

## THEORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORY

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2024-2-11>

### THE AUTHOR'S NARRATIVES OF M. DRAHOMANOVA AND O. KONYSKOHO IN ILLUMINATION OF UKRAINIAN HISTORY

*Mykhailo Havryliuk,*

*Postgraduate Student at the Department of Ethnology and History of Ukraine,  
Drahomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine),*

*Participant in Hostilities*

*orcid.org/0000-0003-4533-2407*

*pamamisha@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** The "Ukrainian Project" appears to the modern audience as an attempt to revive Ukrainian statehood. Taking into account the difficult geopolitical atmosphere, the complex conglomerate of Russian narratives, the national movement offered various models for solving the further political future of Ukraine. Cause-and-effect relationships showed the crystallization of the main directions of the modern movement. Among them, we outline the political radicalism that M. Drahomanov actively promoted in his socio-political, educational and spiritual activities. He believed that radical changes in society through a revolutionary-federal sequence of actions could lead to the creation of a new political future of Ukraine with a socialist flavor. However, in contrast to the socialist perspective and the creation of community unity, O. Konyskyi seeks to concentrate precisely on Ukrainian patriot forces. He offers an evolutionary and cultural model of the realization of a historical choice for the Ukrainian ethnic group, which, unfortunately, was stateless at that time. According to O. Konyskyi, the method of legitimization and proving the right to historical choice had to be carried out only officially, since other attempts would be unsuccessful and threatening for the entire Ukrainian national movement. The comparative method of analysis of O. Konyskyi and M. Drahomanov, their ideological principles and polar approaches in the context of building a new state was used in the preparation of the presented research. Scientific intelligence can be used to prepare for debates and discussions in general secondary, vocational and technical and higher education institutions.

**Key words:** M. Drahomanov, O. Konyskyi, M. Vozniak, L. Hlibov, Ukrainian history, liberation movement, liberation movement, historical documents, epistolary heritage, narrative, Ukrainian sources, comparative analysis.

**Introduction.** The question of the realization of the political paths of the future of the Ukrainian state is investigated, it is proposed to analyze the polemical dialogues of M. Drahomanov and O. Konysky on the issues of guiding the directions of the Ukrainian project. The significance of the epistolary and creative heritage of the famous Ukrainian thinkers mentioned above is clarified. A systematized conclusion is offered to solve the target tasks of the cultural-evolutionary and federalist-radical wings of the Ukrainian modern movement. The purpose of the article: on the basis of well-known and unstudied historical documents, the epistolary heritage of M. P. Drahomanov, O. Konyskyi and the scientific elite of the past to determine the significance of the Ukrainian project in the processes of state formation. To characterize the essence of the polemical dialogues of the classics of the Ukrainian past and political knowledge. To find out individual directions of the political future, approaches, methods and means of their implementation in the conditions of occupation by the Russian Empire. Compose "historical portraits" of M. Drahomanov and O. Konyskyi. The issue of Drahomanov heritage was dealt with by scientists: M. S. Hrushevskyi, V. P. Andrushchenko, M. A. Zhurba, O. P. Reent, I. B. Gyrych, R. P. Ivanchenko, L. G. Ivanova.

Aspects of O. Konyskyi's comprehensive public activity and historiography were interested in domestic scientists, such as: O. O. Mysyura, O. V. Dyachenko, I. B. Hyrych, as evidenced by scien-

tific investigations and dissertation studies, in which a prominent Ukrainian thinker appears in the field of attention. However, a comprehensive comparative analysis has not been carried out, which determines the novelty of scientific research.

**Presenting main material.** The desire of Ukrainians to have their own historical progress and justify their separation from the "Russian world" was born during the formation of the modern movement of the 19th century. The opposition to Russianness began in the context of the rise of the Cossack State and persisted during the Ukrainian national revival. On the way to finding their own historical concept of Ukrainian development, outstanding figures of the past had to experience a large number of prohibitions against the realization of Ukrainian identity. Among the methods of struggle against Ukrainianism, moral, economic, ideological, and physical influence was used. Having put their own career, health, strength and psychological comfort in the driving forces of both the radical and cultural wings of the Community, they defended Ukrainian memory and the exclusivity of their historical individuality and nation. Participants of the Public Movement used all available modern methods of countering the centralizing policy of the Russian Empire: Little Russia, provincialism, cultural inferiority. After all, the creation of a new generation is always accompanied by constant dialogue and controversy, during which the people choose their own approach to creating the future, taking into account the mistakes of the past.

Mykhailo Drahomanov became a professional universal historian who used the positivist method and the comparative historical method. When preparing historical works, he constantly cites veiled examples that testify to the heterogeneity of opinions and worldview positions between Ukrainians and other peoples. In his own logical explanations, the scientist in the work "About Ukrainians, Turks and Tatars" first relies on a significant geographical factor, which historically divided Ukrainians and the tribes of the Ugrians and those who call themselves Russians today. For example, the researcher provides the following reasoned evidence in his work: "They didn't have time to deal with the Khazars, when the Khazars were replaced by other steppe peoples, also from the east – the Pechenegs 2, and then the Polovtsy 3, and they began to crowd Rus'. She had to get out of the steppes and move away from the Black Sea. At that time, the Slavs were greatly offended by these Polovtsians, and they had to fight with them for a long time. Prince Volodymyr Monomakh of Pereyaslav, and then of Kyiv, said about them, as did all the princes, that a Slavic plowman cannot go out into the field to plow the land, because a Polovtsy will come, kill the plowman, and take his cattle and family for himself. . From this it is already clear what kind of evil those Polovtsians were and what kind of attack they made in our land. But over time, the Slavs still gradually began to gain the upper hand over the Polovtsy" (Dragomanov, 1991: 143). Despite everything, another outstanding Ukrainian researcher, O. Konyskyi, openly does not propose to show directly the history of the Ukrainian people and its difficulties in the matter of state building. For example, in his work "Yuriy Horovenko", the scientist writes in a literary-retrospective manner about the historical realities of Ukrainians. The author shows the protagonist's desire to discover Ukraine through a book, a literary word. For him, the works of T. G. Shevchenko "Haydamaki", "Naymichka", in which he finds the Ukrainian spirit and power, become important. The hero of O. Konyskyi's work asks his mother to confirm the fact of the existence of Ukrainian statehood, in the end he asks his mother about the reasons for the disappearance of the state in the Dnieper during the Cossack era. The woman, obviously, trying to preserve the happy fate of the Ukrainian, deliberately silences the knowledge about the historical past and because of this the conversation becomes quiet and invisible to the family (Konyskyi, 1990: 402–510).

O. Konyskyi, conveys the fear of Ukrainians to recognize the existence of their statehood. The scientist was characterized by caution and at the same time a desire to be an active participant in the national movement. This inevitably forced the concealment of true historical facts from the history of Ukraine, that is why he presents the factual material somewhat dosed, the legitimization of works is O. Konyskyi's strategy." That is, the highlighting of the history of Ukraine in the form of counter-

ing fake materials from the historical past, which were widely distributed in Russian journalism and historiography, is a characteristic feature of the scientist's work. This issue remains relevant even today, because the history of Ukraine to this day needs special attention and careful protection from distortions and distortions, artificial historical ideologues somehow: the triunity of East Slavic ethnic groups, with the dominance of the Russian ethnic community. The desire to show the separate history of Ukraine from the Russian and Polish elements was only partially illustrated by O. Konyskyi. Exile and gendarme supervision affected the emotional state of the Ukrainian lover (according to the scientific terminology of S. Svitlenka), forcing him to switch to cultural methods as a countermeasure to imperial doctrines and the unification of the life of the enslaved peoples of the Russian Empire. The inner experiences and emotions of the scientist in the struggle for the Ukrainian project are described quite well in the studies of the researcher, Ukrainophile and representative of the Cossack-Sershin family – H. Berlo. In 1924, she published the unique correspondence of Oleksandr Yakovych with Hrodavitsi, revealing his social and political position. The historian points out that due to objective reasons such as the following: persecution, the threat of destruction by the Russian occupation regime of the scientist's memoir heritage, she was unable to preserve part of this unique correspondence. However, this did not prevent her from recreating the image of O. Konyskyi in the last years of his life and scientific and pedagogical work (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1924:156-a; 1–3).

The main thesis of the scholar's publication, which is kept in the Institute of Manuscripts of the National Academy of Sciences of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, is to confirm the opinion of O. Konyskyi as a careful fighter for the Ukrainian modern movement. Therefore, the period we use covers the chronological boundaries: October 23, 1895 to March 7, 1900. The credo of O. Konyskyi's worldview is faithfully reproduced in his poetic words:

I will bring gifts to my beloved land,  
Not gold, not money – a loud song,  
I sing that song about a new will,

About equality, brotherhood. (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1924: 3).

O. Konyskyi's main message to his compatriots in his vision of the modern historical process is advice: strive for the unity of Ukrainian patriotic forces regardless of status and the need to fight for the national cause. In his creative testament, he once again reminds young Ukrainians of the need to analyze the mistakes that were outlined by previous generations of Ukrainophiles. He was concerned with the fate of Ukrainian national development, which was supposed to become a vanguard for the approval of the future transformational processes of the Ukrainian modern movement. A Ukrainian book appears as a marker of the cultural vector in the submitted memoir documentation. Through this Ukrainian book, the creation of a new history should take place on the territory of Ukrainian lands. O. Konyskyi strives to convey the idea of preserving the historical memory of the people of his heroic exploits, events and everyday life. At the same time, it is worth updating M. Kostomarov's instructions regarding caution in building the national cause: "Oh, and disaster and disaster! So work, as you know, and worry when they send you out of Ukraine to Vologda and Vyatka... You had to protect yourself not for yourself, but for the sake of Ukraine and the entire national cause" (Pinchuk, 1992: 133).

Since the 1890s, the "folklore stage" ends and the active politicization of the Ukrainian movement begins, which is characterized by the formation of a number of political demands for the St. Petersburg political elite and tasks for Ukrainian society. Cultural Ukrainophilism continues, but loses its real appeal. Accordingly, the radicalization of Ukrainophilism becomes inevitable. This fact worries O. Konyskyi. He tries to gather young people around him in order to protect them from the danger that awaits them as a result of direct struggle with the Russian autocracy. The iron hand of

tsarism began to remove from the official public space persons who were promoting radical methods of struggle for the political future of the enslaved peoples of the Russian Empire.

Instead, M. Drahomanov offers a different way of establishing the Ukrainian national idea than O. Konyskyi. The scientist not only talks about the printed word as a way of struggle, but sets specific political goals and plans for revolutionary resistance.

M. Drahomanov offers a distinctive feature in the political choice of the future of Ukraine. He no longer just talks about the printed word as a way of struggle, but sets specific political goals and plans through revolutionary resistance. He notes that: "...everywhere our people are oppressed in the same way, although not by the same kingdom, lordship, merchant... And when those communities everywhere are of the same breed, live side by side, it is clear that it is best for our people: to unite in order to go to his own; to live according to their will on their land" (Dragomanov, 1937: 110–111). The researcher and politician proposes to introduce in the new state a kind of contractual federation within the country, where he wants to see the union of the Ukrainian population (union), which will solve only everyday problems, but will be ready to create a democratic environment. According to M. Drahomanov's vision, each community will represent the interests of those who are part of it on a federal basis and will be ready to voice suggestions and complaints at any time. We can see here an attempt to restore the age-old principle of local self-government in the context of Ukrainian-Russian traditions, which formed the foundation and genetic program of democratic rule in their own territories, which is still followed by Ukrainians in the struggle for freedom (Dragomanov, 1937: 110–111). The federal system is the only way to solve the issue of statelessness. Society and the scientific community were not ready for sudden and rapid changes. M. Drahomanov based on the views of M. Kostomarov, becoming his apologist, took into account the principles of economic expediency of regions and the economic and geographical factor in general when founding a new country. I. M. Boyko confirms the narrative of the past that the social dimension in the works of M. Drahomanov becomes dominant, and the band is the basis for the further development of the state mechanism. That is, the growth of society prevailed over the legal dimension (Boyko, 1995: 33–36).

In his work, the activist calls for careful consideration of the parallels between the development of Moksels and Ukraine. According to him: "It was like a newly born free land, although it already had bad seeds, like the beginning of serfdom, but its will had not yet been rooted in the people by science, which would have shown that people should remain free and be governed only by the elected. It is not surprising that during those times when Ukraine was annexed to the Muscovite kingdom, and its arbitrary tsar, with serfdom, lived without science..."; Therefore, it was important for the scientist to show the true face of Muscovites. In Dragoman's interpretation, the Moscow boyars grew the seeds of serfdom in Ukraine. And in modern times, if Ukrainians wanted to free themselves from that slavery, according to the scientist's words: "now they had to attack not only those of their own people who benefited from human slavery, but also the Moscow government (Dragomanov, 1991: 143).

In the program document "Community" of 1877, M. Drahomanov proposes to define more clearly the boundaries of the will of the Ukrainian people, and for this he cites examples of the tradition of state building in a hidden explanation: "Now it is precisely these foreigners who were sent to Ukraine by the states that enslaved it in the old days, and those werewolves who joined them rule over Ukrainians both in the economy, as richer people, and in political affairs as superiors (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1880: 3). He is trying to solve the task of overcoming statelessness: to appoint Ukrainians to positions, not a foreign element, not Little Russians, who would obediently fulfill all the whims determined by the then political leadership of the state. Such a political apparatus, of course, was not interested in the deployment of a national factor that could become dominant and displace the occupied Russian idea of state building and the state-building process in general. Direct appeals with appeals to change the current political affairs were saturated with a socialist ray. M. Drahomanov did not see further social activity of the Ukrainian



people without the flavor of socialism. He, as a person of his time, was fascinated by new political trends that O. Stronin planted in his head during his studies. Subsequently, with the political and domestic assets of foreign countries that were imbued with this method of change, he developed his own concept of further steps to deepen the political movement. The program we have mentioned is permeated with attempts to implement a new political path, but it was issued abroad, in Geneva.

According to M. Drahomanov, the idea of liberating Ukraine also becomes a kind of multi-ethnic movement, as the researcher proposes to involve different national communities in the process of liberation. The scientist emphasizes the importance of their component in the comprehensive Ukrainian path of the modern movement. He points out the importance of constant interaction with such poly-communities, because the process of nation-building is not a matter that can be resolved too quickly: "Their associations and communities will be free from any compulsion to the customs or language of the Ukrainian group, will have the will to establish their own schools: lower, middle and higher, and the will to insist on any commonality with the group of those peoples, from which those communities, settlements, and associations came to Ukraine. Such working foreigners will be knots for Ukrainians that will tie them to all the neighboring breeds of \nations\, with which Ukrainians must join the great national free union of the \international federation" (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1880: 1–3).

It is certain that such a vision of the subsequent historical choice described by M. Drahomanov testified to an irresistible desire not only to confirm the individuality of the Ukrainian people, to define the place of the Ukrainian nation, but also: to show the legitimacy of the Ukrainians' right to statehood. The scientist justifies this right of statehood through the long-standing connections of Ukrainians with the historical interstate contacts of the East and the West. However, this thesis is written between the lines and becomes clear to those persons who are aware of the historical basis and age-old traditions of the independence of Ukrainian lands in the global space.

It is certain that such a vision of the subsequent historical choice described by M. Drahomanov testified to an irresistible desire not only to confirm the individuality of the Ukrainian people, to define the place of the Ukrainian nation, but also: to show the legitimacy of the Ukrainians' right to statehood. The scientist justifies this right of statehood through the long-standing connections of Ukrainians with the historical interstate contacts of the East and the West. However, this thesis is written between the lines and becomes clear to those persons who are aware of the historical basis and age-old traditions of the independence of Ukrainian lands in the global space.

One way or another, the future statehood, in addition to the political foundation, needs solid socio-cultural and economic foundations. That is why M. Drahomanov shows the structure or the individual program of the development of the state. Among the first steps in this program are "business and economic affairs":

- 5/Whatever all the forces of nature and streams that are needed for the production of useful things, i.e.: land, water with everything in them, machines, tools, etc. were simply in the hands of farming and workers' associations and communities, and no matter what people had to sell their labor to hired masters and heroes, they did it simply for themselves" (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1880: 1–3).

Individual words and phrases of the scientist are characterized by utopianism, but it is precisely in these program principles that the Ukrainian society of natural resources has the right to be recognized. Today, this thesis has been successfully implemented in the Constitution of Ukraine, in accordance with Article 13, and the right to private property is enshrined in the Land Code of Ukraine in accordance with Article 80. Therefore, the principles of state building were drawn up step by step by M. Drahomanov, taking into account the interests of the entire society:

- that how to change individual property \family, homeland\ into collective property, and further, how to organize joint work and how to share benefits from it, should not depend on the goodwill of

each society – each community. It is certain that entertainment and testing \practice\ on economic needs will teach individual communities not only the commonality of work \cooperation\ and the reasonable division of its use among the communities themselves, but also among the communities of entire countries and the whole world" f. And, (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1880: 3).

According to M. Drahomanov, the term "private property" in the updated Ukraine is becoming abstract. Obviously, this is connected with the tradition of the Ukrainian people to jointly solve collective issues. We can assume an attempt to create a kind of conglomerate of socialist narratives and age-old principles for the organization of public space. Indeed, such a combination becomes individual maximalism, but with tangible features of social life and the past.

M. Drahomanov proposes to make education a weapon, but not one that works for self-destruction and the creation of enemy groups in the circle of true Ukrainianism, but that lays the foundation for a new nation:

"In educational \cultural\ matters, we wish: 6\growth of proven\reputable science about natural and social things, as well as skills related to that science. We think:

That such science and skills \verbal, theater, painting, carving, music \will replace the very current beliefs, because of which people have so much quarreled and are quarreling among themselves. As long as this comes \through free science and preaching, then we think we are free to adhere to such faith as they want, however much they are committed to each faith \Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, etc. \, to each brotherhood \shtundas, sloops and others\ maintained \their churches and priests at their own expense, even if there were no public taxes or public labor for this, but everyone would give for it from himself when he wished" f. (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1880: 4).

In contrast to the caution and prudence of O. Konyskyi regarding the coverage of historical aspirations, his opponent, Mykhailo Drahomanov, chooses to deploy an option to counter Russian propaganda. There is one important difference between these two figures: the geographical location as of the date of publication of their works. Other geographical locations that influenced the nature of their creativity.

For example, Mykhailo Petrovych was in exile in 1876 and moved around the European world. Of course, gendarmerie supervision was also present outside the borders of the Russian Empire. However, to the comparison with O. Yakovych, who lived on the territory of the Russian Empire (in distant provinces), it is worth adding this fact, comparing their position in various political-authoritarian parallels. This is precisely what determines the contrast in the characteristics of the openness of the opinions of O. Konyskyi and M. Drahomanov. Some professional historians and researchers point to a conflict of state interests between the leading ideologues of the national movement. M. Hrushevsky was personally acquainted with O. Konyskyi in his younger years. The scientific circle of communication, fascination with the iconic figures led to a historical acquaintance. It reveals to us not only O. Konyskyi's personal rejection of M. Drahomanov, but also their opposition in political choices. As an example, M. S. Hrushevsky gives the following views that prevailed in the scientific Ukrainian elite of that time: "On the other hand, Drahomaniv and his colleagues and like-minded people opposed the politics of the national front, which was a prerequisite for the tension of the national movement: the development of a "high national culture" that was the task of Konyskyi's direction, the tact of cooperation between radical-progressive and socialist elements without distinction of nationalities. Instead of uniting with the clerics and reactionaries, the progressive elements of Galician Ukraine should have sought understanding and joint work with the progressive Jewish, Polish, and Muscovophile elements: it was assumed that such progressive, democratic elements among the Muscovophiles would also be found among the youth and among the elders, and there was nothing to push them away such oppositional, people-loving Muscovite elements and to impose imperial or

magnate liberties on themselves" (Hrushevskiy, 2002: 134). So, historians, as the political elite of Ukraine, have already singled out a public-scientific space for O. Konyskyi and noted his political vision of the future state in the context of dialogues with M. Drahomanov. O. Konyskyi, according to the definition of the leading Ukrainian historian I. Hyrych, is a "fundamental independentist" who does not recognize socialism in any of its manifestations.

"Perebendya" recognizes the dominant national group of Ukrainians and puts it first "among the first" (Hyrych, 2012: 53–84). But the key methods of struggle of the independent Ukrainophile were not revolutionary speeches and pogroms, but the printed word, the legitimization of the modern movement. We find the characteristic confirmation again in the memoirs of M. S. Hrushevskiy, who details the historical realities of the Ukrainian scientific elite: "Dragomanov was sharply opposed to the fact that he was bending Galician youth to Russian books, to Russian fiction – instead of encouraging the widest possible and direct use of European literature – at least German, if not others, because the knowledge of the German language is mandatory for every Galician intellectual" (Hrushevskiy, 2002: 1–134). The gap in the construction of the state structure between two prominent figures: O. Konyskyi and M. Drahomanov became significant. At least the choice of forms and methods of implementation of the Ukrainian project appears as an illustrated fact. After criticizing the means, communicative principles and specific contacts with ethnic groups, which have become observers and participants in the nation-building of Ukrainians, are considered.

Oleksandr Yakovych was in fact in severe stressful and emotional situations due to the controversy, which in one way or another influenced his steps in terms of implementing the ideas of national revival. According to his psycho-emotional state, he was a person who was too concerned with the implementation of the propaganda of the Ukrainian idea of the modern movement. The need for constant support, dialogue, sometimes even the agreement of joint actions was absolutely necessary to make sure that his work in this area is not in vain. An example of this is letters to famous writers regarding publishing matters. In his requests, he discreetly asks for a personal meeting with I. Nechui-Levytskyi and offers him various topics: Yavoriv and Hutsul regions. It seems that these are simple conversations about friendly communication and self-development. However, we can assume that the future steps of the cultural wing of the modern movement were planned at such meetings and the spheres of responsibility between specific historical figures were demarcated. Culture workers tried to imperceptibly promote the Ukrainian idea in the prevailing conditions (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1885: 1–5).

Mykhailo Wozniak's description of the activities of the Chernihiv community in 1861–1863 can be considered as proof of loyalty to the ideas of O. Konyskyi's cultural progress and tireless desire for changes in the historical choices of Ukraine. He cites factual material that describes in detail the steps in the publishing work of O. Konyskyi's comrades, in particular: L. Hlibov and S. Nosa. In the report, M. Wozniak tries to explain to the reader that not all letters accurately reflect the true course of thought of prominent figures, but shows their methods of struggle in national resistance. He names, in particular, Sunday schools as such methods and clarifies that the published memoirs and the available epistolary heritage are the structural stages of the Ukrainian cultural and educational movement. He offers six letters for review. An example of the constant and active work of the Chernihiv community and the interaction of the center of Ukrainophilism is the letter of Leonid Hlibov to Oleksandr Konysky dated May 11, 1861. The Chernihiv community member rather veiledly reports on the publication of a new edition:

"Back in the winter, I heard about ... a publication in Poltava, but I was told that it did not appear due to the case of the editor's transfer to another office, to another city... There was a rumor about your newspaper. I am sending you the program of my "Letter" in the form in which it was sent for consideration by the censorship department. I'm thinking of starting the publication from June, although... I have not yet received the final permission.." (Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho, 1861–1863: 1–3).

The analysis of this note by M. Wozniak, which is presented in a pile with other excerpts of letters, is key to the formation of important conclusions: the Chernihiv and Poltava communities had close contacts, which were formalized through the implementation of various Ukrainian studies projects. There was a so-called agent network, or persons who were appointed to the positions of officials of various ranks and who in their essence supported the Ukrainian modern movement; Legitimacy was important for the cultural direction of the national movement, taking into account the analysis of the program by O. Konyskyi, which is requested by L. Hlibov, which does not go beyond the limits of legality and permissibility by government circulars. After all, O. Konyskyi had a long-standing extensive legal practice and was well versed in the system of administrative and criminal penalties. Legitimacy is often the official recognition of the Ukrainian project, but it provided an incentive to create new programs and appeals that contained hidden vectors of Ukraine's further future.

According to the instructions of O. Konyskyi, the legitimization of the Ukrainian movement was supposed to take place through the well-founded proof of the right to statehood through the publication, distribution of historical facts and the promotion of educational discourse. The Ukrainian idea and its propaganda had to be established through the publishing business. This method was one of the dominant ones for conveying the importance of the political revival of Ukraine and establishing the self-awareness of the population.

**Results and discussion.** As a result of the analysis of little-known and publicly available sources, the polarity of the positions of M. Drahomanov and O. Konyskyi and the specific methods of implementing the Ukrainian project were clarified. The relevance of the Ukrainian question in the modern historical and political process and in the course of geopolitical transformations related to the past has been recorded.

**Conclusions.** The use of M. Drahomanov's and O. Konyskyi's letters, posts, announcements, appeals during the study of the problem of the historical implementation of Ukrainian statehood is a fundamental element for understanding the political future of the Ukrainian nation in the modern era. Comprehending and searching for the historical choice of Ukraine in a comparativist comparative analysis provides an opportunity to explore the polar views of representatives of different political directions of the past. The historical choice of Ukraine is an urgent topic, which is due to new approaches in revealing and opposing Russian propaganda narratives and the stability of the national consciousness of O. Konyskyi and M. Drahomanov in the creation of the "Ukrainian project".

#### References:

1. Drahomanov, M. (1991). Pro ukrayins'kykh kozakiv, tatar ta turkiv [About Ukrainian cossacks, tatars and turks]. Dnipro, 1–155. (In Ukrainian).
2. Drahomanov, M. (1991). Propashchyy chas: Ukrayintsi pid Moskovs'kym tsarstvom, 1654–1876 [Ukrainians under the Moscow Empire, 1654–1876]. Ukrayins'kyy istorychnyy zhurnal, 9, 131–143. (In Ukrainian).
3. Drahomanov, M. (1937). Zbirka politychnykh tvoriv z pryitkamy pid zahal'noyu redaktsiyeyu P. Bohats'koho [A collection of political works with notes under the general editorship of P. Bogatskyi]. Ukrayins'kyy sotsiologichnyy instytut v Prazi, 1–416. (In Ukrainian).
4. Hrushevs'kyy M. (2002). Mykhaylo Hrushevs'kyy: zhyttya, diyal'nist', tvorchist'. Z nahody 135-richchya vid dnya narodzhennya [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: life, activity, creativity. On the occasion of the 135th anniversary of the birth]. Ukrayins'ke Istorychne Tovarystvo, 1–578. (In Ukrainian).
5. Hyrych I. (2012). Mizh naukoyu i politykoyu. Istoriohrafichni studiyi pro vchenykh-kontseptualistiv [Between science and politics. Historiographic studies on conceptual scientists], Navchal'na knyha, 53–84. (In Ukrainian).
6. Konyskyi O. (1990). Opovidannya. Povist'. Poetychni tvory [Stories. Story. Poetry]. Naukova dumka, 402–510. (In Ukrainian).



7. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho (1924). Berlo H. Lysty Konys'koho Ol. [Berlo H. Letters of Konysky Ol.], 14732, 156-a, 1–3. (In Ukrainian).
8. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho (1880). Prohrama [Program], 44075, 1–10. (In Ukrainian).
9. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho (1861–1863). Z chernihivs'koyi hromady 1861–63 rr. /Lysty Leonida Hlibova y Stepana Nosa do Ol.Konys'koho [From the Chernihiv community of 1861–63 /Letters of Leonid Hlibov and Stepan Nos to Ol. Konyskyi], 17000, 1–3. (In Ukrainian).
10. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V.I. Vernadskoho (1865). Perebendya, Konys'kyy, Nechuy-Levyts'kyy Ivanu Semenovychu. Lysty. Sichen', traven' 1885 r. [Perebendya, Konyskyi, Nechui-Levytskyi to Ivan Semenovysh. Letters. January, May 1885]. 27968–27969, 1–5.
11. Pinchuk Yu. (1992). Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov [Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov]. Naukova dumka, 232–510.
12. Yekel'chik S. (1995). Sotsial'no-filosofs'ki ideyi Mykhayla Drahomanova [Social and philosophical ideas of Mykhailo Drahomanov]. Natsional'na akademiya nauk Ukrayiny, Instytut filosofiyi, 33–73. (In Ukrainian).