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Summary. 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.
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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. 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].
Апелій до минулого українського народу, ідеалізація козаків і козацько-гетманської державності, оправдання боротьби проти польської диктатури та турецько-татарських захисників, пошук витіснення національної історії і мови працювала як сильний засіб відновлення історичного гарнотісття, політичного та культурного традицій Української нації. 20-60 років XIX століття. Залишено значний вплив на духовне, культурне та наукове життя українського народу. У концентрованій формі, романтичний погляд можна охарактеризувати як національність і поняття культурної ідентичності, перекинуте до близького та віддаленого минулого його народу, виконане представниками його інтелектуальної верхівки [4].

Від кінця XVII століття, з моменту формування Українського козацького державства, на території, що була під владою Польщі-Унії, жодна з церков не бажала прийняти такий "бойовий порядок", як переклади Біблії і інших церковних книг до мови народу. Тоді наша народна мова не була звільнена від панування церковної слав'янської та староболгарської. Наша країна не пов'язалася з усією європейською протестантською рухом. Отже, в нашій території, ситуація була вражаючою: в одних частинах був православний, у інших - Унія, а в церкві кожен день, чи навіть кожен день, що наші люди були уважні до священника як найвищого судді в духовному родинному, що проявляло неврахування мови народу, показання неподійності мови для комунікації із Богом [5].

Схожа була ситуація в Російському царстві, де єпископи, щоправда, у 1824 році, заборонили деякі російські переклади Біблії. Спробували це Церковна спілка, але дозволили лише для домашнього, але ніколи не величій релігійній читання. Підставою для відмови була закордонна переклади Біблії, які виконувалися французами. Відмова від української переклади Святої Ініції. Факт, що у XIV столітті Степан Перменський переклав декілька церковних книг до Зир'яна (Комі), і для цих 400-500 років до перекладів на інші мови, Михайло Петрович був пов'язаний тільки з слабкістю церковної ієрархії та релігійної традиції в Москві в часи Степана Перменського, він не зміг створити Церковну Пантью [4].

Михайло Драгоманов зазначив, що освіта в Росії почала бути в південному, в Києві: там був розповсюджений християнство, тут була письмовість, тут були вівтарні, було дружинничества і автори "Слова о ратників Ігорів". Мислитель відзначав, що пояснював, як визначалося значення історико-культурних проявлень у Південній Русі в давні часи, сучасні кола відверталися на історію Кінного Європи, але не бачили цю південну Росію в реальних образах. Вони трактували Росію як географічну, а не політичну або суспільно-культурну концепцію. Додатково, вони вважали, що після татарського разорення XIII століття, всі російські початки цивілізації вилізли без сліду, що ж, було повністю створено майже без знаменів цивілізації, без залишків культурних досягнень [6].

Між тим, Михайло Петрович зазначав, як за його ознаки, Кіевана Русь Володимир, Нестор і автор "Слова о ратників Ігорів" була також Південною Південною Русь, яка існувала в деякій відмінній формі під назвою Малої Росії. Загалом, з золотих до цивілізації викликалося, що в Україні, розвиток цивілізації почався, тоді цей обставина повинна була бути знайдена в
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. Khmelnitsky, 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 ethnonym "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].

Smalled 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 etnonym 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 automovitivy of the name "Rus", Mikhail Petrovich Dorikov M. Kostomarov and P. Kulissev 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-
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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 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 enslavers, 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 Gediminoich 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 conglomeration 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 Gedimyn 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].

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 "lacunities 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.
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