

The Relationship between Faith and Knowledge in the Works of Mykhailo Maksymovych

Pavlo Yeremieiev

Associate Professor at the School of History and Associate Professor at the School of Philosophy, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine.

e-mail: p.v.eremeiev@karazin.ua, yeremieievpavlo@gmail.com

Abstract: The paper deals with images of faith and knowledge in the works of Mykhailo Maksymovych, a famous botanist, folklorist, and historian of the 19th century and the first rector of the University of Saint Volodimir in Kyiv. Mykhailo Maksymovych's way of solving the problem of the relationship between religion and science is analysed in the general context of the intellectual processes in Eastern Europe of the 19th century. The study is based on Mykhailo Maksymovych's published works, memoirs, letters, and unpublished texts, held in the Institution of Manuscript at the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine (Kyiv). The methodological foundation is the approaches of the Cambridge School of Intellectual History, theorising on cultural memory and quantitative content analysis with MAXQDA-2022. The paper shows that Mykhailo Maksymovych's attitude to the demarcation problem of knowledge and faith resulted from a combination of his personal religiosity and his fascination with the ideas of Friedrich Schelling. Mykhailo Maksymovych perceived the Bible as a relevant description of the "factual" dimension of human history. He represented the philosophy of the heart, widespread in Ukrainian intellectual life of that period. Maksymovych's deep personal religiosity, combined with his theoretical ideas about the correlation between faith and knowledge, led him to the idea of Orthodox coherence between Russia and Ukraine. This was an actualisation of the

early modern idea, elaborated in the Kyivan Synopsis of the late 17th century. Mykhailo Maksymovych actualised these ideas on the basis of Romanticism. Early modern ideas were close to Maksymovych's consciousness because he was religious in the traditional Orthodox sense. Religious images of Ukraine in the works of Mykhailo Maksymovych were similar to the ideas of Konstantin Leontiev, a famous Russian conservative philosopher of the second half of the 19th century.

Keywords: biblical literalism, content-analysis, historiography, philosophy of the heart, Mykhailo Maksymovych, Romanticism, religion, Ukraine–Russia relations

Introduction

This paper aims to depict the attitude of Mykhailo Maksymovych (1804–1873) to the correlation between faith and knowledge, as well as the role of religion in the construction of images of Ukrainian land by this scholar. It should be noted that Mykhailo Maksymovych was a famous Ukrainian intellectual born in the Ukrainian part of the Russian Empire to the family of a local nobleman, a descendant of the Cossack elite. Mykhailo Maksymovych studied biology at Moscow University and became a professor of botany there. He was also interested in history, literature, and ethnography and took part in meetings with Alexander Pushkin, Sergey Uvarov, Nikolay Gogol', Alexander Gercen, and other representatives of the imperial intellectual elite (Maksymovych 1994: 388–394). In 1827, he published *Little Russian Folksongs* (Maksymovych 1827). It was one of the first collections of folk songs published in the Russian Empire (Hrushevskiy 1927). When Saint Vladimir University in Kyiv was founded in 1834, Mykhailo Maksymovych was invited there as professor of Russian literature and, simultaneously, as the first rector of the newly created University. Due to problems with his health, Mykhailo Maksymovych left the position of rector in 1835, and served as a professor intermittently until 1845, after which he lived in his small village house as a private person. Mykhailo Maksymovych was a generally well-known representative of intellectual life in Ukraine in the 19th century (Ostriany 1960).

Maksymovych's biography, as well as his works in botany, history, and literature, have been studied by historians in the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, the circles of the Ukrainian diaspora, and in modern historiography (Grush-

evskiy 1906; Hrushevskiy 1927; Markov 1986; Chyzhevskiy 1992; Velychenko 1992; Yas' 2014; Kutsyi 2016). However, the role of religion in Maksymovych's life and research activity has not yet been studied.

This research is based on the published works by Mykhailo Maksymovych (Maksymovych 1833; Maksymovych 1847; Maksymovych 1876; Maksymovych 1877; Maksymovych 1880), as well as his published personal documents, such as his autobiography and letters (Maksymovych 1898; Maksymovych 1994; Maksymovych 2004). The author of this paper has also studied Maksymovych's unpublished manuscripts held in the Institution of Manuscripts in the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine in Kyiv (IMVNL).

The attitude of Mykhailo Maksymovych toward the correlation between faith and knowledge was studied by the author using the methodological approaches of the Cambridge School of Intellectual History. Such famous representatives of this school as Quentin Skinner and John Pocock focus on the need to reconstruct the local and historically changeable sense of linguistic action and to understand the context of intellectual processes (Skinner 1969; Pocock 1985). Quentin Skinner and John Pocock used the concept of language games, described by Ludwig Wittgenstein (Wittgenstein 1922), to understand the history of ideas. This concept helps us understand the principles of Maksymovych's, as well as other historians of the Russian empire, use of such terms as 'belief', 'faith', 'religion', 'ethnicity', and so on.

The author studied Maksymovych's worldview in the context of the general situation in the intellectual life of the Russian Empire in the 19th century. This was understood in terms of the 'new imperial history' developed by authors from the journal *Ab Imperio*. The concept of the imperial situation was extremely important. Ilya Gerasimov defines the "imperial situation" as a parallel existence of different social hierarchies and value systems within the borders of the empire and, at the same time, the attempts of the imperial political and intellectual elite to acquire and schematise such diversity (Gerasimov et al. 2009: 3–32). The concept of internal colonisation proposed by Alexander Etkind is very appropriate here (Etkind 2011).

The concept of metaphors by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson should also be considered in order to understand the features of the religious images in Maksymovych's works (Lakoff & Johnson 2003). Based on the understanding that metaphors shape not just our communication but also the way we think and

act, the author of this paper tries to define the basic metaphors Maksymovych used to describe and understand the correlation between knowledge and faith.

Maurice Halbwachs' idea about the social construction images of the past is now generally accepted. Contemporary methodologist of history Lorina Repina arguably writes that we should pay attention to the unreflected mental stereotypes in historians' texts, as well as the social and political circumstances of their activity. Historians create images of the past that are permanently changeable, but, at the same time, such images tend to be canonised in terms of national and state narratives (Repina 2020).

The personal religiosity of Mykhailo Maksymovych

Religion was an essential part of Maksymovych's life. His childhood upbringing was in a monastery, where his parents had sent him to get an education. Maksymovych recalled in his autobiography:

Пятый год жизни моей прошел в Тимковщине. Оттуда я отдан был в Благовещенский женский монастырь, бывший в Золотоноше, в котором училась грамоте и мать моя, и все дяди мои Тимковские. Там у черницы Варсонофии, сестры генерала Голенки, прошел я Граматику, Часловец и Псалтырь (монастырский курс наук, установленный еще св. Кирилом-философом первоучителем славянским) (Maksymovych 1994: 389).

The fifth year of my life was spent in Timkivshina. From there, I was sent to the Annunciation convent in Zolotonosha, where my mother and all my Timkovskie uncles had been taught. With nun Varsanofia, general Golenko's sister, I studied Grammatica, Horologion, and The Psalter (it was a monastic course of sciences, which had been established by the saint Cyril philosopher, enlightener of the Slavs).

This was typical of Ukrainian nobility in the Russian empire in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The social connection between the secular elite and clerical circles in Ukraine was stronger than in ethnic Russian regions. In the central part of the Russian empire, the education systems for the Orthodox clergy and the representatives of the civic elite had been developing separately since

Peter's time, and the clergy was being formed as a distinct estate. The attitude of the Russian nobility towards the priests and monks was rather arrogant. In the Ukrainian part of the Russian empire, there was another situation due to the general features of the historical development of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine (Leiberov 2019: 152–165). Since the second half of the 16th century, when most parts of Ukrainian ethnic territory were within the Polish–Lithuanian commonwealth, Orthodox education here developed in strict confrontation with Catholic confessionalisation. As part of this process, Orthodox schools in Ukraine, such as Ostroh Academy, the schools of the Orthodox brotherhoods, and the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium, adopted the principles of the traditional Western European education system. This specificity was preserved during the Ukrainian Cossack autonomies within the Russian empire. The European education traditions were an integral part of the education system in the Ukrainian Orthodox collegiums. The representatives of the Ukrainian Cossack elite studied there together with representatives of the clerical circles; Orthodox collegiums were intimately involved in the social life of Ukrainian cities. After the abolition of Ukrainian autonomies in the Russian empire, the traditions of social connection between clerical and secular elites were saved (Posohov 2014; Posokhova 2022). This is why the deep engagement of young Maksymovych in traditional Orthodox practices was rather typical for his social group.

It should be noted that many intellectuals in the Russian empire in the 19th century lost their childish faith after becoming adults (Ivaschenko 2020). However, Maksymovych's letters to his wife and others demonstrate that he was a very religious person until the end of his life. For example, in 1858, he wrote to his wife:

Привет тебе, моя милейшая Марусенько, из дому Елагиных, куда я приехал вчера в полдень, слушав обедню в благочестивом городе Болхове... А я отправляюсь завтра в дальний путь, на Оптину пустынь и в Калугу. (IMVNL, fund 32, unit 1, folio 1)

I am sending you a “hello”, my dear Marusen'ka, from Elagins' house, where I arrived yesterday at noon after listening to mass in the pious town of Bolhov... And tomorrow, I am going to go to the Optina monastery.

In 1870 Mykhailo Maksymovych wrote to his wife:

Все, что имеет ближайшее отношение к Алексею [сын М. Максимовича], что имеет влияние на его характер, нрав, ум и здоровье, все то у меня в уме и на сердце занимает главное место, после Господа Бога». (IMVNL, fund 32, unit 46, folio 2)

Everything that relates to Alexeyko [Maksymovych's son], everything that influences his character, temper, intelligence, and health, are all in first place in my heart after God.

Maksymovych was deeply connected with clerical circles; he communicated with bishops Innokentiy Borisov and Evgeniy Bolohvitinov not only because of their common scientific interests in the history of old printing but also because of their spiritual interests (Markov 1986: 24–25).

It is well known that Maksymovych translated psalms into Ukrainian (Holovashchenko 2006: 55–62). In the letter to Russian poet prince Pyotr Vyazemsky, Maksymovych wrote that he made translations to help the peasants in their glorifying God:

Я желал бы напечатать особою книжкою псалмов двадцать, которые переведены удачнее прочих, и посвятить эту книжку Острожскому братству, чтобы там, в Остроге, своенародная, местная речь слышалась не в одних простых и часто недобрых песнопениях, но и в посвященных хвалению Господа-Бога. (Barsukov 1901: 203)

I want to print a particular book of the twenty psalms, which had been translated more successfully than the others, and to dedicate this book to the Ostroh brotherhood in order to make the local language heard not only in simple and sometimes evil songs but also in the cants dedicated to glorifying God.

In general, Mykhailo Maksymovych was a conscious Orthodox Christian whose faith was essential to his life. That is why it is a relevant task to understand the correlation between the faith of the scholar and his scientific work.

The influence of Schelling's philosophy on Maksymovych's attitude to the correlation between knowledge and faith

Maksymovych's attitude to the problem of demarcation between knowledge and faith resulted from his attempts to harmonise the philosophy of Schelling with the traditional Orthodox worldview. Friedrich Schelling was very popular at Moscow University when Maksymovych was studying and teaching there. As a student, Maksymovych attended lectures by professor Mykhail Pavlov (1792–1840), who was primarily responsible for spreading Schelling's naturphilosophie in the Russian empire. It is well known that Mykhail Pavlov started his lectures in agriculture, mineralogy, and forestry with the question: "You want to know about nature, but what is nature and what is knowledge?" (Ostrianyn 1960: 38).

In Schelling's philosophy, the concept of integrity was fundamental. In *Ideas for a Philosophy of Nature: An Introduction to the Study of this Science* (1797), Friedrich Schelling argues that nature is the visible spirit, and the spirit is invisible nature (Schelling 1988). Schelling's historiosophy was formulated in his *System of Transcendental Idealism* (1800). Friedrich Schelling developed the idea of history as a progressive, gradually self-disclosing revelation of the Absolute (Schelling 1993).

Based on these statements, Maksymovych developed his views on the integrity of knowledge and faith. In 1833, he published "The Letter About Philosophy" in the popular Moscow philosophical and political magazine "Telescope" (Maksymovych 2004a). Maksymovych described philosophy as generalising the other spheres of knowledge into a single, general beginning and developing knowledge from this into a harmonious system. He concluded that all science should be philosophical.

In the book "Reflection on Mature" (1833) Maksymovych claimed:

Природа представляет собою храм, полный неизреченными выражениями мыслей Художника Всевышнего, книгу, где каждое слово есть изреченная мысль Творца, отголосок всемогущего «ДА БУДЕТ». (Maksymovych 1847: 2)

Nature is a temple full of indescribable representations of the Supreme Artist's thoughts; it is a book where every word is an untold thought of the Creator and an echo of the omnipotent "LET IT BE".

In more detail, Maksymovych's unpublished "Notes About Human and Divine Knowledge" (1860s) considers the relationship between religion and science. Maksymovych wrote:

Познание, которое человек имеет о Боге, редко, и почти никогда, не бывает совершенном согласии с его остальными убеждениями, хотя человек сам и не замечает этого. Иногда мысли человека о Боге можно бы назвать христианскими, но в том же человеке понятия о религии и о изящных искусствах, если бы мы взяли их отдельно, оказались бы часто языческие, понятия его о науке были бы совсем безбожные... Люди, которые выше других по природным способностям, ближе других достигают внутренней целостности. (IMVNL, fund 32, unit 502, folio 8)

Cognition of God is rarely, hardly ever entirely, consistent with other people's opinions, although a person does not recognise it by himself. Sometimes, a person's thoughts about God can be characterised as Christian. However, if they were taken separately, his ideas about religion and art could be found as pagan, and his perceptions of science are totally godless... People who have better natural capabilities are closer to internal integrity.

This is why we can conclude that Maksymovych was sure that faith and rational knowledge should be integrated into a single system, an approach that came from his attempts to harmonise Friedrich Shelling's concept of integrity with the traditional Orthodox worldview. This brings us to the second problem: Maksymovych's use of specific Christian ideas in his scientific works.

Biblical literalism and the philosophy of the heart in Mykhailo Maksymovych's works

We can find a certain biblical literalism in Maksymovych's scientific ideas. In his popular "Book by Naum about the Great God's World", which was published in 1833 and then reprinted several times, Maksymovych used biblical statements to describe the creation of the world (Maksymovych 1833: 10). We cannot agree with the statement of the Soviet historians, that it was Maksymovych's capitulation to the censorship of the Russian empire (Ostrianyn 1960: 74). It should be noted that in the USSR Maksymovych was described as a progressive scientist, which is why such Soviet historians as Daniil Ostrianin and Polycarp Markov could recognise that Maksymovych had not understood something, although they tried to underline the elements of his worldview that could be characterised as progressive in terms of Soviet ideology (Ostrianyn 1960; Markov 1986).

However, studying Maksymovych's manuscripts shows that he used biblical stories about the Great Flood and the Babylonian tower to describe the history of languages even in his private notes, which the censors did not check. For example, in notes about literature (1834) Maksymovych wrote:

Был един язык и после падения. Расселение людей по лицу всей земли и смешение языков их – вот два роковых события в человеческом роде, непосредственным действием Божьей воли произведенные.
(IMVNL, fund 32, unit 389, folio 28)

There was a single language after the Fall. Resettlement of people over the face of the earth and confusion of languages were two fatal events in human history directly caused by God's will.

In his published article, "What Is the Origin of the Russian Land According to Nestor's Narrative and Other Ancient Russian Scriptures" (1837), where Maksymovych criticised Normanist theory, he also used the Bible to explain the ancestry of the Slavic people. Maksymovych sincerely believed in the literary sense of the Great Flood and tried to explain the origin of the Slavonic peoples from Noah (Maksymovych 1876: 75).

Maksymovych's unpublished extracts from the Bible deserve special attention. He wrote out quotations from Scripture using the words 'tribe', 'folk',

and ‘language.’ He underlined these words with a pencil and added notes like “tribe = dialect, folk = language” (IMVNL, fund 2, unit 2481, folio 1). It seems that he did not just try to understand the biblical context of these words; he also used the Bible to understand the nature of ethnicity. It should be noted that Maksymovych understood the nation in a primordial sense. The romantic concept of national spirit was essential for him (Yas’ 2006). The nation was described as an organism by Maksymovych, who perceived such a description not only as an anthropomorphic metaphor but also as a characteristic of the nation “as it is”. That is why Maksymovych used the Bible to understand the nature and sense of the “national spirit”, understanding nations as the thoughts of God in terms of Johann Herder (Schmidt 1956).

Mykhailo Maksymovych was a representative of the philosophy of the heart. He described the heart as the centre of the emotional and spiritual nature, which is connected with God. In Maksymovych’s unpublished notes for lectures about literature (1834), we find the following speculation:

Средоточие и источник внутренней жизни нашей есть сердце. В сем внутреннем таинственном святилище души почивот начатки духа, составляющего лучшую часть или сторону души нашей, кою обращены они к Божеству и жизни вечной. В сердце живет любовь – чувство беспредельное, вечное всеобщее – коим душа объёмлет все, которое всему дает жизнь. Любовь есть союз совершенства, союз истины, блага и красоты; характер её, гармония жизни. (IMVNL, fund 32, unit 389, folio 32)

Our heart is the centre and source of our inner life. There is a basis for the spirit in this internal mystical sacristy of the soul, and this spirit is the best part of our soul; it is dedicated to divinity and eternal life. Love lives in the heart, and love is an unlimited and holistic feeling; it helps the soul to embrace everything that gives life to everybody. The mind is a rational force of the soul, it allows us to turn feelings of the heart into thoughts. Feelings of truth are explained and turned into knowledge by the mind.

It should be noted that such ideas were rather popular in Ukrainian intellectual life in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Grigoriy Scovoroda (1722–1794) and Pamphil Yurkevich (1826–1874) were the most famous representatives

of the philosophy of heart (Chyzhevskiy 1992). Maksymovych's ideas about the heart were closer to the ideas of Pamphil Yurkevich because Grigoriy Scovoroda criticised some traditional Orthodox ideas and practices (Popovych 2003; Ushkalov 2019). At the same time, Pamphil Yurkevich and Mykhailo Maksymovych developed their philosophies of heart within the framework of Orthodoxy.

Maksymovych's religiosity and his concept of the 'Russian world'

Maksymovych's attitude to the role of faith in understanding history was essential for his concept of the 'Russian world', which was combined with the idea of the national spirit and an emphasis on Ukrainian specificity.

Contemporary Ukrainian historian Olexiy Yas' underlines this contradiction in the works of Maksymovych (Yas' 2014: 182–184). On the one hand, Maksymovych wrote extensively about the ethnic differences between northern Russia and so-called 'Little Russia', or Ukraine (he used these terms as synonymous). In the notes for the lectures at Saint Vladimir University in Kyiv, Mychailo Maksymovych underlines the features of Ukrainians in comparison with Great Russians:

В сношениях детей с родителями более было открытости, равенства, искренности, равно и в отношениях полов, любви молодой... От того более полное и стройное развитие душевных сил, от того чувство достигало до развития непосредственного, до страсти, и самая вера (религиозное чувство) теплее... Жизнь практическая, внешняя более развита у великороссиян, у украинцев – внутренняя жизнь духа. Жизнь первых – довольство, вторых – недовольство. (IMVNL, fund 32, unit 393, folio 10)

There is more openness, equality, and sincerity in the relationship between parents and children, as well as in the relationship of sexes, in the sphere of young love... That is why there is a more complex and consistent development of the soul's powers, and that is why emotion is more ingenious, and as far as passion, development, and faith (religious feeling) is warmer... Practical, external life is better developed among

Great Russians, and the internal life of the spirit is better developed among Ukrainians.

In terms of Romanticism, Maksymovych described ethnicity as an organism; the concept of the 'people's spirit' was fundamental to him, and he wrote about the differences between the spirits of the Great Russians' and the Little Russians'.

At the same time, Maksymovych defended the idea of so-called Russian integrity, using the term the Russian world in opposition to the West. Maksymovych wrote in the "Letter about Bohdan Khmelnickiy" (1857), which was addressed to Mykhail Pogodin, a professor at Moscow University:

Я думаю, что мой Киевский взгляд на Богдана сойдется с твоим Московским в одно Русское воззрение, также, как Московская и Киевская Русь – две стороны одного Русского мира, надолго разрозненные и даже противостоявшие друг другу, сошлись воедино – усилиями Богдана. (Maksymovych 1876: 397)

I think that my Kyiv view of Bohdan will be combined with your Moscow view in a single Russian outlook, as well as Moscow and Kyiv Rus' as two sides of the Russian world, which had been divided and even opposed to each other, and came together through the efforts of Bohdan.

David Saunders shows that Maksymovych believed in the unity of the empire, using the image of the Ukrainian past to give Ukrainians and Russians a fuller sense of their common cultural and historical base (Saunders 1985: 154). Oleksiy Tolochko has demonstrated that in the famous discussion with Mykhail Pogodin about the heritage of the Kyivan Rus', it was Maksymovych who defended the idea of Russian unity with his statement about the historical connection between ancient Rus' and modern Ukraine. At the same time, his opponent Mykhail Pogodin denied this connection; he stated that only Russia was historically linked with Kyivan Rus', and therefore, he recognised the specificity of the Ukrainian historical way (Tolochko 2012: 205–235).

It should be noted that in the middle of the 19th century, Ukrainian national consciousness moved to a new stage. In terms of Lysyak-Rudnickiy, it was the second stage of national building, when we can trace the separation of Ukrainian national consciousness from the Russian one (Rudnytsky 1988). Nevertheless, Mykhailo Maksymovych did not support this tendency. He lived till 1873,

but mentally, he was a representative of the first half of the 19th century, when Ukrainian and imperial loyalty could be easily combined, when Ukrainian national revival was perceived by the conservative Russian thinkers, such as Sheveriov or Pogodin, as a representation of Russianness. Olga Andriewsky, in her brilliant paper “The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse and the Failure of the “Little Russian Solution,” shows that by the middle of the 19th century, such perception went out of fashion (Andriewsky 2003: 188–190). However, we can see that Mykhailo Maksymovych remained in this old paradigm.

It seems to us that Orthodox religiosity can explain this feature of Mykhailo Maksymovych’s national consciousness. Religion was too crucial for him; therefore, Orthodox coherence was decisive even when Mykhailo Maksymovych described the differences between Ukraine and Russia. Mykhailo Maksymovych’s traditional religiosity became a barrier to adopting the modern national consciousness resulting from modernization, secularization, and Westernization (Kravchenko 2011: 364). Such consciousness sometimes includes a religious marker, but only as a sign of national existence among the other ones. However, Mykhailo Maksymovych perceived religion as an intrinsic value. Therefore, even recognizing and emphasizing Ukrainian ethnic and historical specificity in every possible way, Mykhailo Maksymovych remained in the framework of ideas about all-Russian unity. He understood this unity, first of all, in religious categories.

Mykhailo Maksymovych’s choice should be understood in the more general context of the modern Russia–Ukraine relationship. Olga Andriewsky argued that in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, there were two different cultural paradigms of Russian–Ukrainian discourse. The first paradigm was founded on the idea of an ancient and sovereign Ukrainian–Rus’ land and people. This was shaped by the struggle for Cossack’ rights in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, legitimised by the Khmelnytsky Uprising of 1648, sustained in the 18th century through the historical chronicles of the Cossack elite, and given modern form in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Central to this vision was the notion that Ukraine–Rus’ had voluntarily submitted to Polish and, later, Russian monarchs on the basis of legal covenants that guaranteed it specific corporate rights. The other vision emphasized the idea of an all-Russian identity based on common Orthodox heritage, a common Rus’ origin, and a common historical destiny. This idea found its first full expression in the Synopsis, published in Kyiv in 1674 under the patronage of Inokentii Gizel, the archi-

mandrite of Kyiv Pechersk Lavra. The Synopsis justified union with Moscow on dynastic and religious grounds and cast the tsar as the Orthodox autocrat and the defender of the Slavic–Rus’ Orthodox realm. This concept became the basis for a modern Russian historical narrative (Andriewsky 2003: 196–197). The paradigm of all-Russian unity includes many more religious, specifically Orthodox, components than a paradigm of a sovereign Ukrainian–Rus’ land. This is why the very religious Orthodox Maksymovych accepted this view. Interestingly, this logic is found in the book by the Russian conservative philosopher from the second half of the 19th century Konstantin Leontiev, “Byzantinism and Slavdom”, in which the author argues:

Что, как не православие, скрепило нас с Малороссией? Остальное все у малороссов, в преданиях, в воспитании историческом, было вовсе иное, на Московию мало похожее (Leontiev 1876)

Only Orthodoxy has bonded us with Little Russia. Everything else was completely different with the Little Russians: other legends and historical developments that bore little resemblance to Moscow.

As well as Maksymovych, Konstantin Leontiev recognised the differences between Ukrainians and Russians, although for him Orthodoxy guarantees unity between Little and Great Russia.

We can also find another common feature in the worldviews of Maksymovych and Leontiev as both of them rejected the political dimension of Slavic coherence. It should be noted that pan-Slavism was gaining popularity in the Russian empire in the 19th century (Bushkovich 2003: 156; Kiselev 2015: 109). In particular, in Ukrainian territories of the Russian empire, pan-Slavism was present in the ideology of the secret Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, which was suppressed by the government in 1847. Maksymovych was closely acquainted with the previous members of this Brotherhood, such as Taras Shevchenko and Pantyleimon Kulish (Maksymovych 2004b: 133–143; 299–307). He was also profoundly engaged in Slavic studies, writing much about Slavonic languages and traditions. Nevertheless, he had never described the Slavic peoples’ linguistic and cultural closeness as an argument for political unity. Moreover, arguing with Josef Dobrowsky and Pavel Šafárik, Maksymovych said: “There is no longer a single Slavic language, in the same way that there is no longer a single Slavic nation.” (Maksymovych 1880: 56)

Maksymovych constructed auto- and hetero-images based on the Orthodox worldview. Catholicism in such a narrative was described as hostile and alien (Kutsyi 2016: 16–17). For example, Maksymovych in his description of the Union of Brest, Maksymovych condemned it with the help of a combination of enlightenment criticism of religious violence and a very traditional apology of Orthodox Christianity as true Faith (Maksymovych 1876: 565–571). He also characterised the Cossack Uprisings in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth as “crusades for the faith and freedom of the holy Russian Kyiv land” (Maksymovych 1876: 508). Religion divided Slavic peoples, and was a reason why Maksymovych and Leontiev denied the political and cultural significance of Slavic unity.

The study of intellectual history raises issues about the typicality of certain ideas. A collection of works by Maksymovych, published after his death, consists of three large volumes (Maksymovych 1876; Maksymovych 1877; Maksymovych 1880). There are more than half a million words there. So, there is a question: which of his ideas were accidental in his texts, and which were more important for Mykhailo Maksymovych?

Quantitative content analysis using the MAXQDA-2022 program helps us solve this problem. With this program, we can detect the most used terms in the books and articles by Maksymovych (Table 1). It is interesting that the words “church” and “monastery” are used Maksymovych even more often than the words “chronicles”, “ethnicity”, “Rus”, and others. It is good evidence of the role of religious images in his works.

Word	Number of uses
Kyiv (Киев)	2645
was (было)	1500
for (для)	1449
churches (церкви)	1188
monastery (монастырь)	1095
prince (князь)	890
Rus' (Русь)	806
church (церковь)	731
time (время)	639
century (века)	613
hetman (гетман)	507
name (имя)	505
Ukraine (Украина)	465
chronicle (летопись)	460
Khmelnickiy (Хмельницкий)	455
Russian (Русской)	407
we (мы)	316
history (история)	299
city (город)	281
lands (земли)	275
day (день)	270
Dnipro (Днепр)	266
Russia (Россия)	253
people (народ)	222
book (книга)	206
Cossacks (козаки)	195
Little Russia (Малороссия)	183

Table 1. Word frequency in the collected works of Mykhailo Maksymovych

We can also assess the proximity of different words in the Maksymovych's texts. Content analysis shows that the word "Orthodoxy" is more often used in proximity (in a single paragraph) to the words "ethnicity" and "Russian" than in proximity to the words "church" and "Christianity" (Table 2). This shows that the religious images in Maksymovych's works were crucially important for the construction of "people's spirit" (in terms of Romanticism) as well as in formulating the complex hierarchies of loyalties.

	Poles	Cossacks	Khmelnickiy	Church	Catholicism	Orthodoxy	Ukraine	Rus'	Russian
Poles	0	3	35	30	9	25	36	16	36
Cossacks	3	0	9	12	2	6	11	5	10
Khmelnickiy	35	9	0	74	21	50	82	36	83
Church	30	12	74	0	33	67	88	52	117
Catholicism	9	2	21	33	0	30	24	23	32
Orthodoxy	25	6	50	67	30	0	58	37	72
Ukraine	36	11	82	88	24	58	0	50	116
Rus'	16	5	36	52	23	37	50	0	91
Russian	36	10	83	117	32	72	116	91	0

Table 2. The proximity of words in the collected works of Mykhailo Maksymovych

Conclusions

We can conclude that Mykhailo Maksymovych's deep religiosity, combined with his fascination with Schellingianism, caused him to formulate the idea of the integrity of knowledge and the absence of contradictions between science and religion. Maksymovych perceived biblical texts as a factually reliable story

about humanity's past. He represented the philosophy of the heart, developing it within the framework of traditional Orthodox anthropology. Maksymovych's deep personal religiosity and his theoretically formulated ideas about the relationship between faith and knowledge determined his attitude to the problem of Ukrainian specificity. Maksymovych emphasized the historical and cultural differences in the people's spirit of the Russians and the Ukrainians. However, he remained within the framework of the idea of all-Russian unity, which was perceived by him, primarily, in religious terms and which he developed based on Romanticism. Maksymovych's attitude to religion meant that modern national consciousness, which was being actively formed in the middle of the 19th century, remained mentally alien to Maksymovych.

Acknowledgment

This text has been prepared within the framework of the "Religious Dimension of the Image of Ukrainian Lands in Russian Historical Narratives of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century" project, which was financially supported by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) from the Dr Ivan Iwanciw and Dr Myroslawa Mysko-Iwanciw Endowment Fund, University of Alberta, to which I convey my thanks.

Archival sources

IMVNL – The manuscript collection at the Institute of Manuscripts, the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine

References

- Andriewsky, Olga 2003. The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse and the Failure of the "Little Russian Solution," 1782–1917. In: *Culture, Nation and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945)*. University of Alberta Press, pp. 182-214.
- Assmann, Aleida 2011. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barsukov, Nikolay (ed.) 1901. *Pisma M. P. Pogodina, S. P. Shevyireva i M. A. Maksymovycha k P. A. Vyazemskomu 1825 – 1874 godov* [Letters of M. P. Pogodin, S. P.

- Shevyrev and M. A. Maksymovych to P. A. Vyazemsky, 1825–1874.]. St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich Printing House (In Russian). https://imwerden.de/pdf/pisma_pogodina_shevyreva_i_maksimoviha_k_vyazemskomu_1901.pdf
- Bushkovitch Paul 2003. What is Russia? Russian national identity and the State, 1500–1917. In: *Culture, Nation and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945)*. University of Alberta Press, pp. 144–161.
- Chyzhevskiy, Dmytro 1992. *Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini* [Essays on the History of Philosophy in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo Orii pry UKSP Kobza (In Ukrainian). <http://litopys.org.ua/chyph/chyph.htm>
- Etkind, Alexander 2011. *Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gerasimov, Ilya; Glebov, Sergey; Kusber, Jan; Mogilner, Marina & Semyonov, Alexander 2009. New Imperial History and the Challenges of Empire. In: *Empire Speaks Out Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*. Brill Academic Pub, pp. 3–32. https://www.academia.edu/3989561/New_Imperial_History_and_the_Challenges_of_Empire
- Grushevskiy, Aleksandr 1906. M. A. Maksymovych: Iz ukrainskoy istoriografii XIX v. [M. A. Maksymovych: From the Ukrainian historiography of the 19th century.] In: *Izvestiya otdeleniya russkogo yazyika i slovesnosti imp. AN Sankt-Peterburg* [Bulletin of the Department of Russian Language and Literature of the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg], Vol 11, № 1, pp. 375–416.
- Holovashchenko, Serhii 2006. “Ukrainska Psaltyr” M.O. Maksymovycha yak fenomen vitchyznianoi bibleistyky: kilka zapytan do tekstu [M.O. Maksymovych’s “Ukrainian Psalter” as a Phenomenon of National Biblical Studies: Some Questions to the Text]. In: *Mahisterium. Istoryko-filosofski studii* [Magisterium. Historical and philosophical studies], Vol. 23, pp. 55–62. Kyiv: “KM Akademiia”. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/items/dfedb9ef-0bdc-4c51-8f08-3a5694d9e402>
- Hrushevskiy, Mykhailo 1927. “Malorossyiskye pesny” Maksymovycha i stolittia ukrainskoi naukovoï pratsi [Maksymovych’s Little Russian Songs and the Century of Ukrainian Research]. In: *Ukraina* [Ukraine], No. 6, pp. 1–13. Kyiv: Ukrainska Akademiia Nauk.
- Ivaschenko, Viktoriya 2020. Mezhdou naukoy i religiyey? Refleksii o religioznoy identichnosti v avtobiografiyah istorikov XIX – nachala XX vv. [Between Science and Religion? Reflexions about religious identity in autobiographies of historians of the 19th – early 20th centuries.] In: *Aftobiografiya*, Vol. 9, pp. 101–124.
- Kiselev, Vitaliy 2015. Panslavizm i konstruirovaniye natsionalnoy identichnosti v russkoy i polskoy slovesnosti XIX v. [Panslavism and the construction of national identity in Russian and Polish literature of the 19th century] In: *Rusin*, 3: 108–127.

- Kohut, Zenon 2003. A Dynasty or Ethno-Dynastic Tsardom?: Two Early Modern Concepts of Russia. In: Marsha Siefert (ed.). *Extending the Borders of Russian History: Essays in Honor of Alfred J. Rieber*. Budapest: CEU Press; New York, pp. 17–30.
- Kravchenko, Volodymyr 2011. *Ukraina, imperiia, Rosiia. Vybrani staty z modernoi istorii ta istoriohrafii* [Ukraine, Empire, Russia. Selected papers on modern history and historiography]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo Chasopys “Krytyka” https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Kravchenko_Volodymyr/Ukraina_imperiia_Rosiia_Vybrani_staty_z_modernoii_istorii_ta_istoriohrafii/
- Kutsyi, Ivan 2016. Mizh Ruskym svitom ta Slovianshchynoiu: tsyvilizatsiini obrazy u naukovi spadshchyni Mykhaila Maksymovycha [Between the Russian World and Slavonia: Civilizational Images in the Scientific Heritage of Mykhailo Maksymovych]. In: *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini: Zb. nauk. pr.* [Historiographical Studies in Ukraine: Collection of academic papers.] Vol. 26, pp. 6–32.
- Lakoff, George; Johnsen, Mark 2003. *Metaphors we live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Leiberov, Oleksii 2019. Predstavnyky dvorianskoho stanu v korporatsii dukhovenstva Nizhynskoho povitu Chernihivskoi hubernii na pochatku XIX stolittia [Representatives of the Nobility in the Corporation of the Clergy of the Nizhyn District of the Chernihiv Province in the Early Nineteenth Century]. In: *Literatura ta kultura Polissia* [Literature and culture of Polissya], No. 97. Seriia “Istorychni nauky”, 12, pp. 152–165. <http://lib.ndu.edu.ua/dspace/bitstream/123456789/1342/1/15.pdf>
- Leontiev, Konstantin 1876. *Vizantizm i slavyanstvo* [Byzantism and Slavicism]. Moscow: Imp. Ob. istorii i drevnostey ros. pri Mosk. un-te [The Imperial Society of History and Antiquities of Russia at the Moscow University]. <http://elib.shpl.ru/ru/nodes/39950-leontiev-k-n-vizantizm-i-slavyanstvo-m-1876>
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 2004a. Lyst pro filosofiiu [Letter about philosophy]. In: *Khronika-2000. Ukrainyskyi kulturolohichnyi almanakh* [Chronicle 2000. Ukrainian cultural almanac], Vol. 37–38.
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 2004b. *Lysty / Pamiatky istorychnoi dumky Ukrainy* [Letters / Documents of historical thought of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Lybid.
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1827. *Malorossiyskie pesni* [Little Russian songs]. Moscow: V tipografii Avgusta Semena <https://archive.org/details/malorossiyskiepesni/page/n1/mode/2up>
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1847. *Razmyshleniya o prirode* [Reflections on nature]. Kyiv: Tipografiya I. Valnera (<https://www.prlib.ru/item/688185>)
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1876. *Sobranie sochineniy. T. 1. Otdel istoricheskii* [Collected Works. Vol. 1. Historical Section.]. Kyiv: Tipografiya M. P. Fritsa (In Russian). [Максимович, Михаил 1876. Собрание сочинений. Т. 1. Отдел

- исторический*. Киев: Типография М. П. Фрица]. URL: <https://archive.org/details/1.1876>
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1877. *Sobranie sochineniy. 2: Otdelyi: istoriko-topograficheskii, arheologicheskii i etnograficheskii* [Collected Works. T. 2: Sections: historical-topographical, archaeological and ethnographical]. Kyiv: Tipografiya M. P. Fritsa. <https://archive.org/details/maksimovich2>
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1880. *Sobranie sochineniy. T. 3: Yazykoznanie. Istoriya slovesnosti* [Collected Works. Vol. 3: Linguistics. History of literature]. Kyiv: Tipografiya arend. E. T. Kerer. <https://archive.org/details/maksimovich3>
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1898. *Vospominanie o Timkovskih* [Memoir of Timkovskie]. In: *Kyivskaya starina* [Kyiv antiquity], 11: 255–272.
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1833. *Kniga Nauma o velikom bozhiem mire, izdannaya Mihaylom Maksymovychem* [The Book of Nahum on the Great God's World, published by Michael Maksimovich]. Moscow: V universitetskoy tipografii. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Maksymovych_Mykhailo/Knyha_Nauma_o_velikom_Bozhyem_Mire_vyd1833__ru/
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo 1994. *Avtobyohrafiya* [Autobiography]. In: *Kyev yavylsia hradom velykym... Vybrani ukrainoznavchi tvory* [Kyiv has become a great city... Selected Ukrainian Studies.]. Kyiv: Lybid, pp. 388–404. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Maksymovych_Mykhailo/Kyev_iavylsia_hradom_velykym_Vybrani_ukrainoznavchi_tvory/
- Markov, Polikarp 1986. *Obschestvenno-politicheskie i istoricheskie vzglyady M. A. Maksymovycha* [Social, political and historical views of M. A. Maksymovych]. Kyiv: „Vischa shkola”.
- Ostriany, Danylo 1960. *Svitohliad M. O. Maksymovycha* [Worldview of M. O. Maksymovych]. Kyiv: Derzhpolitvydav URSR.
- Pecheranskyi, Ihor 2010. Mykhailo Maksymovych yak filosof [Mykhailo Maksymovych as a philosopher]. In: *Mandrivets* [Traveler], 3: 81–85. https://www.lib.dp.ua/text/mandr_2010_3_13.pdf
- Pocock, John 1985. Introduction: The State of the Art. In: Pocock John. *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–34.
- Popovych, Myroslav 2003. Hryhorii Skovoroda na tli filosofsko-relihiinykh rukhiv svoiei doby [Hryhorii Skovoroda in the context of philosophical and religious movements of his time]. In: *Naukovi zapysky* [Research notes], Vol. 22 (1): 91–103.
- Posohov, Sergey 2014. *Universitet i gorod v Rossiyskoy imperii (vtoraya polovina XVIII – pervaya polovina XIX vv.)* [University and the City in the Russian Empire (second half of the 18th – first half of the 19th centuries)]. Harkov: HNU imeni V. N. Karazina.

- Posokhova, Liudmyla 2022. "Similis Simili Gaudet": Lavrentiy Kordet and Hryhoriy Skovoroda. In: *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*. [Hryhorii Skovoroda and the Baroque World], 9: 130–146. <http://kmhj.ukma.edu.ua/article/view/270838>
- Repyna, Loryna (ed.) 2020. *Proshloe dlia nastoiashcheho: Ystoriya-pamiat y narratyvni natsyonalnoi ydentychnosti: kolektyvnaia monohrafyia* [Past for Present: History-Memory and Narratives of National Identity: A Collective Monograph]. Moscow: Akvylyon. <https://roii.ru/the-past-for-the-present/roii-the-past-for-the-present.pdf>
- Rudnytsky, Ivan 1988. *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Lysiak-Rudnytskyi_Ivan/Essays_in_Modern_Ukrainian_History_anhl.pdf
- Saunders, David 1985. *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750–1850*. Edmonton: CIUS Press. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/David_Saunders/The_Ukrainian_Impact_on_Russian_Culture_1750-1850_en/
- Schelling, Friedrich 1988. *Ideas for a Philosophy of Nature as Introduction to the Study of This Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schelling, Friedrich 1993. *System of Transcendental Idealism*. University of Virginia Press
- Schmidt, Royal 1956. Cultural Nationalism in Herder. In: *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 17 (3): 407–417. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2707552>
- Skinner, Quentin 1969. Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas. In: *History and Theory*, 8 (1): 3–53. <https://people.exeter.ac.uk/sp344/-skinner%20meaning%20and%20understanding%20in%20hist%20ideas.pdf>
- Tolochko, Aleksey 2012. *Kyivskaya Rus i Malorossiya v XIX veke* [Kyivan Rus' and Little Russia in the 19th century]. Kyiv: Laurus. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Tolochko_OP/Kyevskaia_Rus_y_Malorossyia_v_XIX_veke_ros/
- Tomenko, Mykhailo 1994. «Shchyrui malorosiiianyn» - vydatnyi vchenyi (Mykhailo Maksymovych) ["Sincere Little Russian" - an outstanding scientist (Mykhailo Makstymovtch).]. In: *Ukrainska ideia. Pershi rechnyky* [The Ukrainian idea. The first spokesmen]. Kyiv: Znannia, pp. 80.
- Ushkalov, Leonid 2019. Skovoroda i dukhobortsi [Skovoroda and duhoborcy]. In: *Pereiaslavski Skovorodynyski studii: filohohiia, filosofii, pedahohika : zb. nauk. pr.* [Pereiaslav Skovoroda studies: philology, philosophy, pedagogy: a collection of scientific papers], Vol. 6, pp. 239–255. Nizhyn: Vyd. Lysenko M. <https://ukrsvit1.com.ua/kultura/skovorodynstvo/skovoroda-j-dukhobortsi.html>
- Velychenko, Stepan 1992. *National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914*. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

- Wittgenstein, Ludwig 1922. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, Ltd., New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company. <https://archive.org/details/tractatuslogicop1971witt/page/n7/mode/1up?ref=ol&view=theater>
- Yas', Oleksii 2006. Ratsionalne ta irratsionalne v naukovii tvorchosti Mykhaila Maksymovycha [Rational and irrational in the research work of Mykhailo Maksymovych]. In: *Henezza* [Genesis], 2006, No. 1, pp. 51–63. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Yas_Oleksii/Ratsionalne_ta_irratsionalne_v_naukovii_tvorchosti_Mykhaila_Maksymovycha/
- Yas', Oleksii 2014. Istoryk i styl. Vyznachni postati ukrainskoho istoriopysannia u svitli kulturnykh epokh (pochatok XIX — 80-ti roky XX st.) [Historian and style. Prominent figures of Ukrainian historiography in the light of cultural epochs (early 19th – 80's of the 20th century)]. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Yas_Oleksii/Istoryk_i_styl_Vyznachni_postati_ukrainskoho_istoriopysannia_u_svitli_kulturnykh_epokh_Ch1/

Pavlo Yeremieiev, Associate Professor at the School of History and Associate Professor at the School of Philosophy, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine. His main area of research is history. His research Interests are history of religion, history of Eastern Europe (19th – early 20th century), intellectual history, historiography, historical methodology