

УДК 94 (477) + 908(045)

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32589/2412-9321.32.2026.363214>

M. S. GEDIN

candidate of historical sciences, associate professor, associate professor
of the department of history and tourism,
Kyiv National Linguistic University (Ukraine, Kyiv)
e-mail: maksym.hedin@knlu.edu.ua
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5031-8207>

A CRITIQUE OF THE GREAT POWER IDEOLOGY OF SLAVOPHILISM IN THE HISTORICAL VISIONS OF V. B. ANTONOVICH

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to analyze the content of Ukrainian historian V. B. Antonovich's critical views on the ideologemes of Slavophilism, which are linked to their disparaging attitude toward the idea of Ukrainian statehood and the dissemination of Ukrainian culture. The methodology is based on the use of microhistorical and interdisciplinary approaches. The methodological foundation is an interdisciplinary approach. Particular emphasis is placed on the structural-functional systemic analysis of historiographical facts and the comparative-historical method, based on the principles of objectivity and historicism. Methods of periodization, classification, and typology are also employed. General historical methods of historiographical analysis, including historical-genetic and comparative approaches, are utilized. **Scientific novelty.** This article examines V. B. Antonovich's historical and socio-political views on the future of Ukrainian statehood and the development of Ukrainian culture through the lens of his polemics and subsequent criticism of Slavophilism. **Conclusions.** It is noted that V.B. Antonovich's scholarly interests took shape from a young age and underwent a significant transformation throughout his life. These changes were driven, in part, by V.B. Antonovich's critique of the ideology of Slavophilism. In his historical research, he sought answers to social and political questions raised by the life of the people and the society to which he belonged; conversely, he used the information and facts provided by his scientific research to address the social, national, cultural, and political problems of contemporary life. The article also examines V. B. Antonovich's views on Lavrov's philosophy of the 1860s, which he rightly assessed as materialistic, and the philosophy of the spirit as idealistic, thereby revealing the general syncretic essence of his concept, his assessment of "pochennichestvo" as an unsolvable attempt to reconcile Slavophilism with Westernism, as well as F. M. Dostoevsky's worldview in the final years of his life, which he interpreted not merely as religious, but as contemplative, mystical, and ascetic.

Key words: V.B.Antonovych, slavophilism, Slavophile idea, national idea, XIXth century, Revival of the Ukrainian Nation.

М. С. ГЕДІН

кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри історії і туризму,
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет (Україна, Київ)
e-mail: maksym.hedin@knlu.edu.ua
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5031-8207>

КРИТИКА ВЕЛИКОДЕРЖАВНИЦЬКОЇ ІДЕОЛОГІЇ СЛОВ'ЯНОФІЛЬСТВА В ІСТОРИЧНИХ ВІЗІЯХ В.Б.АНТОНОВИЧА

Анотація

Метою статті є аналіз змісту критичних поглядів українського історика В. Б. Антоновича щодо ідеологем слов'янофільства, які пов'язані з їх принизливим ставленням до ідеї української

державності та поширення української культури. Методологія ґрунтується на використанні мікроісторичного і міждисциплінарного підходів. Методологічне підґрунтя становить міждисциплінарний підхід. Особливий акцент зроблено на структурно-функціональному системному аналізі історіографічних фактів і порівняльно-історичному методі, виходячи з принципів об'єктивності та історизму. Використано також методи періодизації, класифікації, типологізації. Використано загальноісторичні методи історіографічного аналізу, історико-генетичний, порівняльний. Наукова новизна. Розглянуто історичні та суспільно-політичні погляди В. Б. Антоновича на майбутнє українського державотворення крізь і розвитку української культури крізь призму його полеміки і подальшої критики слов'янофільства. **Результати дослідження.** Наголошується, що наукові інтереси В. Б. Антоновича формувалися ще з молодих років, і проходили досить суттєву трансформацію протягом всього життя вченого. Ці зміни зумовлювалися у тому числі в процесі критики В. Б. Антоновичем ідеології слов'янофільства. В історичних дослідках шукав він відповіді на питання з сфери соціальної чи політичної, які приносило йому життя народу, суспільності, до котрої належав, і навпаки – ті відомості й факти, які давав йому науковий дослід, він використовував для розв'язання проблем соціальних та національних, культурних і політичних сучасного життя. Розглянуто також погляди В. Б. Антоновича на філософію Лаврова 60-х рр., яку він справедливо оцінив як матеріалістичну, а філософію духу як ідеалістичну і відповідно розкрив загальну синкретичну суть його концепції, його оцінка почвенництва як нерозв'язною спроби примирити слов'янофільство з західництвом, а також світогляду Ф. М. Достоєвського останніх років його життя, яке він трактував не просто як релігійне, але як споглядальне містично-аскетичне.

Ключові слова: В. Б. Антонович, слов'янофільство, слов'янофільська ідея, національна ідея, ХІХ століття, відродження української нації.

Introduction. V.B. Antonovich continued the unique tradition established by M. Maksymovych and M. Kostomarov among Ukrainian historians, who felt a need not only for cultural but also for civic service to their people. Contemporary researchers rightly note that V.B. Antonovich was not an armchair scholar; on the contrary, he took an active part in the political life of the Ukrainian people, and his civic activities began as early as his student years (Korduba, 1928, p.161-162).

In particular, while studying at the university, V. B. Antonovich became interested in Ukrainian peasant life, and together with like-minded individuals who shared his populist views—as well as under the influence of Western social-revolutionary ideas—he organized the Khlopoman movement. This populist-cultural movement among the intelligentsia emerged in the Kyiv and Volhynia regions and sought to study the life and customs of the Ukrainian peasantry. M.S. Hrushevsky wrote in his memoirs: "They travel on foot through Volhynia, Podillia, the Kyiv region, Kholmshchyna, and a significant part of the Kherson and Katerynoslav regions, not only studying folk life but also feeling a deep kinship with it" (Hrushevskyi, 1984, 193–198). Undoubtedly, these travels through Ukraine, his encounters with Ukrainians, and their ethnic culture ultimately shaped V. B. Antonovych's Ukrainian national identity.

At the same time, the scholar began his public activities, taking the helm of the Kyiv community in 1861, which became the main hub of national-cultural and socio-political activity in Ukraine. At that time, the scholar was convinced of the low cultural and ideological level of the vast majority of Ukrainians, so he temporarily postponed introducing the people to ideological and political ideas. Instead, V. B. Antonovich encouraged community members to publish Ukrainian literature and to study the way of life, traditions, customs, and folklore of the Ukrainian people.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In Ukrainian historiography, the scientific heritage of V. B. Antonovych has been the subject of comprehensive study on more than one occasion. In particular, the remarkable figure of the scientist was reflected, among other publications, in one of the latest encyclopedias (Encyclopedia of the History of

Ukraine, 2003). Among the scientists, monographs should be noted that revealed the scientist's historiosophical views on Ukrainian history and made generalizing conclusions (Kiyani, 2005; Vermenych, 2010). In the largest works on this problem, the scientist's life and creative path, his socio-political activity and creative heritage are analyzed in detail (Ulyanovskiy & Korotkiy, 1997). At the same time, V. B. Antonovych's views on the processes of state formation in Ukraine at various stages of history are covered in historiography only fragmentarily.

The purpose of the study a considers the contest and basic ideas of the public activity of the outstanding historian of XIX century V. B. Antonovych, with supporters of slavophilism as well as his struggle for the free development of Ukrainian statehood, language and literature in the Russian Empire in the second half-mid of the XIXth century.

The methodology is based on the use of a microhistorical approach. At the same time, the principles of objectivity, systematization and scientificity are applied. The chronological method, the method of analysis and synthesis, as well as comparative and retrospective methods were used.

Presentation and discussion of the main research material. Recognizing that Ukraine's future political life must be linked to the younger generation, and given the great importance of local Ukrainian organizations, V. B. Antonovich visited community groups in other cities across Ukraine, thereby promoting his ideas (Ulyanovskiy & Korotkiy, 1997). Vasyl Domanytskyi (historian, literary scholar, publicist, and political figure) noted on this subject: "It can be said with certainty that there was probably no cause—provided it was of some importance or concerned a larger circle of Ukrainians— did not pass without Volodymyr Bonifatiyovych participating in it, offering help or advice, and always with extraordinary modesty, never putting himself forward (Domanytskyi, 1906, p.46–47).

It should be noted that as early as the 1850s, V. B. Antonovich was involved in the Polish national liberation movement, but later focused on the issues facing the Ukrainian people. The scholar's final break with the Polish socio-political movement occurred in 1859, when its representatives proposed first restoring Poland within the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of 1772, and only then addressing Ukrainian issues. In response, V. B. Antonovich resigned from the editorial board of the Polish journal *Publicysta* (Hyrych, 2014, p.116). The outward manifestation of the break with the Poles was his conversion to the Orthodox faith, which symbolized, in the eyes of the young scholar, a final union with the Ukrainian people (Korduba, 1928, p.162-163).

V. B. Antonovich, asserting the independence and distinctiveness of Ukrainians, researched Ukrainian history, studying the peculiarities of the Ukrainian people's way of life from the earliest times. He attached great importance to educational and cultural work aimed at preserving the national heritage and protecting the distinctiveness of Ukrainians. He was a tireless advocate for the protection of the Ukrainian language and ultimately contributed to the lifting of a number of restrictions imposed by the Ems Decree of 1876.

In the 1880s, V. B. Antonovich founded the so-called "Kyiv School of Historians" (a historiographical school affiliated with St. Vladimir's University in Kyiv), which became the foundation for the development of Ukrainian historical scholarship. Here, two concepts must be distinguished: the school itself and the movement. V. B. Antonovich's historical school included all of his students, regardless of their ideological and historiographical convictions. This school holds a worthy place within the school of historians at St. Vladimir's University and in Ukrainian historiography as a whole. Accordingly, V. B. Antonovich's historical school, as a movement, encompassed only those historians who shared their teacher's populist ideas in a national-state context, that is, who belonged to the Ukrainian historiographical concept (Fihurnyi, 2008, p.220).

As a professor at St. Vladimir's University in Kyiv, V. B. Antonovich encouraged young people to engage in research in the field of medieval Ukrainian history: he involved students in archaeographic expeditions and archival work, selected topics in Ukrainian studies for competitive and thesis papers, master's and doctoral dissertations, and recommended scholarly works on Ukrainian studies for publication in academic journals (Matiakh, 2003, p. 108).

The scholar's influence on the content of the students' works was evident not only in their methodology but also in the fact that the authors incorporated archaeological, historical-geographical, and ethnographic material into their works. Under the scholar's guidance, the students compiled historical materials, presenting a comprehensive history of each region by drawing on historical, topographical, and archaeological data, while actively studying the scholar's own works. V. B. Antonovych was the first among Ukrainian historians to surround himself with a group of talented and hardworking researchers who continued to develop his work, both during the scholar's lifetime and after his death (Hermaize, 1928, p. 31).

V. B. Antonovich made a significant contribution to the academic pursuits of young scholars, which subsequently had a positive impact on the study of Ukrainian history. V. B. Antonovich utilized all the opportunities available at the time for scholarly inquiry in the field of history—whether related to sources, historiography, or formal organizational matters—to promote the independence of Ukrainian research at various levels. His work at the faculty and department level, his teaching of lecture courses and special courses, his training of young scholars, and his participation in the work of the Nestor the Chronicler Historical Society, the Southwestern Branch of the Russian Geographical Society, the T.G. Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, and the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kyiv, attest to the fact that the scholar made a significant contribution to laying a solid foundation for the cultural and national revival of the Ukrainian nation and for Ukrainian studies (Matiakh, 2003, p. 110).

V. B. Antonovych's scientific and research talent was realized in the field of archeographic and scientific journalistic work, in the field of development of specific historical issues, as well as in archaeological and ethnographic studies. In the course of his scientific activity, V. B. Antonovych introduced new archival materials into scientific circulation, analyzed statistical data, used act materials, applied positivist research methodology, and also tried to realistically highlight the historical process, distancing himself from unnecessary emotional ethnography and poeticizing. Having encyclopedic knowledge and using local archives, the scientist described in detail the everyday life of various local estates, reported previously unknown details of the biographies of historical figures (Korduba, 1928, p. 163–164).

As you know, on May 31, 1843, the Kyiv Archeographic Commission was created to analyze ancient documents under the Kyiv, Volyn, and Podilsk Governor Generals. She conducted search activities in the archives of state institutions, magistrates and monasteries, in private archives in the Kyiv region, Volyn and Podil, as well as, if necessary, in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Warsaw, etc. cities Based on the materials and documents collected by her in 1852, the Kyiv Central Archive of Ancient Acts was created. The result of V. B. Antonovych's many years of work at the head of this authoritative scientific institution of the Dnipro region was the initiation of many publishing projects, the results of which later appeared in the publication «Archive of South-Western Russia», the editor-in-chief of which was the scientist (Ulyanovskiy & Korotkiy, 1997). Such scientific activity of the scientist formed the traditions of documentary in Ukrainian historiography.

Due to the deterioration of his health in January-May 1897, V. B. Antonovych went to Italy for treatment, at the same time he received a scientific secondment to work in the

Vatican archives. After returning to Kyiv, the scientist was constantly ill, he no longer had the strength to teach and therefore stayed at home almost all the time. In 1902, the Russian Imperial Academy elected him as its corresponding member. In January 1903, the royal court recognized his merits for the last time, awarding him with the Order of Stanislav 1st degree (Lototskyi, 1933, p.55).

Despite his illness, V. B. Antonovych does not stop his participation in political life. In particular, at that time, together with O. Konyskyi, he considered the idea of creating a non-partisan organization that would be able to revive the Ukrainian national idea. With the active support of V. B. Antonovych, a secret organization emerged in 1897, which was later named the Society of Ukrainian Successors, and later became the main center of cultural-national and socio-political thought of Ukraine (17, p. 172).

At the beginning of the 20th century Ukrainian intellectuals launched a mass campaign for the cancellation of anti-Ukrainian tsarist decrees. In this context, the work of V. B. Antonovych regarding the restrictions on the free use of the Ukrainian language by the Russian autocracy is indicative. In particular, in 1899, with the active support of the scientist, the 11th Archaeological Congress was convened in Kyiv, which was attended by scientists from the entire Russian Empire and some countries of Western Europe. The Ministry of Internal Affairs allowed reading abstracts in all Slavic languages except Ukrainian. True, at the last minute it changed its decision, but under the condition of conducting a closed meeting and in the presence of no more than 25 people. V. B. Antonovych and his associates refused to participate in the congress as a sign of protest. A similar thing happened in 1903 at the opening of the monument to I. Kotlyarevsky in Poltava – then the ban extended to congratulatory speeches in the Ukrainian language.

Like most of his contemporaries, V. B. Antonovych was indifferent to the problems of the Ukrainian language in public life. It is known, for example, that the old citizens of Kyiv communicated with each other almost always in Russian. For example, V. B. Antonovych always corresponded in Russian, even with such a prominent figure in the Ukrainian national and cultural movement as Fedor Vovk. In this context, the recollections of Sofia Yegunova-Shcherbina about disputes with V. B. Antonovych regarding the meaning of Russian literature are indicative. The scientist was convinced that the influence of Russian culture on Ukrainians was too great and therefore harmful. The problem, according to V. B. Antonovych, was that Russian literature is stronger than Ukrainian, and the Russian language is too close to Ukrainian, which increased the danger. The scientist believed that when Ukrainians learn universal ideas and higher culture from the works of Western European thought, they will strive to express these ideas in their own language and thereby contribute to its development. According to the deep conviction of the scientist, young people should learn foreign languages, read Western European literature richer in ideas – this will be more useful for them than the influence of Russian literature (Fihurnyi, 2008, p. 97). It is indisputable that V. B. Antonovych's focus on European culture, in particular historiography, distinguished the scientist from the majority of his colleagues, who were used to turning to Russian and Polish literature.

V. B. Antonovych's work «Note on the Limitations of the Ukrainian Language» revealed the great scientific potential of the scientist and his ability to discuss with ideological opponents within the framework of censorship. In it, the professor more carefully defends the opinion about the need to cancel the Emsk decree of 1876. The reasons for a rather tolerant presentation, with the use of the method of successive refutation of theses directed against the permission of the free use of the Ukrainian language, lie in the fact that during this period of V. B. Antonovych's life and work, signs of the scientist's fatigue and a

significant decline in physical strength became noticeable (Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, 1994, p. 215–216).

V. B. Antonovych was convinced that the definition of the Little Russian language, whether it is an adverb or a dialect, is the competence of specialist philologists. But the fact that millions of people speak this dialect/idiom is an indisputable fact. Moreover, the eradication of the family language from school, church and even from books, according to the scientist, entails retarding processes in the development of the people: knowledge acquired at school is quickly lost, indifference to cultural life grows. It cannot withstand criticism and the statement that the creation of literary works in, so to speak, a non-existent language causes a kind of apprehension. Even if such a state of affairs were to be assumed, when the works would not find their readers, then the damage from such activity would primarily be borne by the author, and in this sense, there is no need to apply any prohibitive measures, the scientist is convinced.

Accepting the ideas of the Enlightenment, V. B. Antonovych associated the suffering of mankind with the underdevelopment of general philosophical concepts, the dominance of superstitions, with ignorance and ignorance, and the successes of mankind, the progress of historical life, with the progress of knowledge. At the same time, the scientist placed knowledge in dependence on life, and the morality of society in dependence on the «question of food», which introduced sociological realism into his concept.

Being convinced that «moral strength» makes a person a person, V. B. Antonovych paid considerable attention to ethical issues. He built the «Code of Human Duties» based on the properties and needs of human nature, defended an optimistic view of a dignified life and death as an inevitable, natural and reasonable end of life. V. B. Antonovych argued, relying, in particular, on Sechenov's ideas, that the doctrine of free will is a pure fantasy, at the same time, he appreciated the volitional capabilities of a person to influence social life.

V. B. Antonovych had to contrast his concept not only with the theory of «art for art's sake», but also with the aesthetics of the publicists of «Russian Word», who represented, in his opinion, «an ascetic view of art». V. B. Antonovych builds aesthetics on the anthropological principle, qualifying aesthetic feeling, aesthetic pleasure as a normal need of human nature, which is satisfied by beautiful objects. Instead, the theory of «art for art's sake», according to the scientist, was one-sided, as it limited art only to aesthetic pleasure (Yehunova-Shcherbyna, 1928, p.9-10).

The historian concluded that «the tragic outcome of the history of Ukraine is caused by the fact that the Ukrainian people were never able to develop either a thorough civilization or a strong self-discipline; because those who stood at the head of it and undertook to take care of the people's destiny had a very insufficient stock of cultures» (Antonovych, 1991). In general, according to V. B. Antonovych: «The state is a product of the human mind, which was formed according to the requirements of historical life; it is a union to which people of many nationalities joined in order to ensure external security and internal well-being» (1995, p. 157). Instead, the scientist insisted: «In order to create a state, the people must possess considerable endurance, be able to refrain at every given moment from actions that come from the influence of immediate ideas, for the sake of future common benefits; must be able to sacrifice a share, sometimes quite large, of personal will and personal desires for the benefit of the government, which is called to organize society and guide state goals. The South Russian people never possessed these qualities and deeply understood their absence» (Antonovych, 1995, p. 28–29). Characterizing this landmark study by V. B. Antonovych, the researcher M. Corduba noted: «This is a further, more consistent elaboration and deepening of the thoughts expressed by Kostomarov in the treatise on the two Russian nationalities. The fact that it was reprinted three times is the best

evidence of the wide echo and popularity that this article found among the Galician public» (Korduba, 1928, p.64). V. B. Antonovych noted: «This period is characterized by the fact that the real seniority of the Kiev table is recognized by seniority both in principle and in practice. The Prince of Kiev is considered the main sovereign who rules all of Russia. With the help of close relatives, he strives to restore unity in the state and tries to prevent the development of estates; but already in the second generation after Yaroslav, this becomes impossible... The last representative of the Kiev princes is Vladimir Monomakh...». (1991, p. 89–90).

The second stage, in the periodization of V. B. Antonovych, lasts about 80 years, from the Lubech congress to the final fall of Kyiv as the main princely table. «The character of this period is that the real seniority of the Kiev table turns into an honorary one: at the Lubech Congress, all the estates were recognized as independent, and the power of the Kiev prince was recognized only morally, not factually».

V. B. Antonovych traces the third stage, the «partial-century period», from the fall of Kyiv (1169) to the Lithuanian conquest. The scientist wrote: «The character of the ego is the complete isolation and independence of the parts. The Kiev table loses even its nominal primacy, and the other principalities have no claims to hegemony over all of Russia». Therefore, several grand principalities were formed in a certain period of time, and at the same time, the gradual division of the Kyiv principality itself was outlined. S. Efremov rightly noted about V. B. Antonovych's activities: «In another country, under different political circumstances, he would have been able to fully develop his talent as a politician and would probably have become a leader of the broad masses of humanity to a better life. In Russia, in the circumstances of the autocratic-police regime, it happened differently. Only a small part of his great political abilities went into work, and even then it was invisible, often small, without a wide scope, without clear prospects. But still, even with this share, Antonovych the politician fulfilled the oath that he had taken once, at the turning point of his youth, before the judgment of his own conscience» (Yefremov, 1925, p.22).

In the last quarter of the 19th century. social structural changes took place in the Ukrainian public movement. Radical young people who did not accept the activities of V. B. Antonovych entered the social and political arena. In particular, the historian V. I. Ulyanovsky notes: «But already at the end of the 1880s – in the 1890s, when radical youth groups began to appear, and Volodymyr Bonifatiyovych increasingly lost his energy, voices began to be heard from this camp about Antonovych's lethargy, inertness, and cultural bias. His methods of activity and leading ideas were condemned, and he himself was qualified as a precious, but still a relic of old Ukrainianism» (Ulyanovsky & Korotkyi, 1997, p.34-35).

History refuted V. Antonovych's point of view about the absolute lack of formation of the «state instinct» of Ukrainians. However, it is difficult to deny the reasonableness of the subjective reasons expressed by the historian, which repeatedly stood in the way of the establishment of Ukrainian statehood, including in the 20th century. And today, the rapid development of a sovereign Ukrainian state is hindered by the dominance of emotions when solving state problems, selfishness and greed for profit, neglect of state interests, disrespect for one's authority, lack of self-sacrificing struggle for the interests of the community. All this indicates a rather low level of political maturity of the Ukrainian nation.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Thus, in his statist views, V. B. Antonovych actually evolves from evaluating Ukrainianness as a Little Russian identity to understanding national identity as purely Ukrainian. In the difficult socio-political conditions of government persecution of Ukrainians, the scientist managed to find channels for the spread of the Ukrainian idea, which was only formed in the 19th century.

According to the scientist, the inability of the Ukrainian people to create a state is a specific feature of Ukrainians who prefer to live in a federation with a stronger state (title) nation. Classifying Ukrainians as stateless nations, V. B. Antonovych sought a compromise with autocracy in his public, scientific-organizational, cultural-educational activities. At the same time, V. B. Antonovych continued the legitimization of Ukrainian national history, including the protection of the people's rights to a certain territory, the question of the antiquity of the origin and the very existence of the ethnoses, the separateness of Ukrainians from Russians and Poles in history, culture and language, etc.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Use of Artificial Intelligence

No artificial intelligence tools or materials were used in the manuscript.

REFERENCES:

- Antonovych, V.B. (1995). *Moia spovid: Vybrani istorychni ta publitsystychni tvory*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]
- Antonovych, V. (1991). *Pro kozatski chasy na Ukraini*. Kyiv.: Dnipro. [in Ukrainian]
- Antonovych, V. (1995). *Zapyska v spravi obmezhen ukrainskoi movy. U Moia spovid. Vybrani istorychni ta publitsystychni tvory (153–158)*. Kyiv: Lybid. [in Ukrainian]
- Bilodid, V. D. (2012). *Metodolohiia etnonatsionalnoho rozuminnia istorii V. B. Antonovychem*. [in Ukrainian]
- Domanytskyi, V. (1906). Volodymyr Antonovych. *Nova Hromada*, 9, 45-53. [in Ukrainian]
- Fihurnyi, Yu.S. (2008). Tytan ukrainskoho natsionalnoho vidrozhennia – etnonatsiotvorcha ta etnohrafichna diialnist Volodymyra Antonovycha v ukrainoznavchomu vymiri (do stolitnikh rokovykh yoho smerti). *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats Naukovo-doslidnoho instytut ukrainoznavstva. T. KhIKh.*, 109–137. [in Ukrainian]
- Hermaize, O. (1928). V. B. Antonovych v ukrainskii istoriohrafii. *Ukraina*, 5, 30–32. [in Ukrainian]
- Hrushevskiy, M. S. (1984). Volodymyr Antonovych, osnovni idei yoho tvorchosti i diialnosti. *Ukrainskyi istoryk, (1–4) (81–84)*, 193–198 [in Ukrainian].
- Hyrych, I. (2014). *Ukrainski intelektualy i politychna okremishnist (seredyna XIX – pochatok XX st.)*. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi pysmennyk. [in Ukrainian]
- Korduba, M. (1928). Volodymyr Antonovych. *Literaturno- naukovyi vistnyk*, 26, 156–167 [in Ukrainian].
- Krupnytskyi, B. (1959). *Istorioznavchi problemy istorii Ukrainy*. Miunkhen [in Ukrainian]
- Lototskyi, O. (1933). *Storinky mynuloho*. Varshava. [in Ukrainian]
- Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, I. (1994). Karazyn i pochatky ukrainskoho natsionalnoho vidrozhennia U *Lysiak-Rudnytskyi I. Istorychni ese (p. 203–220)*. [in Ukrainian]
- Matiakh, V.M. (2003). Antonovycha Volodymyra Kyivska shkola istorykiv. U *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy: T. 1: A–V*. [in Ukrainian]
- Morozov, D. (2009). Volodymyr Antonovych pro tsentralizm i federalizatsiiu Kyivskoi Rusi. *Naukovi zapysky [Kirovohradskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Vynnychenka]. Serii : Istorychni nauky*, 12, 237-243. [in Ukrainian]
- Rudakevych, O. (2014). Fenomen ukrainskosti Volodymyra Antonovycha v umovakh imperskoi Rosii. *Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh*, 17, 124–127. [in Ukrainian]
- Slavinskyi M. *Spohady*. [in Ukrainian]

- Ulyanovskiy & Korotkiy (1997). Syn Ukrainy: Volodymyr Bonifatiiovych Antonovych. Zapovit [in Ukrainian]
- Yehunova-Shcherbyna, S. (1928). Pamiaty V. B. Antonovycha . *Ukraina*, 9, 95-99.[in Ukrainian]
- Yefremov, S. (1925). Pered sudom vlasnoi sovisti. Hromadska i politychna robota V. Antonovycha.
U *Zapysky istoryko-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN* (s. 22–35). [in Ukrainian]

Дата надходження до редакції 09.12. 2025
Ухвалено до друку 24.12.2025



CC Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)