

ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ ТА МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ



УДК 94 (477) (092)
DOI: 10.31651/2076-5908-2026-1-8-18

Viktoriiia 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
e-mail: viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com



This is an open access article
under the CC BY-NC-ND license

© Автор(-и), 2026

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
e-mail: bilasvitlana24@gmail.com

Fadey YATSENYUK 

PhD in History, Associate Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine,
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University. Chernivtsi, Ukraine
e-mail: fadey2010@ukr.net

Images of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the intellectual space of the Russian Empire at the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries

Abstract. *The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the process of discussing Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly work in the intellectual space of the Russian Empire at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. 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 study lies in an attempt to provide a panoramic reconstruction of the debates that Hrushevsky's activity as a historian provoked within the milieu of the Russian intelligentsia at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. Conclusions. Summarizing our observations on the Russian reception of M. Hrushevsky's creative legacy during the late 19th and early of the 20th centuries we can confidently assert that it became a kind of mirror that clearly reflected the attitude toward all Ukrainians on the part of representatives of many branches of Russian scientific and socio-political thought. The rapid evolution of the theoretical foundations of the Ukrainian movement at the end of the 19th and in the early of the 20th centuries, the diversification of cultural and scientific forms of national life, and the complication of its socio-political field required adequate reflection on the part of Russian intellectuals. As a result, several interpretative approaches were created, ranging from quite successful attempts at academic analysis of M. Hrushevsky's historiographical legacy (N. Ryshkov, K. Radchenko, V. Storozhev, V. Cherepin, N. Chechulin) to outright profanation of the entire spectrum of his activities by supporters of the right-wing monarchist ideology (T. Florinsky, M. Pavlov, I. Sikorsky, S. Shchogolev). It should be noted that manifestations of these approaches can also be traced in contemporary Russian Ukrainian studies, in which M. Hrushevsky continues to be a symbol of Ukrainian identity of his era.*

Keywords: *M. Hrushevsky, Russian imperial space, historiographic images, Ukrainian historiography, reception.*

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: viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com

Світлана БЛА

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

Фадей ЯЦЕНЮК

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія
Федьковича, м. Чернівці, Україна, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2054-9805>, e-mail: fadey2010@ukr.net

**ОБРАЗИ М. ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОМУ ПРОСТОРИ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЇ
НАПРИКІНЦІ XIX – НА ПОЧАТКУ XX ст.**

Анотація.** Мета дослідження* полягає у реконструкції процесу обговорення наукової творчості М. Грушевського в інтелектуальному просторі Російської імперії наприкінці XIX – на початку XX ст. ***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*** дослідження полягає у спробі панорамного відтворення дискусій, які діяльність Грушевського-історика викликала у середовищі російської інтелігенції на зламі XIX–XX ст. ***Висновки.*** Підводячи підсумки російській реценції творчої спадщини М. Грушевського протягом кінця XIX – початку XX ст. можемо впевнено ствердити, що вона стала своєрідним дзеркалом, у якому виразно відобразилося ставлення до всього українства з боку представників багатьох напрямків російської наукової та суспільно-політичної думки. Швидка еволюція теоретичних засад українського руху наприкінці XIX – на початку XX ст., урізноманітнення культурно-наукових форм національного життя та ускладнення його суспільно-політичного поля, вимагали адекватного осмислення з боку російських інтелектуалів. У підсумку було створено декілька інтерпретаційних підходів – від цілком вдалих спроб академічного аналізу історіографічної спадщини М. Грушевського (Н. Ришков, К. Радченко, В. Сторожев, В. Черепін, Н. Чечулін та ін.) до відвертої профанації всього спектру його діяльності прихильниками правомонархічної ідеології (передусім, Т. Флоринський, М. Павлов, І. Сікорський і С. Щоголев). Відзначимо, що прояви цих підходів простежуються й у сучасній російській україніці, в котрій М. Грушевський надалі є символом українства його доби.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, російський імперський простір, історіографічні образи, українська історіографія, реценція.

Problem statement. Outside the Ukrainian intellectual community, it was our Russian neighbors who paid the most attention to M. Hrushevsky's scientific, organizational, and socio-political activities. That is clear, since Ukraine has always been within the sphere of their «vital» interests, so any attempt at political and intellectual separation of Ukrainians provoked resistance from their northern neighbor. The intellectual rivalry between Russians and Ukrainians became particularly acute in the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries, for two reasons. First, at that time, Ukrainians were formally guaranteed democratic freedoms within Austria-Hungary, which allowed them to create national intellectual products relatively freely and spread them to the Russian-controlled territories. Second, it was at this time that Ukrainian historiography, largely influenced by Russian academic tradition, underwent turbulent processes of institutionalization and professionalization, associated with subject-oriented discussions and the differentiation of scientific and organizational structures. It is clear that the historiographical concepts of the most prominent representative of Ukrainian humanities, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, were at the center of Russian reflection on the achievements of Ukrainian cultural life at that time. The historian was unanimously perceived as a kind of symbol of the contemporary Ukrainian cultural movement [1–2]. In view of this, it is important to trace the process of discussing the scholarly activity of the author of History of Ukraine-Rus' within the intellectual space of the Russian Empire at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Analysis of recent publications. Analysis of recent publications. Reception-related issues are quite popular in modern Hrushevsky studies. The Drohobych historiographer Vitalii Telvak has worked most intensively in this field, focusing in a number of monographs [3–4] and articles [5–18] on the discussions generated by the intellectual legacy of the author of History of Ukraine-Rus'. Considerable attention to the discussion of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly as well as socio-political activity in the territories under Russian rule was paid by the Kyiv researcher Svitlana Pankova [19]. The most relevant recent appeal to the lifetime reception of Hrushevsky's historiographical legacy belongs to the Mariupol historian Nataliia Romantsova [20]. However, the aforementioned and other researchers did not set

themselves the task of a special comprehensive study of the problem of the formation of historiographical images of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi within the Russian imperial space during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This determines the relevance of our research topic.

The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the process of discussing Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly work in the intellectual space of the Russian Empire at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

Presenting main material. After moving to Lviv, M. Hrushevsky's scientific activity reached its peak, and the Lviv, and later Lviv-Kyiv period of the scholar's life and work is rightly considered the most fruitful. Along with his creative and scientific-organizational activities, the historian also devoted a lot of attention and time to public and political work during this period. The latter circumstance led to the emergence of new dimensions in the assessment of his scientific work: along with the historiographical context itself, the political and ideological context became increasingly noticeable.

This tendency to ideologize M. Hrushevsky's work manifested itself in the early years of his stay in Galicia, when the scholar began to actively develop the institutional framework of Ukrainian science. Some Russian observers of Ukrainian intellectual life perceived this activity as a threat to the integrity of the «Russian tribe». Thus, when characterizing the Lviv «Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society», which the head of the Society quickly turned into a leading Ukrainian studies forum, the focus was often not on the professional level of the published articles, but rather the political and ideological component of the national and cultural activities that were carried out under the leadership of M. Hrushevsky in Galicia. In this context, emphasis was placed on the unsuitability of the Ukrainian language for scientific publications and the harmfulness to the integrity of the Russian Empire of the work carried out by Ukrainians in Austria-Hungary [21].

Professor of St. Vladimir University and Kyiv censor Tymofii Florinsky was particularly active in shaping the negative image of the scientific and research activities of Galician Ukrainians. He gained fame as an uncompromising fighter against any manifestations of Ukrainian cultural life. In his opinion, the arrival of the young scholar in Eastern Galicia «was a significant event in the history of the development of Little Russian literary separatism... He [M. Hrushevsky] became a truly energetic leader of the Ukrainian movement in Galicia and greatly expanded the scope of the Shevchenko Scientific Society's activities». While acknowledging the energy and organizational talent of the newly elected head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society [22, p. 1], T. Florinsky pointed out the insignificance of his diverse activities, but at the same time, contradicting himself, he exaggerated their danger to the traditional ideological foundations of Russian autocracy. In his reviews of Slavic studies literature, the Kyiv scholar assigned the Ukrainian language (in the author's terminology, «the little Russian dialect») the role of an instrument of popular literature, denying it the right to serve the higher spheres of culture and science [23].

T. Florinsky often moved from theoretical postulates to the practical implementation of his beliefs. For example, during the preparation of the Kyiv Archaeological Congress, he insisted on prohibiting Lviv scholars from delivering their reports in their native language, even though agreement had been reached with the leadership of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. This position of the congress organizers caused a real scandal in scientific and democratic circles in Russia and Western Europe and became a convenient excuse to discuss the difficult situation of the Ukrainian language and culture in the Russian Empire. An additional impetus for such a discussion was the publication in volumes XXXI and XXXII of the «Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society» of abstracts by Galician scientists, which were planned to be presented at the XI Archaeological Congress in Kyiv. A bibliographic review in «Kyiv Epic Stories» emphasized: «It is no exaggeration to say that the congress lost a great deal because it was deprived of the opportunity to familiarize itself with the quite substantial scientific works of Galician scholars» [24, p. 35].

The critical tone of M. Hrushevsky's works on the part of representatives of the Russian right-wing monarchist intelligentsia grew in line with the Ukrainian scholar's intensified efforts to popularize his views in Russian intellectual circles. A striking example of this is the reaction of its representatives to the appearance in an academic collection of the well-known article «The Usual Scheme of 'Russian' History and the Question of the Rational Structure of the History of the Eastern Slavs». Controversially received in academic circles of Russian scholars, it caused outrage in nationalist circles.

This position was most clearly presented by T. Florinsky in his review of Slavic literature. He emphasized the fallacy and harmfulness of allowing the Ukrainian language into academic publications and condemned the very fact of «patronage» of the Ukrainian cultural movement by some Russian scholars [25]. The Kyiv professor also focused on the conceptual foundations of the article, denying their scientific

validity. As a result, the author called on Russian historians to «give proper assessment to Hrushevsky's work». It should be noted that the theses expressed in T. Florinsky's review were later widely circulated by supporters of the pro-monarchist ideology [26, p. 139–140]. Adherents of the latter also saw a powerful ideological subtext in the publication, considering the scientific positions expressed in it to be the basis for the development of «separatist tendencies» among the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the country. Among them were those who, from the standpoint of the postulates of the «conspiracy theory», tried to prove the harmfulness and destructiveness of a separate interpretation of the historical destinies of two neighboring peoples, appealing to the classic Slavophile thesis about the «external threat» to the Slavs [27].

Despite intellectual resistance from some members of the Russian intelligentsia, M. Hrushevsky became increasingly active in the reading community of the Russian Empire, which was made possible first by Prince Petro Svyatopolk-Mirsky's «government spring» and later by the lifting of the ban on the Ukrainian language. The first monographic work with which the Ukrainian scholar entered the Russian reading market was «An Outline of the History of the Ukrainian People». Its appearance effectively introduced broad circles of Russian society to the national model of Ukraine's past and prompted a comprehensive discussion of M. Hrushevsky's scientific ideas in professional circles throughout the empire.

The interest toward the book proved so significant that most Russian historical journals reviewed its first edition. Some of these reviews were ordinary overviews of the new book's content and aimed to familiarize readers with its main ideas. Most reviewers recognized the importance of the book in scientific terms (a comprehensive presentation of Ukraine's past), socio-political terms (satisfying the growing interest of Russian intellectuals in the young Ukrainian movement and the culture and history of Ukrainians), and educational (the opportunity for Ukrainians in the empire to obtain balanced and scientifically sound knowledge about their past). Despite the popular nature of the publication, reviewers praised its scientific value as an independent work, written from a clear theoretical and methodological standpoint, taking into account a wide range of sources and literature [28, p. 232].

Despite the obvious ideological bias of most of the statements made in the book, reviewers noted the calm academic tone of the narrative and the objectivity in covering controversial scientific issues, which was particularly important in the sections devoted to the situation of Ukrainians in modern times. At the same time, numerous controversial comments were made. It is clear that most of these comments concerned issues that M. Hrushevsky presented in a spirit different from that of Russian historiographical tradition. Several provisions were criticized most as insufficiently substantiated: the continuity of the state tradition from Kyivan Rus to the Galicia-Volyn principality; the Ants as the direct ancestors of Ukrainians; the significance of the Ukrainian contribution to the treasury of East Slavic culture, etc. [29]. Despite these conceptual remarks, the debate also revolved around specific scientific issues, such as the interpretation of the class division of Old Russian society, the order of succession to the princely throne, and the understanding of the importance of the economic component in the social evolution of that time [30].

Overall, despite a number of critical remarks, the general assessment of the work was very favorable. One of the most consistent critics of the conceptual provisions of M. Hrushevsky's book, M. Chechulin, noted: «In general, Prof. Hrushevsky's book is very interesting; it reveals the author to be a scholar with considerable knowledge, capable of covering broad issues, and, we might even say, horizons» [29, p. 393]. O. Yatsymirsky expressed his regret that «such a great talent» had not yet taken up a chair at a Russian university [29, p. 394].

The importance of the publication of «Essay» also lay in the creation of a precedent. For the first time after the government's prohibitive actions against the Ukrainian language, it was permitted to publish an alternative to the historical ideology prevailing in the state to a wide readership [31]. M. Hrushevsky himself spoke quite figuratively about this in his 1904 report as head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. According to him, the appearance of the «Essay» 'immunized' Russian censorship and made it possible for his works to further penetrate the Russian reading market, primarily his great «History» [32].

Along with academic reviews, «Essay» also received numerous responses from representatives of Russian intellectual life, concerned about the activation of the Ukrainian public and cultural movement in the Russian Empire and dissatisfied with the concessions made by the tsarist government in the sphere of its Ukrainian policy. Such reviewers perceived M. Hrushevsky's book as a real challenge to the state system and the integrity of the «Russian people». In their reviews, they focused on the Lviv professor's early historical reconstruction, vigorously polemicizing with his theses about the ethnic identity of Ukrainians, deriving their genesis from the Ant tribes, the vision of ancient Russian culture as specifically Ukrainian, etc. Instead of concrete arguments in favor of their views, such reviewers usually used emotional

attacks, often filled with epithets offensive to Ukrainians. For example, one of these critics of «Essay» – M. Pavlov – on the pages of the Kharkiv magazine «Peaceful labor» (edited by the head of the local department of «Russian Assembly» Professor O. Vyazgin), having considered the early historical model of the Ukrainian scientist, categorically stated that «the entire set of learned phrases and scientific words of Mr. Hrushevsky turns out to be nonsense», and expressed the belief that the latter's work «will not be distributed among conscious Russian readers simply because of the absurdity of the content» [33, p. 18]. It is noteworthy that this review, like the rest of the biased critical reviews that appeared on the work of the Lviv professor in Russian periodicals, was quite promptly reprinted by the Lviv «Halychanyn» [34]. In the preface to the second edition of «Essay», M. Hrushevsky called these critical reviews of his work «voices from the ravine».

M. Hrushevsky's «Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People» attracted the attention of a wide range of Russian specialists to his work, and the deepening liberalization of political life in the empire after the events of 1905 made it possible to further discuss the historical works of the Lviv professor, including his Ukrainian-language works. Despite the favorable opinion of the vast majority of Russian scholars regarding M. Hrushevsky's historical works, a chauvinistic segment of Russian intellectuals continued to attempt to discredit the social, political, cultural, and scientific work of the Lviv professor. In this regard, we can note a peculiar trend: the more intensively M. Hrushevsky reoriented his activities toward pro-Russian Ukraine and the more he became integrated into the Russian intellectual space, the more actively his opponents from the right-wing conservative camp acted, exercising their wit in numerous works criticizing the historical and theoretical foundations of the Ukrainian movement and finding ever new counterarguments. They traditionally emphasized the destructive influence of M. Hrushevsky's historical works on the integrity of the perception of the «usual scheme» of Russian history, which, in their far-sighted opinion, would have negative socio-political consequences for the empire. Such an 'exposing' work was especially actively carried out by Kyiv right-wing conservative circles led by the aforementioned T. Florynsky and the newspaper «Kyivan» [35– 37].

Despite the activity of Kyiv nationalists in creating a negative image of the scientific and cultural activities of Galician Ukrainians under the leadership of M. Hrushevsky, we note that the scientist increasingly successfully integrated into the Russian intellectual space, he was invited to collaborate in leading Russian magazines, and the scientist's creative ideas were reflected in the works of Russian historians. We also note that on the pages of liberal periodicals in the Russian Empire, the attacks of representatives of the right-monarchist camp were sharply criticized [38]. For example, the columnist of «Ethnographic Review», characterizing the most eloquent theses of the mentioned works of T. Florinsky, stated that they are an illustration of how «people of science are sometimes very evil and harmful to the people's cause and to science itself as publicists» [39, p. 154]. We note that T. Florinsky's anti-Ukrainianism was critically perceived far beyond the borders of the Russian Empire. Reviewers of the works of the Kyiv professor were surprised by his lack of restraint in discussing Ukrainian issues, emphasizing the political motivation of all research work [40].

Without losing hope of overcoming imperial restrictions on Ukrainian authors, M. Hrushevsky used each subsequent «thaw» in the national policy of the tsarist state to popularize Ukrainian claims. With this aim in mind, in order to familiarize a wider circle of interested readers who do not have sufficient knowledge of the Ukrainian language with his ideas, M. Hrushevsky offered a Russian translation of the first volume of his «History of Ukraine-Rus» to the audience. With this aim, he once again revised its content taking into account new scientific achievements. Russian scientific periodicals met M. Hrushevsky's work with interest and rather critically [41, p. 1–2], as evidenced by numerous reviews in leading historical journals. They gradually formulated key discussion problems that on the eve of the First World War became traditional for the Ukrainian-Russian historiographical dialogue. For example, P. Mykhaylov accused M. Hrushevsky of being biased in depicting the genesis of the Ukrainian people and statehood, of trying to «connect the fate of Rus' and Ukraine into a single whole, to untangle them from a single historical tangle». He also polemicized with M. Hrushevsky's views on the nature of the migration of the Slavs from west to east, defending the correctness of the theoretical foundations of the «usual scheme» of Russian history. Despite the noted discussion points and criticism of many of M. Hrushevsky's conceptual theses, the reviewer emphasized the important creative influence of the work on the further discussion of ancient Russian issues [42].

P. Mikhailov's critical remarks were echoed by O. Kiesewetter's review. The reviewer spoke favorably of the work itself, calling it «significant and extremely valuable», made «with the firm hand of a true

master». Like other Russian reviewers, he also noted the Ukrainian scientist's excessive categoricalness in his statements «about the borders of the Slavic ancestral homeland, about the southern origin of the name «Rus», about the Little Russianness of the ancient Slavic population of the Dnieper». However, he noted that the problems of ethnogenesis and state formation in the era of the Eastern European Middle Ages are «eternal» in science and are unlikely to ever be solved unambiguously given the modest capabilities of available sources. Therefore, M. Hrushevsky's hypotheses have full citizenship rights, especially since they stimulate the revival of discussions among specialists and change the perspective of the problem itself. The reviewer, like other reviewers of the first volume, highly praised the professional culture of M. Hrushevsky, the completeness of the sources he collected and the historiographical literature he worked on [43, p. 46–47].

Representatives of the right-wing monarchist camp reacted quite sharply to the appearance of M. Hrushevsky's «Kiev Rus», rightly seeing in the book a threat to the theory of «unity of the Russian people» they professed. A separate meeting of the Kyiv «Club of Russian Nationalists» was devoted to the criticism of the theses set out in the work, at which a doctor by profession, Professor I. Sikorsky, read a report «Russians and Ukrainians (Chapter from the Ethnological Catechism)». As the title of the report suggests, I. Sikorsky focused on criticizing the ethnological theory of M. Hrushevsky, denying the concept of the independence of the Ukrainian people as a separate ethnic group, which differs from neighboring ethnic groups in many anthropological parameters, substantiated in the book. Having presented a number of his arguments, obtained on the basis of a comparison of anthropometric data of the population of North Russian and Ukrainian provinces, the author came to the conclusion that «Ukraine» and «Ukrainians» are rather geographical and political terms, but not anthropological or ethnic. It is obvious that part of the territory of southeastern Europe was assigned by P. Hrushevsky under «Ukraine» without proper grounds, and its population was included in the «Ukrainians», but these Ukrainians anthropologically do not differ in any way from the Russian population [44, p. 12–13]. Further, I. Sikorsky substantiates in details his own theory of ethnogenesis in the Eastern European space, proving that any statements about the existence of a separate Ukrainian people and its language are inappropriate. I. Sikorsky also presented his arguments about the absence of a Ukrainian nation in a separate brochure «What is a Nation», published during the First World War.

Despite his active scientific, research, and organizational work, M. Hrushevsky continued to keep his finger on the pulse of popularizing Ukrainian history and culture among a wide range of readers. In 1906, the second edition of the popular science book «An Outline of the History of the Ukrainian People» was published. The most detailed review of the second edition of «Essay» on the pages of «European Herald» was given by Vasyl Storozhev. Unlike the review of the first edition of the work, which discussed purely professional issues, in the review of the new version of the book he focused on the worldview points that M. Hrushevsky laid down as the basis for the reconstruction of the past of the Ukrainian lands. Explaining this approach, the reviewer pointed out the peculiarity of the activity of the Lviv professor: «Being a serious scientist, the author brings a lot of feelings to his work and in Galicia is not only a representative of science, but also a sensitive public figure, a party man... The author undoubtedly views his work as a kind of national-cultural mission, reliably based on strictly scientific materials» [45, p. 109]. Such a symbiosis of a talented scientist and an active public figure in one person, the columnist noted, brought M. Hrushevsky considerable authority in wide circles of Ukrainian society on both sides of the Zbruch, which also stimulates attention to his worldview ideas. At the same time, such a combination, V. Storozhev assures, does not at all harm the scientific objectivity of the Ukrainian scientist, «who, due to his national passion, never falls into unpleasant pathos or narrow particularism». Considering «Essay» to be a concise account of the historical evolution of the Ukrainian people over many eras, V. Storozhev acknowledges the validity of the main points of the author's conceptual framework. Thus, he fully shares M. Hrushevsky's view of the Old Russian era as an organic component of Ukraine's past. The reviewer also finds convincing the Ukrainian scholar's thesis about the connection between the Old Russian and Lithuanian-Polish periods [45, p. 110].

Then the reviewer skips the presentation of the book of subsequent historical eras and moves on to the last parts, where M. Hrushevsky presents a detailed description of the state of Ukrainian lands in the late 19th – early 20th centuries. At the same time, he pays special attention to the analysis of the constitutional project of the Ukrainian scientist, the core of which was the idea of national-territorial autonomy for all national minorities of the Russian Empire. Demonstrating the advantages and disadvantages of M. Hrushevsky's project, the reviewer agrees with him in recognizing the need to normalize national

relations in the empire by abandoning its great-power traditions. As a result, V. Storozhev once again emphasized the importance of the appearance of the «Essay», calling it a «beautiful and valuable» book.

The success of «Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People» was so great both among specialists and among readers that the book was awarded the prestigious Count Uvarov Prize at the Academy of Sciences. The official review of the work itself and a brief description of M. Hrushevsky's scientific activity was made by D. Korsakov. He, in particular, wrote that all the scientific work of the Ukrainian scientist is a consistent development of the ideas of his teacher V. Antonovich and other Ukrainian historians of the 19th century. The reviewer highly appreciated M. Hrushevsky's scientific achievements, emphasized the objective tone of his works, and praised the value of the archaeographic and scientific and organizational activities developed in Galicia.

M. Hrushevsky set similar scientific and popularization tasks for his «Illustrated History of Ukraine», which he published in Russian shortly after the Ukrainian edition. Among the numerous and diverse reviews of M. Hrushevsky's historical works in general and his «Illustrated History of Ukraine» in particular, a special place is occupied by the critical review of the Russian Marxist historian M. Rozhkov. Since this is the first known analysis of M. Hrushevsky's historical views from the standpoint of the historical theory of Marxism, let us dwell on M. Rozhkov's critical speech in more detail. At the very beginning of the review, the reviewer notes that he views Hrushevsky's work as an interesting monument of Ukrainian «left nationalism», and the author as «blinded by nationalist enthusiasm» [46, p. 119]. It is these circumstances, according to the critic, that caused the book's numerous weak points. Among the latter, he names a separate consideration of internal and external history; a false depiction of the genesis of the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian state tradition; an underestimation of the economic component of historical evolution; an incorrect understanding of the economic and social laws of human progress; national, not class explanation of a number of cultural, social and economic phenomena, etc. «Everywhere», the reviewer summarizes, «Mr. Hrushevsky is blinded by his cult of nationality, replacing the class foundation with a national one». Emphasizing the «petty bourgeois» nature of M. Hrushevsky's historical views, the reviewer nevertheless finds strong points in his work. For him, these are the depiction of the development of agriculture in the Ukrainian lands of the 17th century, the genesis of the Cossacks, and the struggle of the Cossacks against Polish oppression [46, p. 121].

Characterizing M. Rozhkov's review from the perspective of further deepening and diversifying Hrushevsky's reflection in historical science of the 20th century, we can speak of the formation of a synthesis of a classic for Russian historiography and a typical for Marxism complex of discursive problems in the discussion of M. Hrushevsky's creative heritage, and through his person – and the key postulates of Ukrainian national historical thought. The polemical basis of this discussion will gain further deepening in Soviet historical science of the 20s–30s, and perfection – in the 50s–80s. M. Rozhkov's speech with its acute ideological and class orientation attracted the attention of observers of Ukrainian intellectual life. Thus, in the magazine «Ukrainian Life» regarding the review of M. Rozhkov it was noted: «The reviewer rejects some views of the Ukrainian scientist on the understanding of the events of Ukrainian history, but the views of the reviewer himself, opposed to them, are too dogmatic and apodictic to have any convincing power. In some cases, Mr. Rozhkov shows himself not as a historian with whom one can agree or argue, but rather as a person of a certain party» [47]. The success of M. Hrushevsky's popular science works (both in Russian and Ukrainian) among a wide readership was evidenced by the lack of literature that would provide a scientific and at the same time adapted to the level of the average reader a generalized volume of knowledge about the Ukrainian past. Meeting the growing demand, the scientist published several more popular science essays in separate books.

However, representatives of the pro-monarchist camp were quite wary of M. Hrushevsky's popular science work in the Dnieper region. Another cause for concern was the appearance on the Russian book market of the Lviv professor's popular work, «About Old Times in Ukraine». The publication was reviewed in the pages of 'The Kyivan' by Anatolii Savenko, a well-known figure in the pro-monarchist movement and founder of the Kyiv Club of Russian Nationalists. From the standpoint of supporters of Black Hundred ideology, the author, instead of engaging in the expected scientific debate, trivially ridiculed his opponent's hypotheses as devoid of any scientific value. Traditionally for nationalists, accusing Ukrainian nationalists led by M. Hrushevsky of betraying the interests of the Slavs, A. Savenko emotionally emphasized that the work in question was «the most biased pamphlet I have ever read» [48; 49].

If the attitude of Russian intellectuals to the scientific heritage of M. Hrushevsky was generally balanced, then they perceived much more sharply the socio-political journalism of the Lviv professor,

which emphasized the priority of the struggle for the national and cultural liberation of Ukrainians, emphasized the need to consolidate all social strata of the people in defending their rights and freedoms. Such views could not but cause reservations on the part of Russian social democrats. For example, summarizing M. Hrushevsky's work «Ukrainianism in Russia, its requests and needs», one of the leaders of Russian social democrats V. Ulyanov-Lenin paid special attention to the author's thesis about the danger of the transformation, under the influence of the repressive policy of the tsarist regime, of the Ukrainian national liberation movement into a revolutionary and terrorist one. After all, in this way, not only the people may lose their leaders, but also the national component of the struggle against the tsarism will be eliminated, will recede into the background, giving way to the class component. Noting this thesis, Lenin responded eloquently in the margins of his notebook – «Reaction!!» [50, p. 26].

The growing tension in European politics in the early 1910s, as well as the activation of the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia and the Dnieper region led to an increase in the critical perception of it in Russian nationalist circles. An example of such «Ukrainian studies» of Kyiv nationalists is the report of the Russian historian and publicist Andriy Storozhenko, made by him at a meeting of members of the Kyiv Club of Russian Nationalists. As befits a professional historian, the speaker first of all outlined the broad background of the development of the Ukrainian socio-political movement over the past several centuries, devoting the greatest attention to the figure of M. Hrushevsky. He traditionally assigned the latter a leading role in the emergence and spread of the «Ukrainian fashion». Its most important component, no less traditionally points out A. Storozhenko, is the creation of an artificial Ukrainian language from numerous Latinisms and Polonisms, which the author called «Hrushevsky's language diseases».

Another striking example of anti-Ukrainian works that became widespread in the Russian Empire on the eve of the outbreak of war is the voluminous book by the Kyiv censor, a doctor by profession, Shchoholev Serhii, *Ukrainian Movement as a Modern Stage of South Russian Separatism*, published in 1912. The work took the form of a detailed report on institutions, publications, and individuals who were in any way involved in Ukrainian cultural and socio-political life in Russia and abroad. Perhaps the most attention in the book was devoted to the analysis of the scientific and socio-political activities of M. Hrushevsky, whom the author called «the heresiarch of the modern Ukrainian movement» [26, p. 73]. In his criticism of the scientific, organizational, and socio-political activities of the Lviv professor, S. Shchoholev was not original, but only conscientiously summarized and retold the assessments widespread in Russian nationalist literature.

The above-mentioned views of I. Sikorsky, A. Storozhenko and S. Shchoholev were extremely popular among Russian publicists, who appealed to their works when it was necessary to conduct a polemic with supporters of the originality of Ukrainian history and culture. On the pages of such Russian great-power journalism, the historiographical ideas of M. Hrushevsky were openly profaned. He himself often became the object of sharply satirical essays, where his activities were hyperbolized to the point of absurdity, and the figure itself acquired caricatured features. The author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» was usually portrayed as the most authoritative figure in Ukrainian life - the creator of the Ukrainian language and the modern Ukrainian movement, the goal of which was the separation of Ukrainian territories from the Russian Empire.

Conclusions. Summarizing our observations on the Russian reception of M. Hrushevsky's creative legacy during the late 19th and early of the 20th centuries we can confidently assert that it became a kind of mirror that clearly reflected the attitude toward all Ukrainians on the part of representatives of many branches of Russian scientific and socio-political thought. The rapid evolution of the theoretical foundations of the Ukrainian movement at the end of the 19th and in the early of the 20th centuries, the diversification of cultural and scientific forms of national life, and the complication of its socio-political field required adequate reflection on the part of Russian intellectuals. As a result, several interpretative approaches were created, ranging from quite successful attempts at academic analysis of M. Hrushevsky's historiographical legacy to outright profanation of the entire spectrum of his activities by supporters of the right-wing monarchist ideology. It should be noted that manifestations of these approaches can also be traced in contemporary Russian Ukrainian studies, in which M. Hrushevsky continues to be a symbol of Ukrainian identity of his era.

Funding. The study was supported by the state funding program «National and Imperial Pantheons of Heroes as Frames of Civilizational Rift in the Context of the Russian-Ukrainian War» (number of state registration 0126U000199) with the support of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.

Список літератури

1. Пиріг Р., Тельвак В. Михайло Грушевський: життєпис на тлі доби. Херсон: ОЛДІ-ПЛЮС, 2021. 572 с.
2. Пиріг Р., Тельвак В. Михайло Грушевський: біографічний нарис. Київ: Либідь, 2016. 576 с.
3. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX ст.). Київ: Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.
4. Тельвак В. Постать Михайла Грушевського в історіографії Центрально-Східної Європи (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX ст.). Дрогобич, 2012. 169 с.
5. Тельвак В. Науково-популярні праці Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях початку XX століття. *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*. 2006. Вип. X. С. 348–358.
6. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
7. Тельвак В. Грушевськіана на сторінках «Українського історичного журналу» (1991–2010 рр.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2012. Вип. 22. С. 483–498.
8. Тельвак В. Грушевськіана Руслана Пирога. *Архіви України*. 2011. № 2–3. С. 290–298.
9. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу. *Краєзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
10. Тельвак В. Монографічна грушевськіана: спроба узагальнення. *Гуржіївські історичні читання*. 2013. Вип. 6. С. 104–107.
11. Telwak W. Monograficzne hruszewskiana: próba uogólnienia. *Sensus Historiae*. 2013. Вип. 12. С. 129–136.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. Тельвак В. Дослідження рецепції творчої спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (40–80-ті рр.). *Студії з історії Української революції 1917–1921 років*. 2011. Вип. 5. С. 72–82.
15. Тельвак В. «Добрий історик, але поганий політик»: рецепція творчої спадщини Михайла Грушевського після 1914 року. *Scriptorium nostrum*. 2015. № 1–2. С. 35–64.
16. Тельвак В. Життєвий і творчий шлях М. Грушевського в ювілейних оцінках 1926 р. *Український історичний журнал*. 2008. № 6. С. 111–125.
17. Тельвак В. Постать Михайла Грушевського в польській історіографії (кінець XIX – XX ст.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006. № 5. С. 67–82.
18. Тельвак В., Курилишин К., Тельвак В. Михайло Грушевський та часопис «Діло»: співпраця, конфлікти, рецепція (до 1914 р.). *Руккописна та книжкова спадщина України*. 2022. Вип. 28. С. 347–371.
19. Панькова С. М. Публіцистика Михайла Грушевського як джерело дослідження суспільно-політичної думки в Україні кінця XIX – початку XX ст.: дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Київ, 2018. 305 с.
20. Романцова Н. І. Михайло Грушевський в історичній науці (1890–1934 рр.). Проблема в українській історіографії. Маріуполь: МДУ, 2019. 528 с.
21. Н. Р.–в. [Рышков Н.]. Записки наукового товариства імені Шевченко. Виходять у Львові під редакцією Михайла Грушевського. Т. XIX. Львів, 1898. *Исторический вестник*. 1898. Т. LXXIV. С. 316–318.
22. Проф. Т. Д. Флоринский. О усвоении малорусскому языку роли органа науки и высшей образованности. *Галичанинъ*. 1900. Ч. 40. С. 1.
23. Флоринский Т. Критико-библиографический обзор новейших трудов и изданий по славяноведению. *Университетские известия*. 1901. № 4. С. 38–45.
24. В. Д. [Доманицький В.]. Записки наукового товариства імені Шевченка, тт. 31–32. *Киевская Старина*. 1900. Т. LXXI. С. 34–35.
25. Флоринский Т. Критико-библиографический обзор новейших трудов и изданий по славяноведению. *Университетские известия*. 1905. № 11. С. 184–189.
26. Щеголев С. Украинское движение как современный этап южнорусского сепаратизма. Киев, 1912. 588 с.
27. Радченко К.: Статті по славяноведенню. Выпуск I. Спб., 1904. *Журнал министерства народного просвещения*. 1905. Ч. CCCLXI. С. 443–453.
28. Черепин В. Родная история (Проф. Мих. Грушевский. Очерк истории украинского народа. СПб. 1904). *Киевская Старина*. 1905. Т. LXXXIX, № 5. Отд. I. С. 228–233.
29. Чечулин Н. Проф. Мих. Грушевский. Очерк истории украинского народа. СПб., 1904. 380 с. *Журнал министерства народного просвещения*. 1905. Ч. CCCLVIII. С. 393–399.
30. Сторожев В. Проф. М. С. Грушевский. Очерк истории украинского народа. СПб., 1904. *Мир Божий*. 1905. № 2. С. 49–51.
31. А. Я. [А. Яцимирский]. Проф. М. Грушевский. Очерк истории украинского народа. СПб., 1904. 380 с. *Исторический вестник*. 1905. № 2. С. 694–695.
32. Загальні збори (дня 19 цвітня 1905). *Хроніка НТШ*. Львів, 1905. Ч. 22. С. 3–7.
33. Павлов Н. М. Ученый труд господина профессора Грушевского «Очерк истории украинского народа». Харьков, 1905. 27 с.
34. Павлов Н. М. Сепаратизм в науке. *Галичанин*. 1905. Ч. 48–55.
35. Половинчак Ю. М. Боротьба газети «Киевлянин» з українством наприкінці XIX – початку XX ст.: автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук. Київ, 2007. 20 с.
36. Тельвак В. «Ереснарх українського руху» (рецепція творчої спадщини М. Грушевського в російському правомонархічному середовищі першої третини XX ст.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2010. Вип. 20. С. 131–154.
37. Тельвак В. Перший том «Історії України-Руси» Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2007. Вип. 17. С. 16–38.
38. В. Ш. Существует ли украинский сепаратизм? *Киев*. 1910. № 8. С. 2–5.

39. А. М. [Максимов А.]. Флоринский Т. Малорусский язык и «українсько–руський» литературный сепаратизм. *Этнографическое обозрение*. 1900. № 3. С. 151–154.
40. Polivka J.: Prof. T.D. Florinskij, Slavjanskoje plemja. *Českó Časopis Historickó*. Praha, 1908. Sešit 1. S. 85–90.
41. Бороздин И. Русская историческая литература в 1911 году. Отдельный оттиск. 4 с.
42. Михайлов П. Проф. Мих. Грушевский. Киевская Русь. Т. I. *Журнал министерства народного просвещения. Новая серия*. 1913. Ч. XLVII. С. 389–403.
43. Кизеветтер А. Проф. Мих. Грушевский. Киевская Русь. Т. I. *Русская мысль*. 1911. № 2. С.46–47.
44. Сикорский И. А. Русские и украинцы (Глава из этнологического катехизиса). Доклад в Клубе Русских Националистов в Киеве 7 февраля 1913 года. Киев, 1913. 56 с.
45. Сторожев В. Проф. М. С. Грушевский. Очерк истории украинского народа. *Образование*. 1906. № 6. С. 107–109.
46. Рожков Н. Проф. Мих. Грушевский. Иллюстрированная история Украины. С.-Петербург, б. г. *Современный мир*. 1913. № 4. С. 119–121.
47. Литературная летопись. *Украинская жизнь*. 1913. № 6. С. 110.
48. Любопытная брошюра «Мих. Грушевского». *Галичанинъ*. 1907. Ч. 173. С. 2–3.
49. Тельвак В. Культурна політика Михайла Грушевського як редактора селянських газет. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 19. С. 127–133.
50. Ленинский сборник / под ред. В. Адоратского и др. Партиздат ЦК ВКП(б), 1937. Т. XXX. 330 с.

References

1. Pyrig, R., Telvak, V. (2021). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: biography against the background of the times. Kherson [in Ukrainian].
2. Pyrig, R., Telvak, V. (2016). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: biographical essay. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
3. 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].
4. 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].
5. Telvak, V. (2006). Popular scientific works of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in historiographical discussions of the beginning of the 20th century. *Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk [Drohobyt'sky local history collection]*, X, 348–358 [in Ukrainian].
6. Telvak, V. V., Telvak, V. P. (2021). Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian historical magazine]*, 5, 4–16 [in Ukrainian].
7. 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].
8. Telvak, V. (2011). Hrushevskiana Ruslan Pirog. *Arkhivy Ukrainy [Archives of Ukraine]*, 2–3, 290–298 [in Ukrainian].
9. Telvak, V. (2010). Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress. *Kraieznavstvo [Local history]*, 3, 29–35 [in Ukrainian].
10. Telvak, V. (2013). Monographic Hrushevskiana: an attempt at generalization. *Hurzhiivski istorychni chytannia [Gurzhyi's historical readings]*, 6, 104–107 [in Ukrainian].
11. Telvak, V. (2013). Monographic Hrushevskiana: an attempt at generalization. *Sensus Historiae*, XII, 129–136 [in Polish].
12. 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].
13. 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. Serii istorychna [Bulletin of Lviv University. The series is historical]*, 35–36, 354–366 [in Ukrainian].
14. 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].
15. 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].
16. 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].
17. 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].
18. Telvak, V., Kurylyshyn, K., Telvak, V. (2022). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and the magazine «Dilo»: cooperation, conflicts, reception (until 1914). *Rukopysna ta knyzhkova spadshchyna Ukrainy [Manuscript and book heritage of Ukraine]*, 28, 347–371 [in Ukrainian].
19. Pankova, S. M. (2018). *Journalism of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy as a source of research on social and political thought in Ukraine at the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century*: thesis ... candidate history Sciences. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
20. Romantsova, N. I. (2019). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in historical science (1890–1934). A problem in Ukrainian historiography. Mariupol [in Ukrainian].
21. N. R.–v. (1898). [Ryshkov, N.]. Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Published in Lviv under the editorship of Mikhail Hrushevsky. Vol. 19. Lviv, 1898. *Ystorycheskyi vestnyk [Historical Bulletin]*, LXXIV, 316–318 [in Russian].
22. Prof. T. D. Florinsky (1900). On the assimilation of the Little Russian language as an organ of science and higher education. *Halychanyнь [Galichanin]*, 40, 1 [in Russian].
23. Florinsky, T. (1901). Critical and bibliographical review of the latest works and publications on Slavic studies. *Unyversytetskye yzvestyia [University News]*, 4, 38–45 [in Russian].
24. V. D. (1900). [Domanitsky, V.]. Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, vols. 31–32. *Kyevskaia Staryna [Kievskaya Staryna]*, LXXI, 34–35 [in Russian].

25. Florinsky, T. (1905). A critical and bibliographic review of the latest works published in Slavic studies. *Unyversytetskye yzvestyia [University news]*, 11, 184–189 [in Russian].
26. Shchegolev, S. (1912). The Ukrainian movement as a modern stage of South Russian separatism. Kyiv [in Russian].
27. Radchenko, K. (1905). Articles on Slavic studies. Issue I. SPb., 1904. *Zhurnal mynysterstva narodnoho prosveshcheniya [Journal of the Ministry of National Education]*, CCCLXI, 443–453 [in Russian].
28. Cherepin, V. (1905). Native history (Prof. Mykh. Hrushevsky. Essay on the history of the Ukrainian people. St. Petersburg, 1904). *Kyevskaia Staryna [Kievskaya Staryna]*, LXXXIX, 5, 228–233 [in Russian].
29. Chechulin N. (1905). Prof. Mich. Hrushevsky An outline of the history of the Ukrainian people. SPb., 1904. p. 380. *Zhurnal mynysterstva narodnoho prosveshcheniya [Journal of the Ministry of National Education]*, CCCLVIII, 393–399 [in Russian].
30. Storozhev, V. (1905). Prof. M. S. Hrushevsky. An outline of the history of the Ukrainian people. St. Petersburg, 1904. *Myr Bozhyi [Peace of God]*, 2, 49–51 [in Russian].
31. A. Ya. (1905). [Yatsymirskyi, A.]. Prof. M. Hrushevskyi. An outline of the history of the Ukrainian people. SPb, 1904. P. 380. *Ystorycheskyi vestnyk [Historical Review]*, 2, 694–695 [in Russian].
32. (1905). General meeting (April 19, 1905). *Khronika NTSh [Chronicle of the SSS]*, 22, 3–7 [in Russian].
33. Pavlov, N. M. (1905). Scholarly work of professor Hrushevsky «Essay on the history of the Ukrainian people». Kharkov [in Russian].
34. Pavlov, N. M. (1905). Separatism in science. *Halychanyn [Galichanin]*, 48–55 [in Russian].
35. Polovinchak, Yu. M. (2007). The struggle of the newspaper «Kievlyanin» with Ukrainianism in the late 19th – early 20th centuries: Author's abstract of the dissertation on the history of science. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
36. Telvak, V. (2010). «Heresiarch of the Ukrainian movement» (reception of the creative heritage of M. Hrushevsky in the Russian right-wing monarchist environment of the first third of the 20th century). *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini [Historiographical studies in Ukraine]*, 20, 131–154 [in Ukrainian].
37. Telvak, V. (2007). The first volume of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's «History of Ukraine-Rus» in the assessments of contemporaries. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini [Historiographical studies in Ukraine]*, 17, 16–38 [in Ukrainian].
38. V. Sh. (1910). Is there Ukrainian separatism? *Kiev [Kyiv]*, 8, 2–5 [in Russian].
39. A. M. (1900). [Maksimov, A.]. Florinskyi T. The Little Russian language and «Ukrainian-Russian» literary separatism. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenye [Ethnographic review]*, 3, 151–154 [in Russian].
40. Polivka, J. (1908). Prof. T. D. Florinskij, Slavjanskoje plemja. *Českó Časopis Historickó [Czech Historical Review]*, 1, 85–90 [in Czech].
41. Borozdin, I. (1911). Russian historical literature in 1911. Separate print. 4 p. [in Russian].
42. Mikhailov, P. (1913). Prof. Mich. Hrushevsky Kievskaya Rus. T. I. *Zhurnal mynysterstva narodnoho prosveshcheniya [Journal of the Ministry of National Education]*, XLVII, 389–403 [in Russian].
43. Kiesewetter, A. (1911). Prof. Mich. Hrushevsky Kievskaya Rus. T. I. *Russkaia mysl [Russian thought]*, 2, 46–47 [in Russian].
44. Sikorsky, I. A. (1913). Russians and Ukrainians (Chapter from Ethnological Catechism). Speech at the Club of Russian Nationalists in Kyiv on February 7, 1913. Kyiv [in Russian].
45. Storozhev, V. (1906). Prof. M. S. Hrushevsky. An outline of the history of the Ukrainian people. *Obrazovanye [Education]*, 6, 107–109 [in Russian].
46. Rozhkov, N. (1913). Prof. Mich. Hrushevsky Illustrated history of Ukraine. *Sovremennyi mir [Modern world]*, 4, 119–121 [in Russian].
47. (1913). Literary chronicle. *Ukraynskaia zhyzn [Ukrainian life]*, 6, 110. [in Russian].
48. (1907). Curious pamphlet «Mikh. Hrushevsky». *Halychanyn [Galichanin]*, 173, 2–3 [in Russian].
49. Telvak, V. (2018). The cultural policy of Mykhailo Hrushevsky as an editor of peasant newspapers. *Ukrainskyi selianyn [Ukrainian peasant]*, 19, 127–133 [in Ukrainian].
50. Adoratsky V. et al. (eds.) (1937). Lenin's collection. Vol. XXX. Partizdat of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) [in Russian].