

УДК 93/94: 930.1

Опубліковано 20 серпня 2022 року

MYKHAILO DRAHOMANOV AS THE AUTHOR OF MODERN RESEARCH PRACTICES IN SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF LOCAL HISTORY¹

HAVRYLIUK Mykhailo

PhD student

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University

UKRAINE

Abstract: *Mykhailo Petrovich Drahomanova is unreasonably called a historian and scientist. Analyzing a number of works written by him, we understand that the creation and argumentation of an idea that indicated the Ukrainian separation and the timing of the tradition of the state of Ukraine is dominant. Therefore, we will try to work out one of the proposed models of Ukrainianity in a geopolitical space: facts, historiography.*

INTRODUCTION.

This study is an attempt to outline the main form of the state, which Mykhailo Petrovich Drahomanov would be considered a compromise in the conditions that the occupation administration of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires were created.

For the formation of the historical state concept of Mykhailo Drahomanov, evidence was necessary, arguments that would become the basis. He began work on sources that proved the trap of the tradition of state-building. The scientist was based on his views on the history of the Cossacks, which had a sovereign state, and also was influenced by pro-European ideas that prevail at that time [1]. Historians, such as S.O. Yekelchik argues that Drahomanov was inclined to the federalistic model of the future Ukrainian state. We know that at that time there were federalists, but they advocated the interests of Ukrainians peacefully, publishing newspapers, magazines and brochures. Instead, Mykhailo Petrovich in this regard was quite fundamental and radical.

¹ Ця робота опублікована повторно [без змін]. Першопублікація: Havryliuk, М. (2021). MYKHAILO DRAHOMANOV AS THE AUTHOR OF MODERN RESEARCH PRACTICES IN SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF LOCAL HISTORY. *Грааль Науки*, (4), 568-576. DOI 10.36074/grail-of-science.07.05.2021.109

Drahomanov definitely studied federalistic sentiment, analyzing foreign sources. Historical consciousness and historical opinion as components of the spiritual life of the Ukrainian people, the idealization of the Ukrainian people in the conditions of political unrest, state tradition. Cultural gravity, ethnic and territorial scattering of the Ukrainian people were largely XVIII politicized and ideologized. The specificity of the spiritual life of the Ukrainian people of the XVIII-XIX centuries. It was that his social ideals, ideological guidelines, political paradigms were not expressed in programs of political parties and public organizations, and on the pages of historical and ethnographic research, which claimed to recognize their high scientific and journalistic levels [4].

THE MAIN PART.

Appeal to the past Ukrainian people, the idealization of the Cossacks and Cossack-Hetman statehood, justification of the struggle against Polish domination and Turkish-Tatar invaders, the search for leakage of native history and language served as a powerful means of restoring historical tartiness, political and cultural tradition of the Ukrainian nation. 20-60 years of the XIX century. Marked a significant influence on the spiritual, cultural and scientific life of the Ukrainian people of romantic ideas. In a concentrated form, a romantic outlook can be characterized as a sense of nationality and the idea of cultural identity, transferred to the close and distant past of his people, carried out by the representatives of his intellectual elite [4].

From the end of the XVII s., Since the Ukrainian Cossack State was formed, in its territory, Orthodox clergy, and those who were left under the authority of Poland-Uniate. None of the churches wanted to put up with such a "boy disorder", as translations of the Bible and other church books to the popular language. So our folk language has not been delivered from under the superiority of the Church Slavonic and Starobolgarsky because our country did not moledly to the All-European Protestant movement. Consequently, in our territory, the situation was awesome: the same in parts of it as Orthodox, as well as the UNIA's everyday, or even every day in the Church, which our people have taught respect as the highest judge in the spirit of the genus, manifested the disregard for the language of our people, demonstrated its unfitness to communicate man with God [5].

Similar was the situation in the Russian empire, where the bishops, even in 1824, were banned a few decades Russian translation of the Bible. Made by

the Bible Society, and then allowed only for home, but by no means church reading. Instead, the Ukrainian translation of the Holy Scripture banned. The fact that in the XIV century. Stepan Permsky translated several church books to Ziryan (Komi), and for those 400-500 years ahead of British missionaries, Mykhailo Petrovich was associated exclusively with the weakness of the church hierarchy and the Christian tradition in Moscow in the times of Stepan Permsky, has not yet managed to establish in Northern Muscovy Church Panzry [4].

Mykhailo Drahomanov emphasized that education in Russia began in the south, in Kiev: there was a previously widespread Christianity, here was written writing, here were the annunciations, soning a boyfriend and the author "The words of the regiment of Igorev. The thinker noted that which by stating the relevant manifestations of intellectual life in South Rus in ancient times, modern circles are interested in the history of Eastern Europe, did not see this southern Russia in real images. They interpreted Russia only as a geographical, not a political or socio-cultural concept. In addition, they believed that after the Tatar pogrom of the XIII century, all Russian beginnings of civilization disappeared without a trace, that is, it was completely destroyed physically in all its manifestations, without leaving their people, nor even the remains of cultural achievements [6].

Meanwhile, Mykhailo Petrovich emphasized, according to his features, Kievan Rus Vladimir, Nestor and the author "The words of the regiment of Igorevi" was also South Western Rus, which in somewhat changed form lived under the name of Little Russia. From the Gold to this Coriffeus insisted that when in Ukraine, the development of civilization began, then this circumstance should be found in the current state of the sociocultural development of its people, because after the adoption of Christianity Kyivska Rus gave birth to Nestor, Vladimir Monomakh, produced "Volyn Chronicle", "The Word About the regiment of Igorvim" was also Southwestern Rus, which in somewhat changed form lived underneath the name of Little Russia. In view of this, Coriffeus insisted that when in Ukraine, the development of civilization began, then this circumstance should be found in the current state of the sociocultural development of its people, because after the adoption of Christianity Rus-Ukraine gave birth to Nestor, Vladimir Monomakh, produced "Volyn Chronicle", "The Word of the Igor Regiment", in this case, the Ukrainian people who settled this country had to participate, and not only relative proximity to Byzantium and Southeastern Europe [4].

In modern historiography, the fact of the sharp revival of cultural exchange between Ukraine and peoples of Western Europe during the XVI century is stated. In this case, the focus of the Western European public gradually leaned towards the perception of our Motherland as an original "Cossack Earth" at the border of European and Asian civilizations. Intercivilization space was filled with a specific culture, which consisted on the basis of a combination of elements inherent in Christian culture of Europe. Tightening the population of Ukraine from the raids of Tatar-Muslims inclined the Cossacks to the choice of European Christian culture in the Orthodox version [4].

In this context, stressing that Southwestern Russia, originally Ostrog with Volyn, and subsequently Kyiv became "nurseries" of literature and education for the entire East Slavic world, from the middle of the XVI to the middle of the XVIII century. Mykhailo Petrovich drew attention to the fact that most of his contemporaries did not know which connection existed between the South-Russian figures of the XVI-XVIII centuries and Rusins of the XII-XIII centuries. The emergence of educators of the XVI-XVIII centuries. It became possible precisely as a result of continuous education and relations with the educated world of southern Russia since ancient times and to the XVIII century. The consequence of this he considered that the relative education of the inhabitants of Ukraine XII-XIII centuries. In the official Russian historiography, it was explained exclusively by Byzantine influence, but the development of its literature of the XVI-XVIII centuries. - Latin-Polish influence, recognizing national only polemical literature in defense of Orthodoxy [4].

As a result, she noted Drahomanov, in the history of Ukraine (South Rus) left incompletely investigated even aspects that brought in the north of Russia and pay attention only to those parties concerning the history of Moscow Rus. For example, in the case of the political history of Ukrainian lands, interest in official historiography was only the activities of the ruling dynasty of Rurikovich. Instead, Mykhailo Drahomanov convinced that in the political and social life of Rus Vladimir Monomakh and the state of B. Khmelnytsky, there was a lot that did not come into the venue of the Moscow kingdom, but represents interesting politico-social phenomena of Ukrainian history [4].

The Russian public perceived the restoration of the historical memory of Ukrainian society as a daring challenge, sabotage from the inside against the "Trinity of Russian People's People's Department". That is why the development of Ukrainian historical science has caused a negative reaction

from the Russian intelligentsia, and by the imperial state apparatus-strengthening processes of denationalization of culture, the destruction of language and all Ukrainian social life. It is no coincidence that the official imperial policy in Ukraine was carried out under the slogans of the restoration of the "genuine movement", because it was believed that this "Russian" land is Russian, only with a spoiled polonization of the XVI-XVIII centuries. The consequences of which should be removed as soon as possible for the benefit of the local population [7].

As a result of the repression of Ukrainians, it was perceived as a struggle against attempts to decompose the "National Organism of Trinity of the Russian Nation", which relied on the autocratic system in conducting its policies. Moscow kings even during the formation of its own statehood declared itself to the heirs of the political heritage of Rus-Ukraine, arguing its right to "collecting Russian lands", and, referring to the generic ties of their princes with the Kyiv dynasty, assigned the name "Rus" for the newly created Moscow the state. The Ukrainian national revival destroyed this doctrine. That is why since the 1830s, government circles unfolded a permanent struggle against the national cultural and educational movement of Ukrainians [4, p. 92]. Russian tsarism constantly tried to "scientifically" to justify the appropriation of the Ukrainian territory. Imperial appropriation of the territory was not an act, but a process that reflected and ideological, and symbolic, and artistic, and toponymous development of space. This contributed to the establishment of an idea of the historical right of the Russian empire in the social consciousness [4].

It was history that was the main field of the battle for the autonomy of the Ukrainian people, whose statehood in its historical development did not concern other European peoples. In fact, the Ukrainian history "selected" in the Russian Empire is not just a territory of Ukraine, which Russian official ideologists considered their property, but also "Kyiv-Mother of Russian People", Center Orthodox faith and their statehood. The true Ukrainian history deprived Russian chauvinists of ideological principles in the fight against Polish chauvinists for the consciousness of ordinary Ukrainians who believed in his affiliation to the Lithuanian-Russians, and therefore the Lithuanian-Polish state, or Kievan Rus - Moscow State-Russian Empire [4].

Finding out fundamental nuances of ethnogenesis of the Ukrainian people gave an answer to the main ideological issues of the investigated period. Hence in their writings Mykhailo Drahomanov has repeatedly touched the problems

of the historical past of Ukraine of the period of Kievan Rus. The scientist-publicist emphasized that in the IX century by the Byzantine and Arab writers fixed in the territory of the present Ukraine, on the banks of the Dnieper and the Dniester, the Black and Azov seas, which was called russes. Ethnographic information collected by researchers exposed to close and distant neighboring civilized states of the classical Middle Ages indicate the identity of this people and the state created by him [4].

Thus, M. P. Drahomanov was a supporter of the theory of the southern origin of ethnonymi "Rus", which appears in the Arab and Byzantine authors for the definition of a separate people. Accordingly, the origins of statehood begin in the south. With the gradual coverage of these people of the territory, the general name "Rus" is distributed. In a letter to V. Narlyotsky M. Drahomanov expressed unequivocally against, and did not recognize the existence of concepts Russia-Rus, or two moves. The first of them - "Rus" - in a narrow sense, that is, the old name of Ukraine, the second - "Rus" in the broad sense of this term, as a multi-ethnic state. Hence the division of "Rus" to large, small and white Russia after the collapse of this state [4].

Smaller Russia has become, according to M. Drahomanov, the name of the core of the former state by the Greek tradition, especially emphasized. The term "Little Russia", which was actively propagated by official imperial circles to affirm the secondary to the Ukrainian, and, above all, history, for a completely fair view of the scientist, was a book. This ethnonym was not used by the inhabitants of Ukraine to its entry into the Moscow kingdom-Russian empire, that is imposed by the ideologues of Russian tsarism. Providing automotivity of the name "Rus", Mikhail Petrovich Dorikov M. Kostomarov and P. Kulishev for the fact that these intellectuals did not recognize the division of the concepts of "Rus" and "Russia" [4].

M. P. Drahomanov drew attention to the fact that the term "Rusin" is an old term that has been preserved in the name of the people of Ukraine even in the XIX century. It emphasized that some scholars and ordinary residents of the Dnieper and Western lands of ethnic Russia, supporters of the idea of unity of Russian and Ukrainian ethnic groups, quite false sometimes considered this name artificially brought from the outside, fictitious Poles for contrasting Ukrainians (Rusyns) and Russians. It is possible to state the fact of the ideological confrontation of the Russian and Polish intelligentsia for domination of the consciousness of ordinary Ukrainians, which ensured the implementation of the political goals of a successful part of this confrontation

[8].

Like M. Kostomarov, Mykhailo Petrovich advocated a separation of the development of Ukrainian ethnos, starting with the ancient age, when the inhabitants of North and Southern Russia had significant differences in the language [4].

Provision of scientific falseness of Norman theory, M.P. Drahomanov special emphasis made on such an argument as vision. He emphasized that in the writings of Arabic and Byzantine writers, which described Ukrainian territories IX and X centuries. A large number of cities in the agricultural population is fixed, part of which formed a semi-trading, semi-military layer. Moreover, the fees of these free military wives were more or less elected, and their power is limited to the vision, the council of his wife. M. Drahomanov noted that such a state of affairs remained unchanged until the Tatar invasion [8].

Significant influence on the formation of historical views Mykhailo Petrovich had works by M. Kostomarov, who advanced the concept of succession of later periods of Ukrainian history with the Old Russian Domestic. The very formation of the Old Russian state, this historian considered as a result of the process of formation on the basis of Slavic tribes of six independent nationalities. In general, the leading idea of scientific ethno-historical research by M. Kostomarov can be defined as the concept of equality of territories of Kievan Rus, the socio-political and national-cultural unity of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, which he argued in the work of the "two Russian nationality", written in the influence of circumstances [4].

The presence of heep in the organization of social life, according to Mikhail Petrovich, certified the automotive in the internal self-organization of the Ukrainian-Slavic tribes, their independent development in the direction of creating its own statehood. From this world-political basis, the researcher was assigned a meager role in the influence of an external factor on the process of state-building of the East Slavic tribes, for the exaggeration of which M. Drahomanov criticized the Norman theory of origin of M. Kostomarov. The fact that the origin of the political organization of the Eastern Slavic peoples was mixed with ethnogenesis, which are quite independent with their own processes [13].

In autonomy of the process of ethnic and political development of the Ukrainian people, the thinker saw confirmation of the fact that the history of the ancient Kyiv region is directly related to the history of Cossack Ukraine and

the place of events, and the functioning of republican institutions. The Cossack Council, according to M. Drahomanov, was similar to the Old Russian vision as an institution of the popular decision of the most important issues of management of the ancient community. Cossacks in Sich lived in the conditions of military democracy as a stage of state-building, so the Cossack Council performed a role similar to the early medieval East Slavic Viche - the realization of the law of warriors to participate in solving vital issues of socio-political life [14].

At the same time, the scientist did not absolutize his visual orders, he considered them in evolution, noticing the gradual narrowing of Kiev, by means of pressure from the princes and the boyars, the functions of the vision. Mikhail Petrovich drew attention to the doctrine of origin of the principal authorities from God, which took place after the introduction of Christianity. Martialism served as the idea of the idea of a prince's power. The eastern variant of Christianity proclaimed the subordination of the Orthodox Church to the state, which, according to the church ideology, contributed to the spread of Christianity in its territory, and instead, the Church preached the state ideology, formally based on Christian values [8].

The largest losses caused Ukraine by the Mongol-Tatar invasion of the XIII century. M. P. Drahomanov believed that it greatly slowed down its development, the Ukrainian historical process began to lag behind the pan-European. He drawn attention to that the highest authorities of the "Naval Horde", which was concentrated in the hands of Khan, were needed intermediaries from subordinates of peoples. Therefore, the Ordinians supported the privileges of princes to the detriment of the rights of Vichus, as well as the advantage of the rights of great princes over the rights of small princes and cities. Mikhail Petrovich drew attention to the differences in the relations between different regions of the former Kyiv State with the Horde Empire, noting that the Tatars supported the authorities of the Moscow princes that enjoyed a special commitment of Khan. Instead, the princes of Kyiv - the Galician group, which were not so easy to detect the humility of the will of the conquerors, often died from manifestations of Khan's anger [15].

The struggle for the independence of the lands of Southwest Russia from Mongol rule took place in parallel with the incorporation of the territory of Belarus and Ukraine into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. At the same time, the restoration of Russian statehood in the XIV century. Agreed on the legacy of the feudal fragmentation of the XII century., which did not allow protection

against Tatar raids. Noting that Ukrainians, fleeing from Tatars, had to escape far to the north, to the spider, Niman and Pripyat, as a result of which Ukraine, for some time not completely desolated. Despite this circumstance, the historian defended the point of view of the autonomy of the socio-political development of the Ukrainian people [8].

The scientist in the position of the Ukrainian historiographic tradition stated the organic transformation of Russia as a political formation in the Galician-Volyn princely state during the XIII century. Mykhailo Drahomanov highly valued and positively evaluated the role of Prince's policy Danylo Galitsky, and especially his desire to create in Galich or Holmes the political center of the "Land of Russian" as a legitimate heir of the ancient Kyiv. In this way, having established the Western Center of the Russian statehood independent from the North-East Vladimir-Suzdal principality, to defend the independence of the Galician-Volyn state and its right to unite the Russian lands around its capital [13].

In this regard, Mykhailo Petrovich noted that whose destructive was not destined to Bati Tatars in Southwestern Rus, she quickly recovered from a pogrom, and even inspired fear in Tatars. Soon, the Russians came to offensive actions against enslavents, so that this era is unlikely to be called Mongol's oppression for the southwest movement to the extent that it was for Northeast Rus. Already during Danil Galitsky, Ukrainians dared to rebel against the Tatars, although these uprising were suppressed, but the idea of independence from Mongolsky rule firmly fixed in the public consciousness of the Galician-Volyn principalities, which frankly indicates a deep roots of the state of Ukrainians [16].

In turn, modern researchers pay attention to the fact that the son of the son of Danil Lev in relation to the Golden Horde was reduced to show loyalty and independent conduct in his state. Participation in organized tatars against the North-Western neighbors - Poland and Lithuania, profitable for the Galician-Volyn state also provided lands of the Galician-Volyn principality relative calm. The formal dependence on Golden Horde Khan contributed to the consolidation of society, the formation of strong political institutions and the creation of its own social system. Thus, state-building on Ukrainian lands acquired a systematic nature, but did not reach its logical completion [13].

Instead, the main consequence of the Mongol conquest for Ukraine M.P. Drahomanov considered the fact that weakened by the struggle against the Tatars, it lost more and more its territory, and then was deprived of national

sovereignty. Ukrainian lands were divided between neighboring states, which significantly slowed down to socio-economic, political but also ethnocultural development of the Ukrainian people. After the termination of the dynasty of Rurikovich in Galicia, this territory took possession of Poland, Moldova managed to capture Bukovina and part of Podillya. And the rest of Ukrainian lands entered the power of the Lithuanian-Belarusian princes from the Gediminovich Dynasty [17].

For Ukrainians, the establishment of power by a foreign dynasty was not an extraordinary novelty. Kievan Rus arose as a state as well when establishing a foreign scandinavian dynasty of Rurikovich. In addition, the accession of Ukrainian lands to the Lithuanian state was almost without resistance to the Ukrainian population, since new hosts did not interfere in the domestic life of the Ukrainian society, only demanded the implementation of military service to their benefit for land. Thus, borrowing a significant part of the national and state-building traditions of the Ukrainian people, Lithuanians created its own political culture very similar to Ukrainian [13].

Modern Ukrainian historiography generally goes out of the fact that the Great Principality of Lithuania was a state in which the title people only the title actually and was presented. By the end of the XIV century. The Great Principality of Lithuania in general was a conglomerate of regions with a very colorful status, occupying a domain of the Grand Duke, Vasal Principality and Solved Members of the Ruling Dynasty. To the latter, Ukrainian Kiev, Novgorod-Siversk, Volyn and Podilsky principality belonged to the latter. Their rulers from the Gedimin dynasty, baptized by the Orthodox ceremonial, married to the Russian princes, adopted to local everyday life, were not perceived as conquerors, on the contrary, the fans have been reacting with a local knowledge, which supported them in conflicts with the Grand Duke [13].

Mykhailo Petrovich also considered the Lithuanian state with one of the successors of Kievan Rus. He believed that there were two great kingdoms: on both sides of the Dnieper, where Ukraine and White Rus, ordered the princes of the Lithuanian genus, and then to the north-east, where Moscow, remained the princes of Moscow, an ancient kind of Kiev princes. At the same time, the scientist emphasized that he was released from the Tatars for a century earlier than Moscow Rus. Actually, this can be considered a great achievement, given the fact that the Ukrainians actually did not have a choice in solving the issue of its accession to the Lithuanian state [10].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Summing up the above should be considered a dragomanov researcher who tried to create an actual vision on the problem of teaching domestic history. He launched practices and was able to show another vision on the processes of the past. Drahomanov's concept significantly differed from the general "lacunies of the Russian world", where Ukrainian history was not a separate phenomenon, but by raw material appendage to M. Pogodin and V. Karamzin. Thunders should be introduced to the argumented base, which confirms the uniqueness of Ukrainian history.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Potsiurko O.Iu.(2016). Proekt konstytutsii y ukrainske pytannia v pohliadakh M. Drahomanova. Aktualni problemy filosofii ta sotsiologii, (10), 106-109.
- [2] S. O. Yekelchik. (1995). «Federalizm M. Drahomanova». Sotsialno-filosofski idei Drahomanova. Vylucheno iz: <http://www.ditext.com/yekelchik/federal.html>
- [3] M.Drahomanov(1878). Hromada: Ukrainska zbirka, vporiadkovana Mykhailom Drahomanovym.S.568.
- [4] Drahomanov M. P. (1991). Borba za dukhovnuiu vlast y svobodu sovesty v XVI-XVII stoletiyakh (s. 54 – 106). Kyev.
- [5] Drahomanov M. P. (1907). Stari khartii volnostei (S.34). Kyiv: Ranok.
- [6] Hrebtsova I.S. (2002). Peryodecheskaia pechat v obshchestvennom razvytyi Yuzhnogo stepnogo rehyona Rossyiskoi ympery (Vtoraia tret XIX v.). Odessa: Astroprynt.
- [7] Drahomanov M. P. (1915). Rai i postup. Viden: Nakladom Drukarni Partii Ukrainskykh sotsialistiv-revoliutsioneriv.
- [8] Hrushevskiy O. (1915). Z zhyttia Kyivskoho ukrainskoho hurtka v 1870-1874 rr. (S. 107 – 112.). Odesa: Osnova.
- [9] Kolesnyk I.I. (2000). Ukrainska istoriografiia (XVII- pochatok XX stolittia). Kyiv: Heneza.
- [10] Vashchenko V.V. (2009). Stratehii konstruiuvannia M.Hrushevskym ukrainskykh metanaratyviv: metody ta yikh funktsii (avtoref.dys..d-ra ist. nauk) Dnipropetr.nats.un-t im. O. Honchara. Dnipropetrovsk, Ukraina.
- [11] Vashchenko V.V. (2009). Stratehii konstruiuvannia M.Hrushevskym ukrainskykh metanaratyviv: metody ta yikh funktsii (avtoref.dys.d-ra ist. nauk). Dnipropetr.nats.un-t im. O. Honchara. Dnipropetrovsk, Ukraina.
- [12] Drahomanov M.P. (1991). Chudatski dumky pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu (s.430-457). Vybrane. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- [13] Kruhlashov A. M. (2000). Stavlennia M. Drahomanova do problem relihii ta Tserkvy. Ukraina moderna. – Lviv,. – Chyslo 4-5. – S. 105-123.
- [14] Kashuba M. (1993). Humanistychni ta reformatsiini idei v Ukraini druhoi polovyny XVII st. Yevropeiske vidrozhennia ta ukrainska literatura XIV –XVIII st. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- [15] Klymchik L.A. (1995). Pedahohichni pohliady M.P. Drahomanova: (dys..kand.ped.nauk). Instytut pedahohiky, APN Ukrainy. Kyiv,Ukraina.
- [16] Kozub L. (2002). M. P. Drahomanov – doslidnyk istorii suspilno-politychnoho rukhu XIX stolittia v Ukraini (avtoreferat dys..kand.ist. nauk). Kyivskiy universytet im. T. Shevchenka. – Kyiv, Ukraine.