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Abstract. The research dives into similarities between historical events in the early twentieth and twenty-first centuries, drawing connections to Borys Hrinchenko’s inspirations which resonate with contemporary efforts in resisting Russian occupation, emphasizing the struggle for Ukrainian independence, identity, and freedom through primarily ideological, cultural, national, and linguistic means. The article highlights the leading pedagogical ideas of the scientific and journalistic heritage of Borys Hrinchenko, a prominent Ukrainian linguist, writer, poet, playwright, publicist, critic, ethnographer, educator, and public figure of the late nineteenth – early twentieth centuries. The author focuses on various aspects of the scientist’s contributions, including ethnographic research and methodological systematization of Ukrainian folk art, social endeavors aimed at common societal objectives, educational perspectives, and pedagogical intentions. Additionally, the emphasis is on humanizing personal and social interactions among individuals through the promotion of universal moral ideals and spiritual values, among other aspects. The article provides characteristics of educational concepts related to the national upbringing of Ukrainian youth within Borys Hrinchenko’s scientific and journalistic heritage. It outlines the pedagogical discussions on intergenerational transmission in the realm of Ukrainian studies during the specified period. The author attempts to reinterpret the eminent thinker’s persona in intrinsic harmony with well-known figures from the intellectual elite of that era. Significant attention is devoted to the alignment of creative concepts between Borys Hrinchenko and Ivan Franko. The article highlights Kamenyar’s extensive praise for Hrinchenko, mentioning his resilience challenging criticism, often hostile, and his consistent profound love for Ukraine and “sincere democracy” in all his writings. Specific examples are presented to illustrate Hrinchenko’s aimed critique of Khrystyna Alchevska’s idleness, particularly in the context of russifying Ukrainian schools and publishing her books in Russian. The research offers an entirely different interpretation of the critical perspective on certain intellectuals’ scientific and literary works from the relevant period. This perspective was aimed at the promotion of Ukrainian studies and national education. The article explores certain aspects of Hrinchenko’s role as a teacher in a rural school, drawing from historical and scholarly references. It emphasizes the strong connection between two generations of the Ukrainian national movement – Borys Hrinchenko and Dmytro Doroshenko – by analyzing their common efforts. The author highlights their effective collaboration in developing the Ukrainian independent press, public engagement, educational initiatives, and shaping the Ukrainian people’s national consciousness and identity.
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I am uncertain about the way our “self” will endure beyond the cessation of the physical body. But I know that there is only one way to live on this earth after that: by commitment to truth and fairness. That is why the whole life of a person worthy of being called a human being must be devoted to accomplishing that task to the best of the person’s capabilities. Borys Hrinchenko (from The letter to the teacher D. T., 1897).

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past ten years, Ukraine has actively been engaged in the restoration and preservation of its cultural heritage, due to the war with the Russian empire. There has been a notable shift in the intellectual history field, moving away from solely examining the history of ideas and aiming at a broader exploration of intellectual activity within sociocultural contexts. This evolution emphasizes the anthropological dimension of intellectual history, characterized as the “history of intellectuals,” focusing on the thinkers and their interpersonal relationships. (Andryeyev, & Andryeyeva, 2019, р. 86).

“Today, the emphasis on universal priorities has strengthened the values of democracy, freedom, humanity, and responsibility in education, and thus – Ukraine’s integration into the European Community”. At the same time, in a country that is fighting for its territory, history, culture, spirituality, etc., the orientation towards a conscious European dimension and the promotion of national identity and civil society values remain unchanged (Budnyk, 2023, pp. 130-131). The ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine is termed an existential war, as it reflects a historical clash of two incompatible existences encompassing cultural, ideological, linguistic, and national dimensions. This conflict has now extended to include military confrontation, marked by the aggressive and brutal armed actions of the Russian occupier. Indeed, from the late nineteenth century onward, the unity of Ukraine has emerged as a fundamental element in ideological declarations, programs, and manifestos, as well as in the scholarly and literary works of thinkers. This period, spanning the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, stands out as a significant era of Ukrainian awakening, largely shaped by the influential figures of that time. This article is dedicated to the exploration of the remarkable figure of the Ukrainian intellectual Borys Hrinchenko (1863–1910). He played diverse roles as a teacher, writer, ethnographer, historian, literary critic, publicist, and social and cultural activist. The focus will be on his dynamic collaboration with prominent individuals of his era, who dedicated their lives to promoting the Ukrainian national idea. Together, they made significant contributions to the scholarly representation of the nation’s resilience (Skotnikova, 2023).

Recently (9 December 2023), we celebrated the 160th anniversary of his birth. However, the events of the early twentieth and twenty-first centuries are unfortunately similar, and Ukrainians are once again forced to fight for their national identity and freedom, freeing themselves from the intrusive authoritarian Soviet regime. It is important that Ukrainians, having experienced numerous challenging phases in their history, have not lost the main thing – their faith in the victory of the national idea.

This article aims to (1) examine the distinctive features of Borys Hrinchenko’s scientific and journalistic heritage concerning the educational concepts for nurturing Ukrainian youth, (2) delineate the pedagogical discussions related to intergenerational knowledge transfer within the realm of Ukrainian studies from the late nineteenth to the early twenty-first centuries, and (3) to rediscover the profound thinker’s persona within an inherent association with well-known figures of the intellectual elite of that era, such as I. Franko, D. Doroshenko, and others.

2. RESEARCH RESULTS

2.1. At the intersection of Hrinchenko studies

The fascination with Borys Hrinchenko’s character and scholarly accomplishments is increasing.
Present-day scholars, among historians, educators, ethnographers, and literary critics, are unanimous in highlighting his individuality and patriotic attitude as a promoter of the Ukrainian national idea. Specifically, Hrinchenko’s bibliographic essays and historical and pedagogical works find representation in the studies conducted by M. Verkalets (1990) and A. Zhyvotenko-Piankiv (1999); N. Rodionova (2006); N. Zubkova (2008); A. Movchyn (2013); I. Hyrych (2014); O. Budnyk (2015); H. Vasianovych (2015); V. Andreyeyev and S. Andreyeyeva (2020); V. Ogneviuk (2021); B. Yaremchenko (2021) and others. This can be attributed mainly to the fact that Hrinchenko was withdrawn from Ukrainian history during the Soviet era. Stalin, Bukharin, and the so-called pseudo-patriots, who collaborated with the pro-moscow authorities, considered Hrinchenko a threat. Consequently, an unprecedented campaign was initiated against all things Ukrainian, with a particular focus on language, culture, and history.

Presently, we have an opportunity to reassess Borys Hrinchenko’s works, draw lessons from them, tailoring them to contemporary requirements. Hence, we will try to delineate some of the most noteworthy facets of professional and educational pursuits within the domain of Ukrainian studies.

Therefore, rereading Borys Hrinchenko’s works, we experience particular thoughts and emotions that shape our attitudes, values, and mindset. Delving into Borys Hrinchenko’s various writings prompts contemplation, particularly regarding the ontological aspects of Ukrainian nationality and our spiritual values:

As time slips by, lives in a ballet,
Anticipating what’s yet to sway.
We chorus, “It’s high time for freedom with a chime,
“Not comin’, not comin’, like a distant drum”
Whispering, “Time doesn’t wait, it decides our fate”.
(Hrinchenko, “How long?”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

The author wrote these lines over a century ago, yet their significance remains undiminished in the contemporary context of the ongoing fight for Ukrainian independence and unity. Today, as Ukraine strives to consolidate its nationhood and defend its interests against the Russian threat, these words continue to resonate strongly. We are at the juncture where historical events unfold, and simultaneously, we are actively experiencing them. Naturally, individuals evolve within society, and as one ascends in both social and spiritual growth, their significance expands. This multifaceted quality is a distinguishing feature of the exceptional personality of Borys Hrinchenko.

2.2. Borys Hrinchenko’s educational horizons and pedagogical existences

The idea of national enlightenment distinctly defines Borys Hrinchenko’s creative heritage. His dedicated social and pedagogical activity in the realm of education, spanning over a decade from 1881 to 1893, played a significant role in his life. The public figure, ethnographer, and educator conveys appreciation to his instructors, whom he describes as “great hearts, great minds,” “great creators,” and “heavenly agents” (Hrinchenko, “To Teachers”).

The scientist’s pedagogical existences are reflected in numerous scientific works, in particular, “Folk Teachers and Ukrainian School”. The socio-pedagogical aspect of his work included petitions for the ban of corporal punishment in schools and the opening of public (zemstvo) schools; improving the staff’s well-being, establishing school libraries, providing teachers with scientific and methodological literature, initiating public readings, etc. Borys Hrinchenko wanted Ukrainian students to be instructed in their mother tongue, so he did everything possible to provide schools with Ukrainian books. He wrote the textbook “Ukrainian Grammar” and “Native Word” (based on Konstantyn Ushynsky’s system in “Native Word”).

Borys Hrinchenko was convinced that fostering positive transformations in society requires “actions based on respect and strong will.” This implies a commitment to collaborative social and educational initiatives, specifically the partnership between schools, families, students, and communities, all striving to pursue high moral ideals. Courage is evident in his engagement in socially transformative activities,
embodying hope for a brighter life for his people and capturing the essence of “all dreams coming true” in his creations:

Rise, offspring of the sun’s warm kiss,
Strew joy’s blossoms with tender finesse.
Let the heavens glow in radiant hue,
As triumph’s melody breaks through!
(Hrinchenko, “Don’t feel afraid just because there are still clouds”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

During that period, the Ukrainisation of educational institutions emerged as a highly significant concern, causing Hrinchenko to be deeply apprehensive about their future. Consequently, he emphasized the importance of teaching in Ukrainian in all educational establishments (schools and universities) in his pedagogical writings. In this regard, they relied on Hrinchenko’s pamphlets “What School Do We Need” (2007) and “On the Path of Ignorance”, clearly emphasizing the importance of developing the younger generation’s national consciousness. Hrinchenko had optimistic expectations for the efforts of Ukrainian educators driven by national consciousness, addressing them in his article “People Teachers and Ukrainian School” (1906): “Educators should not remain idle, anticipating a call from the social movement to fulfill their social and professional responsibilities. Instead, they should proactively engage in the nation’s spiritual revival by enhancing their overall cultural, theoretical, and methodological expertise.” (Hrinchenko, 2013b, pp. 84-85).

He authored the initial textbooks on the Ukrainian language and literature, such as “Ridne Slovo” for students. He gained widespread recognition for compiling the first four-volume definitive Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. During that period, Hrinchenko’s dictionary earned acknowledgment from the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences and was honored with the second Kostomarov Prize. This dictionary served as the basis for formalizing the Ukrainian spelling in the 1920s. While employed as a community teacher in the village of Vvedenske in the Kharkiv region, B. Hrinchenko deliberately delved into the study of residents’ folk art, language, and ethnographic characteristics (Rodinova, 2006). Upon relocating to Oleksivka (currently in the Luhansk region), he persisted in gathering ethnographic content, including legends, fairy tales, satirical songs, narratives, and fables. Concurrently, he dedicated himself to educational efforts aimed at shaping the public worldview, as well as promoting the social and pedagogical ideals of esteemed figures through publications such as “Popular Books” (1891), “Our Indifference” (1892), “Something about Ukrainian Publications” (1892), and more.

Borys Hrinchenko expressed deep concern about the inadequate social conditions prevailing in the rural schools at that time. According to the memoirs of his wife, Mariia Zahirna, a Ukrainian writer, poet, teacher, translator, and educator, B. Hrinchenko observed with pain the deteriorating state of the school with “peeling walls,” “broken windows,” “leaking” ceilings and “pits on the floor” (Movchun, 2013, p. 6). Thus, even under such conditions, as a public school teacher, he made every effort to educate and raise future patriots of Ukraine, proving this by his actions. While working as a teacher, he showed a deep desire to teach and communicate in Ukrainian, which he considered his native language, so he rented a house a few floors away from the school in a neighboring Ukrainian village. “Although living conditions were difficult, Borys Hrinchenko endured them to communicate with common people [...]. He wanted to live among Ukrainians [...]”, – mentions his wife, who stood by her husband in every aspect (Ibid, p. 6).

According to D. Doroshenko’s memoirs:

“Hrinchenko garnered a considerable number of dedicated supporters, particularly among public school teachers and peasants from the local community where he taught during his youth. He succeeded in instilling a sense of conscious Ukrainianism in many of these peasants, earning their profound respect. I observed their great respect for him, treating him with the reverence one would reserve for their father.[...]” (1947, p. 14).
2.3. Ivan Franko and Borys Hrinchenko: unity of ideas and intentions

Before delving into the similarities between these two prominent figures within Ukraine’s educational, communicative, and cultural spheres, it’s crucial to highlight the inherent diligence and effectiveness shown by both individuals. As an illustration, Borys Hrinchenko authored “10 volumes and ranks second in literature in terms of the number of works after Ivan Franko,” who managed to produce two works per day throughout his lifetime. Additionally, “in terms of popularity in the early twentieth century, Hrinchenko was second only after Shevchenko” (Skotnikova, 2023). Hrinchenko’s contemporaries described him as someone who “worked more than he lived” (To the 150th anniversary, 2013).

Ivan Franko’s profound admiration for Hrinchenko’s social, pedagogical, and public endeavors is not incidental. Kamenyar ranked 30-years-old Hrinchenko as the foremost among Eastern Ukrainian thinkers, emphasizing his vigilance, talent, and “unyielding diligence and diverse intellectual pursuits” (Franko, 1981, p. 14). Hrinchenko’s concepts align closely with Franko’s perspectives, where Franko envisions societal progress through the convergence of “[...] science and labor [...] when all people’s knowledge becomes beneficial work for society, and all labor is an expression of their cultivated thought, intellect, and knowledge” (Franko, 1986а, p. 33).

As mentioned, Hrinchenko was a model of extraordinary diligence:

*Through labor’s might, we’ll break the chains,*
*Come, brothers, let’s toil on the plains.*
*Fear not, let’s work with heart and hand,*
*With courage, we’ll stride forth, and reclaim the land!*

(Hrinchenko, “Get to work”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

Or:

*I gave my strength without regret*
*On a noble path, a respectable space….*

(Hrinchenko, “In life at lavish feasts”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

In this context, I. Franko, similarly to B. Hrinchenko, emphasizes that the realization of ideas and the application of theoretical knowledge in practical human activity can only be achieved through hard work: “All that knowledge unveils and thought brings into existence, labor transforms into an object, into an action, into life, bestowing them upon succeeding generations of workers as tools and inspiration for ongoing endeavors [...]”. (Franko, 1986а, p. 34).

We find similarities in Hrinchenko’s reflections:

* [...] I’ll toil away, my hands won’t rest,*
*Seeds I sow, for bread, my very best.*
*Even if not for us, in the sun,*
*Our kin will reap, our daughters, sons.*

(Hrinchenko, “I stand alone in a noisy town”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

B. Hrinchenko shares with Kamenyar the concept of communal unity searching for shared social objectives, a sentiment highlighted in the poem “Seeds”:

*With strength so slight, unite and bind,*
*Join the group, a power you’ll find.*
*Together more, achieve the chore,*
*Swiftly reach the goal and even more.*

(Hrinchenko, “To My Friends”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

I. Franko emphasizes the importance of the interaction environment for the development of the individual:

*“People are starting to recognize that wealth alone, and even science alone, cannot bestow complete happiness upon an individual. True fulfillment, according to Franko, can only be achieved in the...”*
company of others, within the realms of family, community, and nation. In these social connections, he contemplates the efficacy of all endeavors and a genuine sense of contentment” (Franko, 1986b, p. 345).

The scientist did not stop admiring B. Hrinchenko’s public activity, despite its controversial nature. This was the reason why Hrinchenko had difficult relations with V. Naumenko, M. Hrushevsky, M. Drahomanov, Olena Pchilka, H. Alchevska, and other famous scholars of that era. On this occasion, at the end of the “Old Community” meeting in Kyiv, M. Lysenko made the following statement: “Oh, Borys Dmytrovych, you are a good worker, but if only you could live on an uninhabited island, without people!” (Doroshenko, 1947, p. 14). The young D. Doroshenko notes that “the reason for Hrinchenko’s difference from the old members was mainly in his passionate temper, undeniable authoritarianism and sharply manifested individualism […]. He shared a striking similarity with Kulish in temperament, though he did not possess the same level of ambition as Kulish […]” (Ibid).

Hrinchenko’s humanistic inspirations remained unaffected by critical discourses. He considers the individual to be the highest value in the humanization of relations between people, the fullest expression of their talents, and the satisfaction of educational needs, ensuring the priority of universal and civic virtues, as well as the humanization of the national education system, which aims to form a holistic scientific picture of the world, spirituality, culture, the basics of ethics and aesthetics in the younger generation. His poetic creations were written in the light of humanism, in particular, in the poem “Again” we read:

Why dwell in a world with a frozen core?
A heart of ice, not warmth it bore.
Claiming humans, yet what’s the truth?
Forgotten essence, lost in youth?!
(K. Fomin, Trans.).

“Human” against the background of patriotism and spirituality, talent and hard work, as Franko successfully noted:

“Certainly, when it comes to vigilance, talent, diligence, and a wide range of spiritual interests, Chaichenko (the pseudonym of Hrinchenko) deserves the foremost position in this Company, which consists not only of writers but also of true champions for the Ukrainian language. This man […] floods almost all of our publications with his many valuable writings: stories, poems, critical and popular scientific articles, works without rest, sends manuscript after manuscript to the censors, is not betrayed by any failures or criticism, often unfavorable, and in everything he writes, along with his knowledge of the Ukrainian language, he also shows a fervent love for Ukraine, sincere democracy, a quick eye for the weaknesses of the Ukrainian society […]” (Franko, 1893, p. 19).

After all, Hrinchenko was annoyed by the imperfection of the Ukrainian society, which often distorted the human in a person, and deformed the sense of dignity and honor.

2.4. The idea of national identity and patriotism in Borys Hrinchenko’s works

B. Hrinchenko conveys the concept of the people’s national liberation in several poems, emphasizing freedom as “the foundation of public existence” in works like “Monologue”:

For truth, for freedom, through all life’s swings,
I’ll endure, with no fear, the joys it brings.
To the people, I’ll live and die,
With steadfast heart and head held high
(“To people”; K. Fomin, Trans.)

The concept of liberty within human endeavors can be seen in this context:

Yet I cherish solely the free,
Only they must live and be.
(“To a Bird”; K. Fomin, Trans.)
B. Hrinchenko is ashamed of those Ukrainians who define patriotism through “dumplings”, “bacon” and “embroidery at home”:

[...]
He still praises dumplings
And takes Kobzar to read,
And starts to get drunk
To use Ukrainian words [...]

(“Ukrainian”; K. Fomin, Trans.).

Later, Hryhorii Vashchenko echoed similar sentiments, cautioning against excessive zeal for minor Ukrainian traditions and customs, even as he advocated for the promotion of the highest spiritual values in society. He notes: “The traditional ideal of a human being is not an embroidered shirt that you can take off and remain a Ukrainian. The idea of a human being is the best that the people have created in understanding the properties of the human personality and its purpose” (Vashchenko, 1994, р. 103). Certainly, we are delving into the obvious spiritual significance of the national concept within Ukrainian society.

Hryhorii Vasianovych, discussing Hrinchenko’s views on patriotism, noted that the formation of strong patriotic sentiments faces significant hindrance from the injustice in the relationships between the wealthy and the impoverished, the absence of dignity for both, and the arrogance of the affluent alongside the humiliation of the less fortunate. Hrinchenko emphasizes that a societal breakdown is imminent when there exists a vast gap between various social classes. (2015, p. 120).

2.5. Borys Hrinchenko and Khrystyna Alchevska – on criticism and the russification of Ukrainian schools

Borys Hrinchenko was known for his critical (radical) perspectives on reality perception and the relevant structure of the education system. It’s important to highlight that during his time, critical pedagogy had not yet emerged as a distinct field; these concepts only gained widespread recognition in the late 20th and early 21st centuries (Giroux, & Witkowski, 2010). In our research, we are re-examining the significance of critical aspects concerning the social and literary (un)activity of certain intellectuals during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries regarding the advancement of Ukrainian national culture and education. This leads to a contemporary (new) interpretation of Hrinchenko’s works and the publications about him.

Following the critical attitude toward Khrystyna Alchevskaya, we can judge Hrinchenko’s unwavering national position and determination in his professional activities, though their relationship developed while he worked for a long time at a private school founded by her mother. He consistently and openly expressed his displeasure with the conditions at the Oleksiyivka school in the Kharkiv region and criticized certain actions taken by Alchevska. This perspective is also detailed by M. Zahirnia, who highlights that the school lacked Ukrainian spirit both in its ethos and language of instructions, as mentioned. Because “children had to study reading moscow textbooks, they had to pass exams in moscow, and the authority visited the school quite often” (Zahirnia, 1999, p. 64). However, as a dedicated school teacher, Borys Hrinchenko communicated with his students, explained the material in Ukrainian, encouraged them to read Ukrainian books, study Ukrainian folklore (fairy tales, poems, fables) at home, and willingly shared books from his family “home library”. It was no coincidence that a member of the school board had information that this teacher could not even speak “russian” and that the children did not speak russian in class either.

“[...] The students knew that there were Ukraine and moscovia, that there were Ukrainian and moscow languages, not landlords’ and peasants’, [...] they knew that they were Ukrainians, they knew the history and geography of Ukraine, they knew about all the greatest writers [...], they knew about the plight of Ukraine’s powerlessness, they knew more about Galicia than the average Ukrainian intellectual of the time. And they knew how to express their knowledge in the proper Ukrainian language [...]”. (Zahirnia, 1999, p. 64-65). Therefore, Hrinchenko was truly proud of his students, who “[...] understood well that at school you have to answer in the language that
Another example of Borys Hrinchenko’s pedagogical criticism of Khrystyna Alchevska’s professional pedagogical and public activities. In 1892, the liberal-democratic activist celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of her educational work, a grand celebration that included the invitation of many progressive leaders from Ukraine, Russia, and Europe. On this occasion, in his Letters from Naddniprianska Ukraine, Borys Hrinchenko describes his deep sadness when he recalls her:

“Three decades ago, Oleksiy and Khrystyna Alchevsky were considered earnest and enthusiastic contributors to the Ukrainian community in Kharkiv. Since that time, considerable transformations have taken place, leading to a markedly different situation for Khrystyna Alchevskaya. Thirty years have passed since she surrendered her native land and has been working quite sincerely to corrupt our people. She establishes moscow schools in Ukraine, reads and distributes moscow books among the Ukrainian people, and persuades in her writings that these people perfectly understand all moscow literature in moscow […]” (Hrinchenko, 1994, pp. 39-40).

Hrinchenko claims that Alchevskaya “has been demoralizing the people for thirty years, thinking that she is serving literacy”, which he calls “betrayal”, and calls her anniversary “thirty years of renegade” (Bezzub, 2014, p. 90).

Therefore, when he received a personal invitation to the celebrations, Hrinchenko’s response was obvious:

“With all my respect for Khrystyna Danylivna as a person, I cannot join your celebration. The reason for this is that I have a completely negative attitude towards her activities, the ultimate result of which is the russification of my people. If I behaved differently, I would consider myself a traitor to my beliefs”. And later, in a letter to Alchevskaya, the national pedagogue wrote: “You want education for the people. But education is about self-respect! And if there is no self-respect, there is no education! And how can people have self-respect when they are called the worst names, beaten with a nail, and tied to a cart […]” (Verkalets, 1990, p. 19).

Of course, this response annoyed and frightened the celebrant, who wanted her school in Oleksiivka village in the Kharkiv region to be properly represented to the public and foreign guests, including those from Russia, Paris, and Switzerland. Therefore, she continued her negotiations with the persistent Hrinchenko engaging influential people – her husband O. Alchevsky, L. Dashkevych, and others. However, the national teacher was relentless in his convictions and firm principles:

“[…] I believe that Ukrainians should serve Ukraine and Ukrainian education, not moscow education. [Highlighted by O.B.]. Respecting the figures of moscow education on moscow land, I cannot but have a negative attitude towards moscow education on Ukrainian land. The final result of Khrystyna Danylivna’s work is the moscowisation of my people, which is precisely what my activities are directed against. It is clear that I […] have no reason to congratulate Khrystyna Danylivna on 14 May. If I had done so, I would have turned out to be a person who does one thing and says the opposite”. (Ibid., p. 20).

Hrinchenko could not accept the fact that Alchevska continued not only to speak but also to write in Russian. He was skeptical that, thanks to her writings, Ukrainian peasants understood moscow books perfectly. She received a critical review of Borys Hrinchenko’s first book “What Should People Read?”, and later directly complained about the “sharp anti-Ukrainian direction” of the author’s second volume. Therefore, he had many conversations with Kh. Alchevska on this topic, pointing out the “crime against the Ukrainian people”, but this did not change her convictions. Throughout his brief yet productive life, the scholar steadfastly adhered to Ukrainianism. He expressed regret over the fact that the Ukrainian intelligentsia endorsed everything Russian, disregarding their native language, even warned about it by Taras Shevchenko.

In this regard, Hrinchenko wrote:

“[…] It’s important to understand that leaving your job to return to your homeland and working for those who oppress it is not merely a shift in perspective; rather, it constitutes a genuine act of
betrayal. [...] In time to come, Ukrainian life will thrive abundantly. During that time, we will look back and assess the journey we’ve undertaken. We will recall the individuals who played a role, distinguishing between those who sacrificed their lives for their homeland and those who betrayed it by selling it. (Hrinchenko, 1994, pp. 39-40).

Another aspect that underscores the life connection between Khrystyna Alchevska and Borys Hrinchenko reveals elements of conflict, misunderstanding, and rejection in their relationship. Maria Hrynchenko-Zahirnia wrote in her Memoirs that when Alchevska suggested Hrinchenko join the League of National Education in France, he agreed, asking to be registered as a member of this organization from Ukraine, not Russia. However, she immediately refused because she was afraid (Zahirnia, 1999, pp. 60-61). According to her friends, teachers, and associates, Alchevska was extremely afraid of the Moscow authorities, so she tried to behave “cautiously,” including in promoting everything Ukrainian.

However, there are also quite interesting facts from Khrystyna Alchevska’s life and work and her family that are positive for Ukrainian studies. For example, it is worth mentioning the monument to Taras Shevchenko on the territory of their estate in Kharkiv, erected in 1990 – the first in Ukraine and the second in the world. After the Soviet occupation, Mykola Alchevsky transferred the bust of Kobzar to the Kharkiv Art Gallery in the 1930s. Today it is kept as a Ukrainian relic in Taras Shevchenko National Museum in Kyiv. Thus, Ukrainian messages were present in the Alchevskis’ lives, as evidenced by the Ukrainian nanny who was the first to teach Khrystyna her native (Ukrainian) language. In addition, prominent Ukrainian educators such as Panteleimon Kulish, Hnat Khotkevych, Oleksandr Oles, Mykola Lysenko, and others visited their homes often. That is why the unbreakable spirit of Borys Hrinchenko, who has never deviated from his patriotic principles, critically and angrily states:

“Alchevska has stepped off the Ukrainian path and no longer wants to go back to it” (Zahirnia, 1999, p. 61).

2.6. Educational tropes of the Ukrainian intellectual elite – Borys Hrinchenko and Dmytro Doroshenko

The results of historical and scientific research (Zhyvotenko-Piankiv, 1999; Yaremenko, 2021) show Hrinchenko’s commitment to the ideas of Ukrainian independence, identity, self-awareness, and patriotism. This earned him the trust and respect of Ukrainian youth, he had a significant spiritual impact on them. One notable individual in this group was the then-young historian, Dmytro Doroshenko. Without going into an in-depth biographical study of these outstanding personalities, it is worth mentioning, for example, that in the early twentieth century (especially during the 1905-1907 revolution) they fruitfully cooperated in the formation of the Ukrainian independent press (Hromadska Dumka, Nova Hromada, Rada, etc.), as well as in public and educational campaigns (writing and publishing books for Ukrainians, the activities of the Kyiv-based Prosvita, etc.). According to D. Doroshenko’s memoirs, Hrinchenko was loved by young people who gathered around the “Century”, organized in Prosvita (Doroshenko, 1947, pp. 14-16). This contributed to the formation of the national consciousness of the Ukrainian people, an active driving force capable of independent cultural and political life, and the liberation struggle of 1917-1920. (Andryeyev, & Andryeyeva, 2019, p. 93).

While studying at Kyiv University at the Faculty of History and Philology (1906), Doroshenko was actively involved in social and cultural life, in particular, he was the leader of the student movement, which adopted the resolution on the establishment of four departments at the university (of the Ukrainian language, Literature, History, and Law), and for this purpose, he also initiated the invitation of teachers from Lviv and Ukrainian professors from various universities (Doroshenko, 1949, pp. 89-90). He admires Hrinchenko’s personality and mentions his memory in this way:

“[...] I had a chance to take a close look at him and evaluate him with all the positive and negative traits of his character, and now, looking back [...], I would say that he was undoubtedly an outstanding individual, a man of great potential, born to be the leader, if not of the entire Ukrainian
According to Vitaliy Andryeyev and Svitlana Andryeyeva, no significant difference in political views that would have influenced the direction and content of public and educational activity of Dmytro Doroshenko and Borys Hrinchenko in the period 1905-1907 was demonstrated. Their main priority was to “[…] struggle for the autonomy of Ukraine within the Russian Empire, federalism and parliamentarism. For a while, D. Doroshenko was under the influence of populist democratic ideology and Borys Dmytrovych’s [Hrinchenko] personal authority” (2019, p. 94). Representing the Ukrainian elite of that period, these two outstanding personalities “demonstrate a difficult transition from the populist Ukrainophilism to the political Ukrainianness, which is characteristic of the beginning of the modern era”. (Hyrych, 2014, pp. 413–414). Thus, some studies show that Borys Hrinchenko had a significant impact on the formation of Dmytro Doroshenko’s worldview, and contributed to the development of his scientific interests in Ukrainian studies, in particular folklore, linguistics, literary studies, etc.

### 3. CONCLUSION

Considering the numerous socio-political, cultural, educational, economic, and other challenges of building civil society in Ukraine, its integration into the European and global community, and the struggle of Ukrainians for freedom, independence and national identity, Borys Hrinchenko’s creative heritage is extremely relevant today, as similar problems existed in the early twentieth century. In the scientific and pedagogical heritage of the scientist, we distinguish the following key ideas: national liberation; socio-pedagogical and national education; profound ethnographic study and systematization of Ukrainian folk art; community consolidation for the achievement of common social goals, socio-pedagogical partnership (schools, parents, children, community) for the revival and preservation of the bright spiritual ideals of the society; liberty in the human activity of a person with a noble civic idea; humanization of social relations between people based on universal moral ideals; materialization of ideas, implementation of theoretical knowledge in practical human activity is possible only through constant collaboration (Budnyk, 2015). Undoubtedly, B. Hrinchenko’s scientific and pedagogical concepts hold significant practical significance and can be effectively applied in the training, upbringing, and advancement of today’s youth.

When studying the magnitude of Borys Hrinchenko’s personality, one can see his influence on various spheres of public life in Ukraine (late nineteenth – early twentieth centuries). The thinker’s pedagogical, social, and scientific activities were closely connected with many representatives of the intellectual elite of the time – M. Hrushevsky, Ivan Franko, M. Drahomanov, D. Doroshenko, and others. Hrinchenko was extremely focused, persistent, and determined in his views and preferences. Borys Hrinchenko’s relentless commitment to high standards for both himself and others, combined with his inclination towards authoritarianism in professional dealings and Ukrainian affairs, has greatly influenced the distinctive style of this unwavering radical advocate.

His challenging approach impeded his collaboration, connections, and communication with other notable figures in the Ukrainian community, whom he occasionally criticized vehemently and angrily for their lack of action. Nevertheless, for many, he continued to serve as an exemplar of persistent dedication to his people, advocating for freedom and independence among the younger generation, and fostering unity and solidarity in the struggle against both external and internal enemies. Despite living only 47 years, Hrinchenko left a huge creative heritage for his descendants and belongs to the cohort of true Ukrainian patriotic personalities. As D. Doroshenko notes, “Fate had destined him to spend his talent and abilities on “trivial issues”. If he had lived seven years more [...] he would have been able to witness the state revival of Ukraine, he could have easily taken a ministerial post” (1947, p. 47).

We consider the study of Borys Hrinchenko’s theoretical foundations for the shaping of the national identity of the youth, along with the possible implementation of his ethnographic, poetic and journalistic
heritage in the educational process of educational institutions of various levels as promising directions for further research.
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Between Past and Future: Reflections on the New Interpretation of Borys Hrinchenko’s …

Грінченка, які співзвучні із сьогоденням у царині боротьби з російськими окупантами за українську незалежність, самобутність і свободу як спротив, передусім, ідеологічний, культурний, національний, мовний. Висвітлено провідні педагогічні ідеї науково-публицистичної спадщини Бориса Грінченка – українського мовознавця, письменника, поета, драматурга, публіциста, критика, етнографа, освітнього і громадського діяча кінця XIX – початку XX ст. Автор наголошує на таких аспектах діяльності вченого, як: етнографічне вивчення й систематизація народної творчості українців; громадська робота заради досягнення єдиних суспільних цілей; освітні горизонти й педагогічні інтенції; гуманізація особистісних і соціальних взаємин між людьми на засадах вселюдських моральних ідеалів і духовних цінностей тощо.

Обґрунтовано особливості просвітницьких ідей національного виховання української молоді у науково-публицистичній спадщині Бориса Грінченка, окреслено педагогічні дискурси міжпоколінчевої трансмісії у просторі українознавства досліджуваного періоду. Здійснено спробу нової інтерпретації особистості великого мислителя в іманентній єдності з відомими представниками тощої інтелектуальної еліти. Значну увагу приділено питанням співзвучності творчих ідей Бориса Грінченка та Івана Франка; також на високу оцінку Каменярем його постаті, який “не зраджує ніяким невдачам ані критикою, часто неприхильною, а у всьому, що пише, проявляє побіч знання мови української також гарячу любов до України” та “щирий демократизм”. На конкретних прикладах показано гостру критику Бориса Грінченка (без)діяльності Христини Алчевської через русифікацію українських шкіл та видання її книг російською мовою. У дослідженні набирають іншого розуміння питання змісту критичного стосовно наукових і літературних творів деяких ученіх-інтелектуалів окресленого періоду з популяризації українознавства й національного виховання.

Ключові слова: педагогічна діяльність, духовність, моральні ідеали, освітні інтенції Бориса Грінченка, гуманізація взаємин, україномовна освіта, національне виховання.