the ideas and conclusions, often polemizing with them. Summarizing historical-ethnographical issues, expressed in "History of Ukrainian Literature", the reviewer emphasized that: "Ethnographical work of academician Hrushevsky impresses us with this immense quantity of Ukrainian folklore material details, as well as with scientific literature on folklore in connection with folklore of other peoples, countries, referring to rich foreign literature" [11, c. 148]. Highlighting thoroughness and exhaustiveness of issues studied, the reviewer wished the author to "finish his project of the history of literature".

Galician colleagues of Hrushevsky continued to reflect on his work in the middle of 20-ies. The first three volumes of "History of Ukrainian Literature" were reviewed by V. Doroshenko on the pages of Lviv journal "Stara Ukraina" ("The Old Ukraine"). Continuing the already launched discussion of the work on the pages of Lviv print media, the reviewer contemplated on the lack of comprehensive research on the history of Ukrainian historical-literary process from the angle of national historiography. Having admitted that the scientific authority of Hrushevsky guarantees the highly professional level of the work, V.

Doroshenko appreciated its scientific and national-upbringing value. The reviewer pointed at the peculiarity of the author's approach to determining of the task of the historical-literary research and he consequently noted: "The style is grand, but at the same time easy to read and exciting. The work in general interestingly approaches the question of the language as well as its interpretation. In this respect, Hrushevsky's work is truly prominent phenomenon of scientific literature" [7, c. 190–191].

Author's originality, as Doroshenko insists, is based on the focus on the folk art, since researchers of the XIX-XX centuries paid little or no attention to the issue. Briefly summarizing the content of the first three volumes, the researcher eagerly remarks the impressive volume "of the fascinatingly interesting material, views and notes". V. Doroshenko finds the first volume the most interesting, as there Hrushevsky reconstructed the beginning of the national literary process and put forward various hypotheses, using the sociological method. These hypotheses, though being disputable, conceptually enrich Ukrainian literary studies. Explicitly expressing admiration for Hrushevsky's professionalism, V. Doroshenko again emphasized that "History of Ukrainian literature" is "a true masterpiece, worth its best counterparts from French scientific literature" [7, c. 191]. Thus, as concludes V. Doroshenko, educated Ukrainians would impatiently wait for the continuation of Hrushevsky's "epochal work".

Ilarion Svientsitskyi made a comparative characterization of the first three volumes of "History of the Ukrainian Literature" on the background of historical-literary works belonging to an afterwar period. The reviewer compared theoretical-methodological basis of the work of three authors: M. Voznyak, C. Yefremov and M. Hrushevsky. The conclusion stated that the huge advantage of "History of Ukrainian Literature" of the latter is the skilful application of sociological approach. This method linked the Ukrainian literary art with socio-economic conditions of the people and integrated it into broader Eastern-European context. On the other hand, as reviewer claims, the desire of Hrushevsky to enrich the palette of the Ukrainian medieval culture development led to exceeding categoricalness of his conclusions in defining authenticity (e. g. "Slovo o polku Ihorevym" ("The Tale of Irog's Campaign" and origin of some literary monuments (e. g. "Molinnya Danyla Zatochnyka" (Praying of Danylo Zatochnyk)). I. Svientsitskyi argued with the general scheme of work, that is based on the author's defending of his Anti-Normanist convictions. While defining the place of the study among other historical-literary works, the reviewer noted, that "Hrushevsky linked the folk national literature with international one, and in general, he united the whole literature up to XIV ct. with the historical destiny of a nation" [17, c. 101].

Hrushevsky's intensive elaboration of "History of Ukrainian literature" was also highlighted during the celebration of his anniversary in 1926. For the first time different speakers on events devoted to this remarkable date attributed an important place to this new synthesis ("History of Ukrainian Literature") next to his famous "History of Ukraine-Rus", emphasizing that these two studies are the most important achievements of Ukrainian humanities of that time [19, c. 275–304]. The creation of "History of Ukrainian Literature" was regarded as evidence of universality of Hrushevsky's genius and his leading role in the national science. Thus, Volodymyr Lypskyi, the president of All-Ukrainian Academy of Science, in his congratulating speech made an important remark: "Your History of Ukraine is an enormous work, originally written, including an impressive multitude of sources. This is the first comprehensive, scientific, and detailed History of our land... Even if it was your only work, even then it would be an eternal monument. So, when we regard the History of Ukrainian Literature..., we vividly understand that Hrushevsky is the best connoisseur of Ukraine and one of her most prominent sons" [34, c. 8]. The head of SSS Kyrylo Studinsky expressed a similar idea: "You managed to take a careful look at spiritual treasure of Ukrainian people, at its past, and then you laid the foundation with your literary and philological works, the top of them being "History of Ukrainian Literature" [34, c. 10].

The critical reflection on the historical-literary works of Mykhailo Hrushevsky continued in the second half of 20-ies. However, due to "the growing struggle on the historical front" it became harder and harder to continue this struggle in the Motherland. Only "Ukraina" and other rare collections edited by AUAS abstained from obligatory condemning rhetoric in discussion of Hrushevsky's works. Thus, they continued further contemplation on new parts of "History of Ukrainian Literature".

M. Markovskyy reviewed the first part of the fifth volume. Continuing his review on the previous volumes, the reviewer characterised in few sentences the whole complexity of the literature period under study. Markovskyy again emphasized that it was Hrushevsky who was the first to comprehensively study Ukrainian literary art of XV – the beginning of XVII centuries and he concentrated on his creative findings. While summarizing the content of its chapters, the reviewer demonstrates Hrushevsky's skilfulness in using source materials and original interpretations, as well as the issues raised. "...The work of Hrushevsky is a valuable contribution to our science, – as Markovskyy claims, – referring to works of his predecessors, but exposing them to his sharp criticism, Hrushevsky definitely resolves certain questions, often from a new point of view..., and in general, he provides such a wide picture of this previously obscure part of Ukrainian cultural past, that any literate person would read it with interest" [14, c. 187].

Dmytro Abramovych reviewed two parts of the fifth volume of "History of Ukrainian Literature", also on the pages of "Ukraina". Summarizing its ideas and content, as well as highlighting the originality

of its concept, the reviewer underlined a crucial influence of Hrushevsky on Ukrainian Literary Studies. At the same time, he outlined the range of debatable and weak points, which are caused by the general scarcity of other studies on this period of Ukrainian culture. However, these weaknesses considerably concede to the advantages to this work, as, to Abramovych's convictions, "it is useful not only by its scientific methods, new studies and research, but by its methodological and pedagogical contemplations" [1, c. 99].

Kost Koperzhynsky put forward an attempt of comprehensive regard on the historical-literary heritage on the pages of "Studii z istorii Ukrainy" ("Studies on the history of Ukraine"). According to his views, this monumental work of Kyiv academician appears to be the only research where the history, sociology and literary studies combine" [12, c. XLV]. After characterising the innovative approach of Hrushevsky in researching Ukrainian literary process, K. Koperzhynsky noted, that the researcher often had to "wander the unknown paths".

The author of the article concentrated on the sociological method of the scientist, as he underlined the growing intensity of his historical-sociological researches from the beginning of the XX century. While illustrating the consistency of the method's application, K. Koperzhynsky drew reader's attention to the problem of general periodization of Ukrainian literature as the important theoretical issue of "History of Ukrainian literature". The author concluded with noting the originality of Hrushevsky's interpretation of the majority of the researched issues and underlined a highly professional level of his historical-literary works, evidenced by general appreciation of the work in academical environment.

Moscow "Literary Encyclopaedia" expressed an official party vision of the historical-literary heritage of M. Hrushevsky on the verge of 20-30-ies. Following the general tendencies, Kyiv academician was called "a short-sighted, little bourgeois politician", though noting his revision of previous political preferences and choosing the side of Soviet authority". K. Burevoi in his encyclopaedical entry contrasted weaknesses of Hrushevsky's style in his own literary works to the solid professional level of his historical-literary works, in particular – his "History of Ukrainian Literature", as the reviewer called it – "the essential source in researching Old Ukrainian literature" [4, c. 73]. While criticizing the methodology of the main historical-literary study of Ukrainian researcher, the author noted: "being the follower of the French sociologist Durkheim, Hrushevsky failed to understand the great law of the class struggle, and thus, his works are quite eclectic" [4, c. 74].

In the second half of 20-ies "History of Ukrainian Literature" was also noted abroad. All five volumes at once attracted attention of Hrushevsky's long-standing opponent, famous Polish Literary studies scientist and professor of Berlin University – Alexander Brückner. His thorough review in German first of all noted an incredible Hrushevsky's hard work, that continued despite unfavourable conditions. The reviewer underlined that "author's knowledge and aspirations deserve nothing but respect" [35, c. 462–463]. He characterized "History of Ukrainian Literature" as a fundamental work, written with incredible erudition and researcher's talent. Brückner also appreciated the study of certain issues, as for example pages of Volynian chronicle. The reviewer regarded it as "the most perfect evaluation, that was truly needed" [35, c. 465]. However, he completely disagreed upon authorial concept and criticized the interpretation of a range of historical-literary phenomena.

As a continuation of the discussion from the beginning of XX century, A. Brückner criticized Antinormanist views of his Ukrainian colleague, claiming, that patriotic feelings often guide the logic of scientific research. As an illustration for these claims, the Polish scientist pointed at Hrushevsky's attempts to artificially make the Ukrainian literature older and by false arguments prove Ukrainian origin of some Polish and Russian written artefacts. A. Brückner wrote about the attempts of Hrushevsky "to make" some Polish writers Ukrainians, with explicit irony offering to consider himself, native of Ternopil, to be Ukrainian. Despite the polemical tone of the entire review, The Polish scientist in general appreciated the work of his colleague, noting its propaedeutic character.

After the tragic death of Hrushevsky in 1934, in order to define the place of the scientist in the humanitarian science of that time, the research of author's enormous heritage gained a new impetus. Different obituarial publications established a tradition of considering "History of Ukraine-Rus" and "History of Ukrainian Literature" to be the greatest works of Hrushevsky. These multivolume studies are also labelled as the greatest achievements of Ukrainian humanitarian science at the period of national revival.

Unbridled criticism of Hrushevsky slowed down a bit in Soviet Social studies during the second half of 30-ies. At that time, the party publications were mainly writing about him to provide information, and not to criticize. Modern researcher Sergiy Bilokin noted the "paradoxical presence of favourable situation for Hrushevsky precisely at the end of 1930s" [3, c. 257]. For example, the daughter of Hrushevsky managed to prepare 10<sup>th</sup> volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" in 1936, as well as the 6<sup>th</sup> volume of "History of Ukrainian Literature" was planned to be published in the second half of 30-s.

Oleksander Biletskyi wrote an editorial review on this volume, which is available nowadays [3, c. 261–264]. While sticking to evaluating Hrushevsky as a representor of "bourgeois science", the reviewer noted that "such a systemic and thorough layout of facts as in 6<sup>th</sup> volume, has never been seen before in Ukrainian Literary historiography. Not that many historical-literary works can be compared to the work of Hrushevsky" [3, c. 263]. Regarding a considerable erudition of the author, his involving of the wide

text base, originality of the introduced historical-literary concepts, O. Biletskyi emphasized that “its publication would be truly desirable, as well as the history of its continuation, that brings the history of Ukrainian literature to the last decades of XVIII century” [3, c. 264].

Galician and emigrated scientists studied Hrushevsky's works more objectively and thoroughly. His literary studies research was analysed in detail on the pages of “Novyi Chas” (“New Times”). The author of the notes – Yevgen Pelenskyi emphasized, that obituary publications while glorifying Hrushevsky as a prominent historian, pedagogue, organizer of public and scientific life, a bit out shadowed Hrushevsky's achievements in elaboration of the history of literary process. Apart from his literary scientific research, Hrushevsky created favourable circumstances for talented people on the field of literature as they could publish their works on the pages of different journals, as “Literary and Scientific Herald” [10]. Ye. Pelenskyi also highlighted an under-explored issue of Hrushevsky's fiction works, despite the fact, that the scientist wanted to devote himself to this genre when he was young. The reviewer draws a distinct line between Hrushevsky's literary works, written in the framework of Ukrainian Romanticism school, from ones, written during the “mature” period with distinctive historical “colouring” resembling style of Kostomarov [9].

D. Skytskyi analyzed theoretical and methodological foundations of historical-theoretical works of Hrushevsky. He pointed out that like all other works of the scientist, “History of Ukrainian Literature” has “visible traces of a prominent personality of the author: the energy of the word, a profound thinking culture, daring conclusions and alongside it all – an outstanding erudition” – those are the features that attract most the reader and motivate him/her for work [18, c. 25]. D. Skytskyi is convinced that analytical, synthetical and intuitive talents are fully applied in this research. Despite the immense volume of the material engaged as well as the originality of its methodological processing, the researcher also notes a certain controversy in Hrushevsky's attempts to focus on prominent phenomena of the historical-literary life and on its common routine manifestations simultaneously.

In literary studies discourse of the author D. Skytskyi notes the prevalence of ideological and sociological interpretations: “A historian in him, who observes the development of spiritual life diachronically, noticing the influence of foreign factors, is complemented by a sociologist, who observes the social life synchronically and explores society's functions, connection of spiritual functions with forms of social order and its economical welfare” [18, c. 26–27]. Sociological method gave the possibility to comprehensively observe Ukrainian historical-literary process, starting from Early Middle Ages and also track the mutual interinfluence with literatures of other nations. As a consequence, Hrushevsky involved national oral literature, that lacked attention from his predecessors. In general, as a researcher noted, the multitude of ideas in “History of Ukrainian Literature” would define the directions of the further research in future.

Leonid Biletskyi made another attempt of generalising of Hrushevsky's historical-literary researches. He emphasized that Hrushevsky's interest in the past of the national literature is as traditional as his historical works. Even while creating his “History of Ukraine-Rus” the researcher referred to solely literary sources, attributing them the same importance and informativity as to traditional sources. These researches alongside with Literary studies works explain rapid breakthrough in his “History of Ukrainian Literature”. After characterizing the scheme of the work and accentuating at the proclaimed by Hrushevsky tasks in the introduction to the first volume, L. Biletskyi analysed innovative features of the work in detail. The most original, in his view, were the establishing of the strong connection between oral and written literature, and revelation of the dialectics of Ukrainian literary process, when the decline in one aspect was compensated by thriving in another one. Hrushevsky managed to do this with the help of his scheme and sociological method [2, c. 129–130].

While characterising the work, L. Biletskyi was especially excited by its first volume, that reconsidered the study of the oral literary works, and also by some parts of the fourth volume, dedicated to the study of Ukrainian “bylyny”. However, even long-studied problems that were covered in the research, carry the “imprint” of Hrushevsky's talent as he would offer an unusual view on the established points in science. “This is an extremely rich in opinions work, truly original, never repeating anyone's opinion., - as finishes Biletskyi. – Each page of this work stimulates our own thinking, raises a range of questions and motivates to continue the elaboration of his original concept further, follow his track to the top of his creative ideas and long-lasting creative process” [2, c. 134–135].

**Conclusions.** Therefore, “History of Ukrainian Literature”, as its active discussing during 20–30-ies testifies, became an important phenomenon of Ukrainian humanities at times of national revival. Alongside with “History of Ukraine-Rus” it was recognised as the greatest creative achievement of Hrushevsky and the evidence of a vivid improvement of Ukrainian science. The critical discussion with remarks and methodological suggestions contributed to the modernization of Ukrainian Literary studies and opened new conceptual-methodological horizons. These polemical remarks expressed at interwar period concerning the ideas in “History of Ukrainian Literature” laid the foundation of historical-literary Hrushevsky Studies, and not during afterwar period only. As an input for further interpretations of Literary Studies heritage of M. Hrushevsky, they are still recognized by researches of our time.

## Список літератури

1. Абрамович Д. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури. Т. 5. Київ, 1926–27. *Україна*. 1929. Кн. 1. С. 95–99.
2. Білецький Л. М. Грушевський як історик української літератури. *Наша культура*. 1935. Річник 1-й. С. 129–135.
3. Білокін С. Рецензія О. Білецького на шостий том «Історії Української Літератури». *Український історик*. 1991–1992. № 3–4/1–4. С. 261–264.
4. Буревой К. Грушевский Михаил Сергеевич. *Литературная энциклопедия*. Т. 3. Москва, 1930. С. 71–74.
5. Грушевський М. Автобіографія, 1914–1919. *Великий Українець: Матеріали з життя та діяльності М. С. Грушевського*. Київ, 1992. С. 214–219.
6. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури: в 6 т., 9 кн. Т. 1. Київ, 1993. 392 с.
7. Дорошенко В. Михайло Грушевський. Історія української літератури. Том I (Частина I, книги: 1, 2 і 3). Київ–Львів, 1923. *Стара Україна*. 1924. Ч. XII. С. 190–191.
8. Дорошенко В. Михайло Грушевський: Історія Української літератури. Київ; Львів, 1923. Т. I–III. *Діло*. 1923. № 183. С. 6–7.
9. Є. Ю. П. [Є. Пеленський] Михайло Грушевський як белетрист. *Новий час*. 1935. № 222. С. 7.
10. Є. Ю. П. [Є. Пеленський] Михайло Грушевський як дослідник літератури. *Новий час*. 1934. № 270. С. 6.
11. Камінський В. Михайло Грушевський. Історія Української літератури. Тт. I–IV. *Етнографічний вісник*. 1926. Кн. 2. С. 145–148.
12. Копержинський К. Українське наукове літературознавство за останні 10 років. *Студії з історії України Науково-дослідчої катедри історії України в Києві*. Київ, 1929. Т. II. С. XXI–LII.
13. Коряк В. Література на робфаках. *Путь Просвещения*. 1923. № 6. С. 75–94.
14. Марковський М. Грушевський М. Історія української літератури. Т. IV. Київ, 1925. *Україна*. 1926. Кн. 1. С. 144–147.
15. Марковський М. Михайло Грушевський. Історія української літератури. Том п'ятий, випуск перший. Державне видавництво України, 1926 р., ст. 204. *Україна*. 1927. Кн. 3. С. 183–187.
16. Перетц В. Михайло Грушевський. Історія української літератури. Частина перша. Тт. I–III. *Україна*. 1925. Кн. 4. С. 158–163.
17. Свенціцький І. Три історії української літератури. *Учитель*. 1925. Кн. 2. С. 97–101.
18. Скитський Д. До методології історії літератури Мих. Грушевського. *Дзвони*. Річник V. 1935. С. 25–30.
19. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ; Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.
20. Тельвак В. Постать Михайла Грушевського в історіографії Центрально-Східної Європи (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Дрогобич, 2012. 169 с.
21. Тельвак В. Науково-популярні праці Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях початку XX століття. *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2006. Вип. X. С. 348–358.
22. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
23. Тельвак В. Грушевська на сторінках «Українського історичного журналу» (1991–2010 рр.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2012. Вип. 22. С. 483–498.
24. Тельвак В. Грушевська Руслана Пирого. *Архіви України*. 2011. № 2–3. С. 290–298.
25. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу. *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
26. Тельвак В. Монографічна грушевська: спроба узагальнення. *Гуржіївські історичні читання: Збірник наукових праць*. 2013. Вип. 6. С. 104–107.
27. Тельвак В. Громадсько-політична діяльність Михайла Грушевського в Галичині в оцінках сучасників. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio F. Lublin*, 2016. Vol. LXXI. S. 65–88.
28. 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.
29. Тельвак В. Дослідження рецепції творчої спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (40–80-ті роки). *Студії з історії Української революції 1917–1921 років*. 2011. Вип. 5. С. 72–82.
30. Тельвак В. Добрий історик, але поганий політик: рецепція творчої спадщини Михайла Грушевського після 1914 року. *Scriptorium nostrum*. 2015. № 1–2. С. 35–64.
31. Тельвак В. Життєвий і творчий шлях М. Грушевського в ювілейних оцінках 1926 р. *Український історичний журнал*. 2008. № 6. С. 111–125.
32. Тельвак В. Постать Михайла Грушевського в польській історіографії (кінець XIX–XX ст.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006. № 5. С. 67–82.
33. У півстолітніх змаганнях. Вибрані листи до Кирила Студинського (1891–1941). Київ, 1993. 766 с.
34. Ювілей академіка М. С. Грушевського. 1866–1926. Ч. I. Ювілейні засідання. Ч. II. Привітання. Київ, 1927. 143 с.
35. Brückner A. Hrushevskij Mychajło. Istorija ukraźnśkoż literatury. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*. 1927. Bd. 4. S. 462–471.

## References

1. Abramovych, D. (1929). Hrushevsky M. History of Ukrainian Literature. V. 5. K., 1926–27. *Ukraine [Ukraine]*, 1, 95–99 [in Ukrainian].
2. Biletskyi, L. (1935). M. Hrushevsky as a historian of Ukrainian literature. *Nasza kultura [Our culture]*, 1, 129–135 [in Ukrainian].
3. Bilokin, S. (1991–1992). Biletsky's Review on the Volume Six of the History of Ukrainian Literature. *Ukrainskyi istoryk [Ukrainian historian]*, 3–4/1–4, 261–264 [in Ukrainian].

4. Burevoi, K. (1930). Hrushevskiy Mykhayl Serheevych [Hrushevsky Mikhail Sergeevich]. *Literaturnaja Encyklopedija [Literary Encyclopedia]*, III, 71–74 [in Russian].
5. Hrushevskiy, M. (1992). Autobiography, 1914–1919. *Great Ukrainian: Materials from the life and work of M. S. Hrushevsky*, 214–219 [in Ukrainian].
6. Hrushevskiy, M. (1993). History of Ukrainian Literature, I, Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
7. Doroshenko, V. (1924). Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of Ukrainian Literature. Vol. I (Part I, books: 1, 2 and 3). *Stara Ukraina [Old Ukraine]*, XII, 190–191 [in Ukrainian].
8. Doroshenko, V. (1923). Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of Ukrainian Literature. Kyiv-Lviv, 1923, vol. I-III. *Dilo [Work]*, 183, 6–7 [in Ukrainian].
9. Ye. Iu. P. [Ie. Pelenskiy]. (1935). Mykhailo Hrushevsky as a belletrist. *Novyj chas [New time]*, 222, 7 [in Ukrainian].
10. Ye. Iu. P. [Ie. Pelenskiy]. (1934). Mykhailo Hrushevsky as a researcher of Ukrainian literature. *Novyj chas [New time]*, 270, 6 [in Ukrainian].
11. Kaminskiy, V. (1926). Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of Ukrainian Literature. Vol. I-IV. *Etnografichnyy Buleten [Ethnographic Bulletin]*, 2, 145–148 [in Ukrainian].
12. Koperzhynskiy, K. (1929). Ukrainian scientific literary studies over the past 10 years. *Studies on the history of Ukraine Research Department of the History of Ukraine in Kiev*, II, XXI–LII [in Ukrainian].
13. Koriak, V. (1923). Literature on robfaks. *Put Prosveshcheniya [The Way of Enlightenment]*, 6, 75–94 [in Ukrainian].
14. Markovskiy, M. (1926). Hrushevsky M. History of Ukrainian Literature. Vol. IV. Kyiv, 1925. *Ukraina [Ukraine]*, 1, 144–147 [in Ukrainian].
15. Markovskiy, M. (1927). Hrushevsky M. History of Ukrainian Literature. Vol. V, part I. 1926, p. 204. *Ukraina [Ukraine]*, 3, 183–187 [in Ukrainian].
16. Peretz, V. (1925). Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of Ukrainian Literature. Part One. Тт. I-III. *Ukraina [Ukraine]*, 4, 158–163 [in Ukrainian].
17. Svientsitskiy, I. (1925). Three histories of Ukrainian literature. *Uchytel [Teacher]*, 2, 97–101 [in Ukrainian].
18. Skytskiy, D. (1935). To the methodology of the history of literature of Mykh. Hrushevsky. *Dzvony [Bells]*, V, 25–30 [in Ukrainian].
19. Telvak, V. (2008). The creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in the estimation of contemporaries (end of the 19th – 30s of the 20th century). Kyiv; Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
20. Telvak, V. (2012). The figure of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in the historiography of Central-Eastern Europe (end of the 19th - 30s of the 20th century). Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
21. Telvak, V. (2006). Popular scientific works of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in historiographical discussions of the beginning of the 20th century. *Drohobyskiy kraieznavchyy zbirnyk [Drohobysky local history collection]*, X, 348–358 [in Ukrainian].
22. Telvak, V.V., Telvak, V.P. (2021). Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical magazine]*, 5, 4–16. [in Ukrainian].
23. Telvak, V. (2012). Hrushevskiana on the pages of the “Ukrainian Historical Journal” (1991–2010). *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini [Historiographic research in Ukraine]*, 22, 483–498 [in Ukrainian].
24. Telvak, V. (2011). Hrushevskiana Ruslan Pirog. *Arkhivy Ukrainy [Archives of Ukraine]*, 2–3, 290–298 [in Ukrainian].
25. Telvak, V. (2010). Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress. *Kraieznavstvo [Local history]*, 3, 29–35 [in Ukrainian].
26. Telvak, V. (2013). Monographic Hrushevskiana: an attempt at generalization. *Hurzhivski istorychni chytannia: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats [Gurzhyi historical readings: Collection of scientific papers]*, 6, 104–107 [in Ukrainian].
27. Telvak, V. (2016). Social and political activities of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in Galicia in the assessment of contemporaries. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio F, LXXI*, 65–88 [in Ukrainian].
28. Telvak, V. (2000). Study of the historical and theoretical heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in the historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora (1939–1990). *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriya istorychna [Bulletin of Lviv University. The series is historical]*, 35–36, 354–366 [in Ukrainian].
29. Telvak, V. (2011). Study of the reception of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's creative heritage in the historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora (40s–80s). *Studii z istorii Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917–1921 rokiv [Studies on the history of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921]*, 5, 72–82 [in Ukrainian].
30. Telvak, V. (2015). A good historian, but a bad politician: the reception of the creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy after 1914. *Scriptorium nostrum*, 1–2, 35–64 [in Ukrainian].
31. Telvak, V. (2008). The life and creative path of M. Hrushevskiy in the jubilee evaluations of 1926. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical magazine]*, 6, 111–125 [in Ukrainian].
32. Telvak, V. (2006). The figure of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in Polish historiography (late 19th–20th centuries). *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical magazine]*, 5, 67–82 [in Ukrainian].
33. (1993). In the half-century competitions. Selected letters to Cyril Studinsky (1891–1941). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
34. (1927). Anniversary of Academician M. S. Hrushevsky. 1866–1926. I. Jubilee Sessions. II. Greeting. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
35. Briukner, A. (1927). Hrushevsky Mykhailo. History of Ukrainian Literature. *Journal of Slavic Philology*, 4, 462–471 [in German].