

Mykhailo Hrushevsky
History of Ukraine-Rus'

Volume 10
The Cossack Age, 1657–1659

Translated by
Marta Daria Olynyk

Edited by
Andrew B. Pernal and Yaroslav Fedoruk, *Consulting Editors*
and
Frank E. Sysyn, *Editor in Chief*

with the assistance of
Myroslav Yurkevich



Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press
Edmonton • 2014 • Toronto

Contents

Foreword	xi
Editorial Preface to the Hrushevsky Translation Project	xiii
Editorial Preface to Volume 10	xv
The Composition and Structure of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's <i>History of Ukraine-Rus'</i> , Volume 10—Andrew B. Pernal	xxiii
A Historian's Conscience: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and His Creative Work in the Last Years of His Life (1931–1934)—Yaroslav Fedoruk	xl
Glossary	xcvi
Maps	ciii

* * *

I. The Elections of the Hetman and the Metropolitan. The Establishment of the Swedish-Ukrainian Alliance 1

Frames of mind in Chyhyryn in August 1657 (1); rumors of a rebellion (1–4); Ferenc Sebesi is dispatched (4–6). Muscovite plans: negotiations with Pavlo Teteria in Moscow in August (6–12); Vasiliï Kikin's mission to Ukraine (12–15); plans to dispatch Aleksei Trubetskoi on a mission for a 'scrutiny' of Ukrainian affairs (12, 16–19). The Chyhyryn council and Ivan Vyhovsky's election to the hetmancy (19–26). A conversation with Kikin in Chyhyryn (26–28). A conversation with Artamon Matveev (28–30). A conversation with Matveev in the matter of Stary Bykhaï and the Belarusian Cossacks (30–32). News from Moscow and its reverberations in Ukraine (32–38). Negotiations with the khan (38–39). The council of Korsun and the reelection of the hetman (39–43). The drafting of the Swedish-Ukrainian alliance (43–47). The mission of the Mynevsky brothers (48). Vyhovsky in Kyiv (49–50). Correspondence with Grigoriï Romodanovsky (50–51). Vyhovsky's conversation with Romodanovsky in Pereiaslav—early November (51–52). Samiïlo Pochanovsky's mission (52). The tsarist government rescinds its plans (53–54). Dmitriï Ragozin's mission to Vyhovsky (54–56). Ragozin's conversations with Cossacks and burghers (56–61). A conversation with Iurii Mynevsky in Moscow (61–65). Bogdan Khitrovo's mission (65). The election of the metropolitan (65–70).

II. The Opposition of the Sich and Pushkar's Revolt. The Renewal of the Crimean-Ukrainian Alliance 71

The rebellion in Zaporizhia (71–72). The Sich ideology (72). Vyhovsky's repressions (72–73). Iakiv Barabash's loyal declarations (73–75). The Zaporozhian mission of Mykhailo Strynzha and his associates (75–76). A conversation with the Zaporozhian ambassadors in Moscow (76–83). The tsar's decree to the Zaporozhians (83). Khitrovo's mission (84–86). Vyhovsky's measures against the opposition (87–90). Strynzha's action (88). Martyn Pushkar—the Zaporozhians' ally (88–89). Pushkar's correspondence with Strynzha (90–91). Vyhovsky's meeting with the voevoda Nikita Ziuzin in Starokostiantyniv (91–94). Ziuzin's recall (94). The march on Poltava (94–95). The council of Pereiaslav (95–97). Pushkar's mission to the tsar (97–98). The council of Pereiaslav and the second treaty of 25 February (98–102). The renewal of the Crimean-Ukrainian alliance and preparations for a campaign against the Left-Bank rebels (102–5). The Myrhorod coup (106–8). Diplomatic races: Vyhovsky's mission—Maksym Fylymonovych, Hryhorii Lisnysky (108–14); the mission of Martyn Pushkar and Stepan Dovhal—Ivan Iskra, Mykhailo Tysha (110).

Firs Baibakov's mission to Pushkar (114–19). Muscovite draft instructions to the provincial voevodas (120–21). Draft instructions to Vasilii Sheremetev (121–26). Ivan Apukhtin's mission to Vyhovsky (126–30). Iskra's mission (130–31). Lisnytsky's mission (132–35). Prokip Berezhetsky's mission (135–39). Ivan Alfimov's departure (141). Petr Skuratov's departure (140–41). Sheremetev's mission (141–42). Apukhtin visits Vyhovsky (143–46). Pushkar's alarms (146–48). Alfimov visits Dovhal (148). Alfimov visits Pushkar (149–51). Pushkar's letter to Vyhovsky (151). Vyhovsky's letter to Pushkar (151–52). Barabash's proclamation (152–53). The proclamation; Pushkar's alarms (153–54). Vyhovsky on campaign: the proclamation from Manzheliia (154–56): a conversation with Skuratov (156–58); the battle of Poltava (159–63); the demise of Pushkar (163–66). The curbing of the unruliness (166–67). Emigration across the Muscovite border (167–68).

III. Conflicts with Muscovy and the Union of Hadiach

169

The significance of the victory attained over the rebellion (169–70). The prospects of introducing Muscovite administration and the strengthening of the opposition; the next task: getting rid of the voevodas (170–72). The hetman's conversation with Apukhtin (172–73). Romodanovsky's march (173). Romodanovsky's 'Articles' (174–78). Barabash arrives for a meeting with Romodanovsky (178). Symptoms of a new revolt (179–81). The hetman's conversation with Iakov Krekshin (181–82). Panic and flight from beyond the Dnipro (182–83). Sheremetev summons Vyhovsky (183–84). The hetman's conversation with Stefan Iablonsky and Rafail Korsak (184–87). Ivan Serbyn on Vyhovsky's moods (187, 188–89). The council of Chyhyryn in July 1658 (187–88). The hetman's conversation with Viktor Zahorovsky; Zahorovsky's news (189–90). The hetman's conversation with Iakov Portomoin (190–91). The campaign beyond the Dnipro (191–93). Danylo Vyhovsky's attack on Kyiv (193–97). The capture of Barabash (197–98). The Treaty of Hadiach (199–200). Polish-Ukrainian relations from the autumn of 1657 to the summer of 1658 (200–207). The retention of Cossack lands in Volhynia and Polisia (200–203, 208–12). Teodosii Tomkovych's mission (212–13). Teteria's mission in February–March (214–17). Jerzy Lubomirski's views (217–18). Teteria's mission in May (218). Discussion of the agreement with the Cossacks (219–21). The views of Jan Leszczyński (221–25). Teteria's points (225–27). The Treaty of Hadiach: the treaty (227–31); Kikin's report (231–39, 241–44); information from an anonymous diary (236, 240); Krzysztof Peretiatkowicz's account (240–41); the Treaty of Hadiach—texts (244–53); the Treaty of Hadiach (253–64).

* * *

Bibliography	265
Abbreviations	265
Unpublished Sources	265
Published Sources	266
Secondary Literature	267
Addenda to the Bibliographies	269
Tables of Hetmans and Rulers	297
Translations and Publications Consulted	304
Index	305

A Historian's Conscience: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and His Creative Work in the Last Years of His Life (1931–1934)

YAROSLAV FEDORUK

History holds a multitude of mysteries large and small, as if to caution the curious that not everything created by human hands in this world can be brought to light. In their zeal to solve such mysteries, scholars often resemble detectives following a complex and fascinating trail step by step, sometimes over several generations, as they seek to uncover particular phenomena, events, and subjects of history and to grasp that discipline as a whole. Pursuing such investigations, the historian becomes so absorbed in a given era as to develop a feel for its style, particularities, tempo, and dynamics, delving deeply into the life of the period and coming to empathize with the preoccupations, joys and sorrows of his protagonists.

The life of Mykhailo Hrushevsky and his family in the 1930s is a sensitive topic of this kind. No one immersing himself in the documents and the inner world of those constantly threatened by the odious despotism and persecution of the Stalin regime can remain indifferent to their fate. This is apparent in the writings of those scholars who have dealt with the subject over the past quarter century, when open discussion of it has become possible. Their accounts breathe sympathetic identification with the Hrushevsky family and all that it endured after Mykhailo Hrushevsky's arrest in 1931. One of the mysteries touched upon in many of their writings is the fate of Hrushevsky's scholarly legacy after his death in 1934. In this introduction, I propose to show how Hrushevsky went about the writing of the last volume of his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, which deals with the hetmancy of Ivan Vyhovsky (1657–59) and was published in 1936 thanks to the efforts of his daughter, Kateryna, as well as volumes 6–8 of his *History of Ukrainian Literature* and other works. This subject is investigated against the background of the development of Ukrainian historiography in the 1920s and 1930s.

The study of books or manuscripts in a private collection inevitably leads the historian to focus on their author, the circumstances of his life, his working conditions and biography. At some point, those books and manuscripts become forever separated from their owner, setting out to make their way in the world like frail vessels tossed on giant waves. In the course of their voyage they pass through the hands of innumerable individuals and survive the cataclysms of their epoch or, all too often, vanish without trace.

Works of such cardinal importance to historiography and to national culture as the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* are bound to attract particular attention. Thus it is not surprising that Kateryna Hrushevaska's publication of the first part of volume 10 and the fate of its manuscript and presumed continuation has long been the subject of numerous hypotheses, rumors, and suppositions. The Ukrainian historian Ivan Butych (1919–2007), a specialist in archaeography and source studies who became known in his lifetime as the 'conscience of Ukrainian archaeography,' stated that he had seen the manuscript in the 1950s in the Manuscript Department of the State Public Library (now the Manuscript Institute of the Volodymyr Vernadsky

National Library of Ukraine). Three decades later, toward the end of the 1980s, Butych publicly shared his memories of its general archaeological description.¹ Since then, many historians have had occasion to write about this subject or make reference to it in talks and public statements.² Serhii Plokyh's investigation of the fate of the manuscript—the only special study of the matter published to date—has appeared in English and in two Ukrainian versions.³ Prospects of locating and publishing the manuscript were also mentioned in plans prepared in the late 1980s for collaborative work between the newly established Archaeographic Commission of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.⁴ At the initiative of Serhii Bilokin, a resolution was adopted at the commemorative international conference on 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian, Politician, and Civic Figure' (Kyiv, 24–25 September 1996) to approach the general prosecutor of Ukraine to investigate the circumstances surrounding the disappearance of Hrushevsky's manuscripts from the Manuscript Department of the Central Academic Library of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in the 1960s and 1970s.⁵ There were other attempts to resolve the problem as well.

As we see, many scholars have taken the fate of Hrushevsky's legacy to heart. Aside from these special studies, the monographs, articles, and source publications of many other

1. Cf. the articles by Larysa Kopan' (*Literaturna Ukraïna*) and Serhii Bilokin' (*Ukraïns'kyi istoryk*) in the following footnote.

2. Pavlo Sokhan', 'Tvorcha spadshchyna M. S. Hrushevs'koho i suchasnist', *Arkhivy Ukraïny*, 1996, nos. 1–3: 4; Hennadii Boriak, 'Povernuty narodovi naukovi spadshchynu M. S. Hrushevs'koho,' *Literaturna Ukraïna*, no. 11, 16 March 1989, repr. under the cryptonym H. B. in *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk* (New York, Toronto, and Munich), 1989, no. 4: 109–11; idem, 'Naukova spadshchyna M. S. Hrushevs'koho povertaet'sia narodovi,' *Literaturna Ukraïna*, no. 47, 23 November 1989; Larysa Kopan', 'Kudy zh podivsia rukopys Hrushevs'koho?' *Literaturna Ukraïna*, no. 49, 7 December 1989; Iaroslav Malyk, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka* (lecture delivered at the Ivan Franko State University of Lviv) (Lviv, 1991), p. 15; Serhii Bilokin', 'Vydannia "Spomyniv" M. Hrushevs'koho: Istoriia rukopysu ta vydannia,' *Ukraïns'kyi arkeohrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, n. s. (hereafter *UAShch*), no. 15 (2010): 697–713; idem, 'Pro vydannia, zaboroneni na stadii verstyky, abo tyrazhi iakykh bulo znyshcheno (1920–1941),' in *Do dzherel: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu Oleha Kupchyns'koho z nahody ioho 70-richchia*, 2 vols. (Kyiv and Lviv, 2004), 2: 580–81; idem, 'Retsenzii Oleksandra Bilets'koho na shostyi tom "Istoriï ukrains'koï literatury,'" *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk*, 1991–92, nos. 3–4 / 1–4: 258–59; Liubomyr Vynar, 'Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi v ukrains'kii i vsesvitnii istorii,' *ibid.*, p. 21; Bohdan Klid, 'Istoriia i polityka: Borot'ba navkolo spadshchyny Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *ibid.*, p. 191; Ihor Hrych, 'Nevydani tvory M. Hrushevs'koho,' *Andriivs'kyi uzviz*, 1991, no. 1 (February): 6; idem, 'Neopublikovani materialy z kyïvs'koï arkhivnoi spadshchyny M. Hrushevs'koho,' *Arkhivy Ukraïny*, 1996, nos. 1–3: 7–8; Leonid Reshod'ko, 'Povernennia na Ukraïnu,' in *Velykyi ukrainets': Materialy z zhyttia ta diial'nosti M. S. Hrushevs'koho*, comp. and ed. Andrii Demydenko (Kyiv, 1992), pp. 382–83; idem, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Fotoal'bom* (Kyiv, 1996), p. 101; Frank E. Sysyn, "'Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy" Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho ta tvorennia natsional'noi istoriografii,' in *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i ukrains'ka istorychna nauka: Zbirka materialiv konferentsii* (Lviv, 1999), p. 17; idem, 'Introduction to the *History of Ukraine-Rus*,' in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus*, vol. 1 (Edmonton, 1997), p. xxxii; idem, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the *History of Ukraine-Rus*,' in *The Hrushevsky Translation Project* [Edmonton, 1997], p. 23; Iryna Matiash, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka: Zhyttiepys, bibliohrafiia, arkhivy* (Kyiv, 1997), p. 107; idem, *Zirka pershoï velychyny': Zhyttiepys K. M. Hrushevs'koï* (Kyiv, 2002), p. 195; [Vitalii Tel'vak], 'Arkhiv Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' in Roman Nowacki, Wiktoria Telwak, and Witalij Telwak, *Biohrafichni narysy vydatnykh predstavnykiv ievropeïskoi kul'tury: Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, ed. Roman Nowacki, Politechnika Opolska: Narysy ta monografii, no. 198 (Opole, 2007), p. 216.

3. Serhii Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London, 2005), pp. 262, 421–30; idem [S. Plokhii], 'U poshukakh ostann'oho tomu Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' in *Poklykannia: Zbirnyk na poshanu prof. o. Iurii Mytsyka* (Kyiv, 2009), pp. 66–75; idem, *Velykyi peredit: Nezvychna istoriia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho* (Kyiv, 2011), pp. 265–66, 415–21.

4. Archive of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. Cf. 'Mr. Peter Jacyk, Founding Benefactor, Peter Jacyk Centre,' in *The Hrushevsky Translation Project*, p. 29.

5. Liudmyla Sakada, 'Vidznachennia 130-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia M. S. Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1997, no. 1: 148 (resolution, art. 7), repr. in *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk*, 1996, nos. 1–4, special issue, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Studii i materialy. Z nahody 130-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia*, p. 400.

historians studying Hrushevsky's life and work provide an important context for further investigation.

Thanks to this body of scholarly work, as well as archival material that has had limited circulation to date, we are now in a position to offer a general survey of the fate of Hrushevsky's unpublished legacy as it was assembled after his death in 1934. Hrushevsky's daughter worked on the editing and publication of his manuscripts until her arrest in 1938.

The Historical Institutions of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences under Attack (1929–31)

As the 1930s began, it was clear to Hrushevsky that the country was no longer on the course that it had been following in March 1924, when he returned to Kyiv from the emigration. The situation in the Academy was particularly symptomatic of that fact. Changes were under way in several sectors at once: the structure and organization of the Academy; the planning of scholarly research, which was coming under heavy ideological pressure; and staffing, now disrupted by dismissals and arrests of academic employees.

The first indications that the Bolshevik Party intended to take control of the Academy and alter Hrushevsky's organizational principles were already apparent by the late 1920s.⁶ In December 1928 the People's Commissariat of Education, supported by the Presidium of the Academy, raised the question of reorganizing Hrushevsky's History Section, which it proposed to reduce to a subsection. Speaking on behalf of the academic council of the History Section, Hrushevsky protested such a notion, arguing that the section's reorganization as a state academic body would deprive it of its character as a community institution and alienate many of those involved in its work, especially those not on regular staff.⁷ But the matter was brought to the attention of the most senior party officials in Ukraine, and on 9 January 1929 it was addressed at a meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of Ukraine (hereafter CC CP(B)U). There it was resolved to 'change our line with regard to material support for Hrushevsky.'⁸ From that time forward, the financing of Hrushevsky's historical institutions was gradually and inexorably reduced to the point that two years later he had to abandon a number of his publishing plans, such as those for the journals *Ukraïna* and *Za sto lit* (In One Hundred Years).

The All-Union Conference of Marxist Historians in Moscow (28 December 1928–4 January 1929) was followed by a major offensive of Marxist historians against the concepts expounded in Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and in the work of staff members of his historical institutions in the Academy.⁹ As the authorities began their case against the bogus 'Union for

6. Of the more important works on this subject published after 1991, see Viktor Zaruba, 'Rozhrom i znyschennia kyïvs'koi shkoly istorikiv Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk*, 1991–92, nos. 3–4/1–4: 147–68; Ruslan Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho: Ostannie desiatylittia (1924–1934)* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 73–102; Oksana Iurkova, *Diial'nist' naukovo-doslidnoi kafedry istorii Ukraïny M. S. Hrushevs'koho (1924–1930)* (Kyiv, 1999), p. 207ff.; Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 213–80; Yaroslav Malyk, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: V umovakh bil'shovyt's'koho rezhymu* (Lviv, 2012), pp. 93–110.

7. Volodymyr Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, Manuscript Institute (Natsional'na biblioteka Ukraïny im. V. I. Vernads'koho, Instytut rukopysu, hereafter Manuscript Institute), fond X, nos. 2537–2619, fol. 86 (minutes, no. 24, general meeting of the History Section, 24 December 1928).

8. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriïeu ta politykoiu (1920–1930-ti roky): Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv*, comp. R. Ia. Pyrih, T. T. Hrytsenko, O. S. Rubl'ov, and A. A. Soloviova (Kyiv, 1997), doc. 83, pp. 120–21.

9. *Trudy Pervoi vsesoiuznoi konferentsii istorikov-marksistov (28 dekabria 1928 g.–4 ianvaria 1929 g.)*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1930); *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriïeu ta politykoiu*, doc. 82, pp. 116–20 (Semen Semko's report to the CC CP(B)U on the conference). Of the literature on this, see: Thomas Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture*

the Liberation of Ukraine,' trumped up by the secret police, some of the historians working in Hrushevsky's commissions or collaborating with him were arrested. The arrest of the head of the Archaeographic Commission, Osyp Hermaize, on 26 July 1929 was followed on 20 January 1930 by that of Mykhailo Slabchenko, who had just been elected an academician. On 19 April 1930 they were sentenced to several years of imprisonment and hard labor.¹⁰

Regardless of the growing threat to the Academy and its individual members, Hrushevsky did not compromise his principles and conducted himself honorably. Contrary to the expectations of the secret police (State Political Administration or GPU), he did not issue a condemnation of Serhii Iefremov, his implacable foe at the Academy, but instead expressed solidarity with him to the extent possible under the circumstances. Such risky behavior was by no means general among the Academy's membership.¹¹

Hrushevsky did not dismiss Osyp Hermaize, then arrested and under investigation, as a staff member of the Presidium of the History Section until Hermaize and others indicted as members of the 'Union for the Liberation of Ukraine' had been tried.¹²

On Hrushevsky's initiative, the memory of Stepan Tomashivsky (1875–1930) as a 'Galician archaeographer' was honored at a meeting of the Archaeographic Commission on 11 January 1931. The authorities regarded this as an 'appeal to honor a non-Soviet scholar' and were quick with a harsh reaction. On 26 February, at the next meeting of the commission, Hrushevsky was obliged to strike the commemoration of Tomashivsky from the record of the previous session when it was presented for ratification.¹³ The incident was not forgotten by the supreme party bodies, which reprimanded Hrushevsky for it over the next several years, considering it 'an open manifestation of class hostility on the part of Hrushevsky upon the death of the fascist historian Tomashivsky.'¹⁴

Such honorable conduct with regard to his colleagues, regardless of complications in Hrushevsky's previous relations with them, makes it easier to understand the attitude Hrushevsky adopted when he himself was arrested and subsequently exiled to Moscow.

At the Fifteenth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) in December 1927 directives were adopted for the formulation of the first Five-Year Plan, which was intended to

(Toronto, Buffalo, and London, 1987), pp. 229, 232–35; John Barber, *Soviet Historians in Crisis, 1928–1932* (New York, 1981), pp. 42–46; Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 382–413; Vitalii Tel'vak, 'Marksysts'ka retseptsiia tvorchoho dorobku Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho (Persha tretyna XX stolittia),' *UASHch*, nos. 13/14 (2009): 365–97.

10. Nataliia Polons'ka-Vasylenko, 'Istorychna nauka v Ukraïni za soviets'koï doby ta dolia istorykiv,' *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Paris and Chicago, 1962), vol. 173, *Zbirnyk na poshanu ukraïns'kykh uchenykh, znyshchennykh bol'shevyts'koiu Moskvou*, pp. 17–19; idem, *Ukrains'ka akademiia nauk: Narys istorii*, 2 pts. (Kyiv, 1993), 1: 67–76, 2: 65–66; Ievhen Skliarenko, 'U sfabrykovanii spravi "SVU": (I. Iu. Hermaize),' in *Represovane kraieznavstvo (20–30-i roky)* (Kyiv, 1991), p. 129; Viktor Zaruba, *Istoryk derzhavy i prava Ukraïny akademik M. Ie. Slabchenko (1882–1952)* (Dnipropetrovsk, 2002), pp. 233–36.

11. Pavlo Sokhan', Vasyl' Ul'ianovs'kyi, and Serhii Kirzhaiev, *M. S. Hrushevs'kyi i Academia: Ideia, zmahannia, diial'nist'* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 120–22; Volodymyr Prystaiko and Iurii Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i HPU-NKVD. Trachichne desiatylittia: 1924–1934* (Kyiv, 1996), p. 82.

12. Hermaize was not expelled from the Presidium of the Academy until the general meeting of 16 May 1930 (Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2537–2619, fol. 100). See also documents containing numerous reports from secret GPU agents about attitudes in Ukrainian circles, including those of Hrushevsky and other academicians and staff members of the Academy (Fedir Savchenko, Mykhailo Mohyliansky et al.) in connection with the arrests of 1929, as well as excerpts from correspondence on that subject opened by the secret police. This material is collected in *Ukrains'ka intelihentsiia i vlada: Zvedennia sekretnoho viddilu DPU USRR 1927–1929 rr.*, comp. Viktor Danylenko (Kyiv, 2012), pp. 551–645. For Hermaize's testimony at GPU interrogations in August 1929, see *ibid.*, pp. 556–57.

13. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 10705–10807, fols. 139, 141.

14. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1864, fol. 72; nos. 11049–11106, fol. 74 (report of the Archaeographic Commission for 1931). Cf. Leonid Reshod'ko, 'Dvichi pomerlyi,' in *Velykyi ukraïnets'*, p. 441.

permeate every sphere of the country's industrial, agricultural, educational, cultural, and ideological life. The Academy, too, came under increasing pressure to prepare a schedule of research projects appropriate to the plan. In 1930 a worker-peasant inspection team from Kharkiv and a brigade of worker collectives from Kyiv were sent to investigate the Scholarly Research Department of Ukrainian History established by Hrushevsky. As a result of their activity, the department was reorganized in September 1930 and renamed the Department of the History of Ukraine in the Era of Commercial Capital.¹⁵ This was pursuant to a resolution adopted at the autumn 1929 session of the Academy concerning the specializations of departments of Ukrainian history, which were to be renamed according to Marxist terminology.

A further consequence of these inspections were official remarks on the lack of a plan of action in Hrushevsky's department with regard to fulfilling the Five-Year Plan for 1928–33. Immediately after the renaming of the department, in October 1930, the Presidium of the Second Division of the Academy sent Hrushevsky a demand to report on work accomplished in the course of the two years that had elapsed since the start of the plan and to specify the research plans of academic staff for the next three years. His reports were due no later than 10–12 October, and research plans were to conform as closely as possible to the needs of 'the economy and socialist construction.'¹⁶

Hrushevsky attempted to maintain the status quo with regard to staff work on established subjects and projects that had already been under way for several years. At a department meeting held on 8 October 1930 to discuss the Five-Year Plan in the Academy's research departments, it was resolved to approve the academic five-year plan without amendment. Insignificant exceptions were made with regard to modifying individual research activity (for example, in the case of Serhii Shamrai).¹⁷ Several weeks later, at a session of the Academy's council on 29–30 October, Hrushevsky came out against rigid supervision of the work of every department and individual scholar. His opponent at the session was Dmytro Bahalii, who decried individualism in the planning of the Academy's work.¹⁸

Later, when Hrushevsky was already in exile in Moscow and his historical concepts and school were being fiercely attacked at the Academy, the lack of a five-year plan was raised as one of the greatest shortcomings in the work of the historical institutions that he had organized. According to these accusations, the research projects to be undertaken by those institutions began to be determined only in 1931: up to that time, plans had been made 'spontaneously, based on the individual interests of particular scholars,' as noted in the report for the years 1928–33. The same report termed the projects undertaken from 1928 to 1930 'detached from Soviet life.'¹⁹ In June 1931, when the Presidium of the Academy issued a circular on planning for the following year, the historical institutions were instructed to plan research projects associated as closely as possible with the tasks of socialist economic development and cultural revolution. The party demanded that every research project undertaken at the Academy be 'a weapon in the struggle for socialism.'²⁰

Such instructions were, of course, completely foreign in letter and spirit to Hrushevsky and his colleagues. Hence the accusation that he was focusing his own work and that of his whole

15. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3447–3497, fol. 41; Petro Tron'ko, 'Pryrechenist' shkoly Hrushevs'koho,' in *Represovane kraieznavstvo*, p. 12; Zaruba, 'Rozhrom i znyschennia,' pp. 155–56.

16. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3084–3128, fol. 37.

17. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3447–3497, fol. 52^v.

18. Sokhan', Ul'ianovs'kyi, and Kirzhaiev, *M. S. Hrushevs'kyi i Academia*, p. 129.

19. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1864, fol. 43^v.

20. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 11049–11106, fol. 57.

department mainly on the political and cultural history of the Cossack era, which, according to the preparatory document on the five-year plan, he regarded as the period of greatest development of Ukrainian national life.²¹ Framing the issue in such terms was considered hostile to Marxist methodology.

At the same time, in the autumn of 1930, a severe blow was dealt to Hrushevsky's publishing plans. The authorities cut off financing for his most important periodical, *Ukraïna*, and canceled the printing of the forty-fourth issue of the journal, which was ready for publication.²² Hrushevsky did not, however, lose hope of reviving the journal, even in reduced format. In a letter to Professor Lev Peretts, a Leningrad literary scholar and brother of the academician Volodymyr [Vladimir] Peretts, he expressed the hope that *Ukraïna* would continue to appear in 1931. Lev Peretts helped prepare a new issue of the journal in Leningrad on the subject of the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius. But the content of *Ukraïna* planned by its editorial board was cut so severely that, according to Hrushevsky himself, the material gathered in 1930 would fill all the issues planned for 1931.²³

At the same time, Hrushevsky told Dmytro Kravtsov of his doubts concerning the authorization of the *Zapysky Istoryko-Filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN* (Proceedings of the Historical and Philological Section of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences) for publication.²⁴ The State Publishing House also stopped issuing other important collections initiated by Hrushevsky in the History Section of the Academy: *Za sto lit* (In One Hundred Years), *Poludneva Ukraïna* (Southern Ukraine), *Zakhidna Ukraïna* (Western Ukraine), *Naukovyi zbirnyk za 1930 rik* (Scholarly Collection for 1930), *Pervisne hromadianstvo* (Primitive Society), and others.²⁵ Thus Hrushevsky's basic serial publications were now under threat, and the first signs of the disruption of his academic publishing plans came suddenly and unexpectedly.

But what probably caused Hrushevsky greatest concern was the fate of volume 9, book 2 of his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, which was at the publishing house in 1930. The possibility of a ban on publication of the volume hung like a specter over the author and Ukrainian historiography in general. There was also cause for concern about volume 6 of Hrushevsky's *History of Ukrainian Literature*, which had also been submitted to the State Publishing House in the autumn of 1930 (for a detailed discussion, see p. lxxix below). Hence Hrushevsky's great alarm about the prospects for his publishing plans in the last few months before his departure for Moscow in March 1931.

The tone of Hrushevsky's letters written in this period exudes a degree of resignation ('if I am still alive'), weariness of life, and a mood of pessimism ('if things do not change for the worse').²⁶ He tried to preserve what he had created at the Academy but suffered one setback after another. The party's offensive against scholarship, which he was trying to oppose,

21. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1864, fols. 41–41^v.

22. Oleksander Ohloblyn, 'Pro deiakı zahublenı pratsı i vydannia Vseukraïns'koï akademii nauk u Kyievi,' *Naukovyi zbirnyk UVAN* (New York), no. 2 (1953): 197; Nataliia Polons'ka-Vasylenko, 'Spysok vydan' Akademii nauk, znyshchenykh u 1930-40 rokakh,' *Visnyk Akademii nauk Ukraïny*, 1992, no. 10: 94; Oksana Iurkova, "'Ukraïna" na istorychnomu fronti: Vid naukovoho chasopysu ukraïnoznavstva do zhurnalu tsykladu nauk istorychnykh,' *Problemy istorii Ukraïny: Fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky*, no. 16 (2007), *Na poshanu doktora istorychnykh nauk, profesora Stanislava Vladyslavovycha Kul'chyt's'koho z nahody 70-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia ta 50-richchia naukovoï pratsi*, pt. 2: 328–30.

23. Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (hereafter RGALI), fond 398, op. 1, d. 1, fols. 6, 14^v (letter of 20 January 1931 to L. M. Peretts).

24. Manuscript Institute, fond 262, spr. 113 (Hrushevsky's letter of 15 October 1930 to Kravtsov).

25. Svitlana Pan'kova and Halyna Shevchuk, "'Za sto lit": Pokazhchyk zmistu,' *UAShch*, nos.10/11 (2006): 247.

26. RGALI, fond 398, op. 1, d. 1, fols. 5, 6.

continued unabated, and the forces were very far from equal. Meeting frequently with his colleagues (whether at the Academy or, more informally, in his own home), Hrushevsky kept raising the issue of what to do and how to survive under the circumstances.²⁷ His human qualities, civic courage, and historian's conscience were most fully manifested in those difficult years as he refused to abandon his friends and students, seeking to support them and encourage them to continue their work. According to the testimony of Kateryna Hrushevka, in this period her father did all he could to help members of the Academy who had been dismissed from their posts, employing them as non-staff associates.²⁸

At a plenum of the Academy held in January 1931, Hrushevsky was dealt yet another blow. The Academy was reorganized a second time: the History Section headed by Hrushevsky was abolished and replaced by a Historical Cycle of the Academy.²⁹ At the same plenum the people's commissar of education, Volodymyr Zatonsky, who had been elected an academician a year and a half earlier, openly denounced Hrushevsky and accused him of anti-Soviet activity. Coming from such a highly placed party and government official, such criticism was a signal for further accusations and the commencement of repressive measures against Hrushevsky.

In the same year, the GPU began its persecution of scholars working in Hrushevsky's Department of Ukrainian History. Hrushevsky's assistant Maria Zhukovska, an archivist and non-staff academic member of the Commission on Cultural History, was arrested on 26 January.³⁰ This was followed on 8 March by the arrest of Fedir Savchenko, the head of the Commission on the History of Western Ukraine, who had followed Hrushevsky's example and returned to Kyiv from the emigration, becoming one of his closest collaborators.³¹

There was no doubt about the impending arrest of Hrushevsky himself, as the punitive mechanism of the GPU was already closing in on him. On 7 March he was suddenly obliged to leave for Moscow 'on assignment,' as the official phrase had it. Two weeks later, on 23 March, he was imprisoned.

Discussions in Ukraine about Hrushevsky and His School (1931–34)

Hrushevsky's arrest and ensuing exile in Moscow were the grim prelude to the full-scale campaign mounted against him in the Ukrainian SSR in the early 1930s, which expanded to take in his family, students, colleagues, and the scholarly institutions that he had established at the Academy.³² A similar campaign had taken place in Russia, where scholars of the older

27. T. H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Department of Manuscript Holdings and Textology (hereafter IL), fond 122, spr. 19, fol. 7.

28. Ibid.

29. Zaruba, 'Rozhrom i znyshchennia,' p. 157.

30. Iurkova, *Diial'nist'*, pp. 82, 230, 337; Hryhorii Kostiuk, 'Taimnytsia smerty akademika M. S. Hrushevs'koho (Za radians'koiu presoiu i spohadamy suchasnykiv),' repr. from *Ukrains'kyi zbirnyk* (Munich), 1954, no. 1 (December), in idem, *Na magistraliakh doby: Statti na suspil'no-politychni temy* (Toronto and Baltimore, 1983), pp. 9–30; Liubomyr Vynar, *Naivydatsnihyi istoryk Ukraïny Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1934)*, Biblioteka Prolohu i Suchasnosti, no. 169 (n. pl., 1986), p. 96.

31. *U pivstolitnikh zmahanniakh: Vybrani lysty do Kyryla Studyns'koho (1891–1941)*, comp. Oksana Haiova, Uliana Iedlins'ka, and Halyna Svarnyk (Kyiv, 1993), p. 612 (Savchenko's last letter of 6 March and Studynsky's note); Polons'ka-Vasylenko, 'Istorychna nauka,' p. 31; Oleksandr Rubl'ov, 'Osobystyi sekretar akademika M. S. Hrushevs'koho (F. Ia. Savchenko),' in *Represovane kraieznavstvo*, pp. 171–72; idem, "'Atashe" Akademika M. S. Hrushevs'koho,' in *Reabilitovani istoriieiu* (Kyiv and Poltava, 1992), pp. 50–58.

32. As of mid-1932, there were ten staff members working in the Department of Ukrainian History and its commissions, which were as follows. Department of the History of Ukraine in the Feudal Era: full member M. S. Hrushevsky (director); senior researchers K. M. Hrushevka and S. V. Hlushko; researcher P. S. Hliadkivsky; assistant L. P. Shevchenko; technical

generation were swept away in the 'Case of the Academicians' (1929–30), while in Belarus, beginning in the mid-1920s, cases involving the bogus 'Union for the Liberation of Belarus' were fabricated according to the same scenario as in Ukraine. These measures led to the persecution, exile, arrest, execution, or suicide of many prominent Belarusian historians, literary scholars, writers, and academicians such as Mitrafan Doňnar-Zapolski, Uladzimir Picheta, Usevalad Ihnatoŭski (also elected an academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences), Ivan Lutsevich (Ianka Kupala), and Vatslaŭ Lastoŭski.³³

On 4–5 and 24 May 1931, almost immediately after Hrushevsky's release from prison following a number of lengthy interrogations, the Academy held meetings to discuss the historical concepts that Hrushevsky had developed in his works. The stenographic records of those discussions, preserved in the Academy of Sciences collection at the Manuscript Institute of the Volodymyr Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, convey the prevailing atmosphere.³⁴ The first session featured an officious public discussion of a paper by Academician Volodymyr Iurnets on 'The Sociological Views of Academician Hrushevsky' in which the latter was severely criticized. Knowing that Hrushevsky was unable to return from Moscow, the Academy's authorities cynically sent him an invitation to participate in the discussion and even take a place of honor at the head table.³⁵ The second session was a condemnation of his work by his students and closest colleagues in the department, who also engaged in self-criticism of their own methodological approaches to the research of ideologically inappropriate subjects. The attack was not confined to the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* or the *History of Ukrainian Literature* but encompassed other scholarly interests of Hrushevsky's and subjects addressed in the journal *Ukraina*, which he edited. There was also particular criticism of the works of Osyp Hermaize, who was already imprisoned, and of Kateryna Hrushevka.

Hrushevsky's arrest was thus a signal for the acceleration of the campaign of struggle against 'national democratism,' 'fascist conceptions,' and 'opportunism'—the terms used to condemn Hrushevsky and his historical school. In an Academy report for 1933 this ideological course, which became firmly established there for decades to come, was summarized as follows: 'In a whole series of institutions Academician Hrushevsky sought to propose subjects (with the dictatorship of the proletariat in power!) serving to propagate a bourgeois national revival, the nationalist conception of the "Ukrainian historical process, which lacked a bourgeoisie," the "leading role of the Ukrainian intelligentsia," etc.'³⁶

Sessions of this kind were held with official pomp, and the criticism of Hrushevsky was harsh and devastating. Anyone who did not adopt a militant tone was subject to criticism and charges of flouting Marxist-Leninist principles of historical scholarship. Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, then secretary of the Commission on Socioeconomic History, recorded her painful impressions of such public denunciations, to some of which she was an eyewitness.³⁷

secretary I. I. Shchitkivsky. Commission on the History of Kyiv and Right-Bank Ukraine: senior researcher S. V. Shamrai (acting director of the department); researcher M. F. Karachkivsky. Commission on Cultural History: researcher V. S. Denysenko. Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era: researcher V. D. Iurkevych. See Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 243, fol. 5; nos. 3447–3497, fol. 37.

33. Rainer Rindner, *Historyky i ŭlada: Natsyiatvorchypratsës i historychnaia palityka ŭ Belarusi XIX–XX st.* (Minsk, 2003), pp. 286–300; Aleksandr Dubrovskii, *Istoriik i vlast': Istoricheskaia nauka i kontseptsiiia istorii feodal'noi Rossii v kontekste politiki i ideologii (1930–1950-e gg.)* (Briansk, 2005), pp. 115–18; Polons'ka-Vasylenko, 'Istorychna nauka,' pp. 17, 31; Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, pp. 245–46.

34. See Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 14628; no. 2786. Cf. the analysis in Zaruba, 'Rozhrom i znyschennia,' pp. 158–59; Tel'vak, 'Marksysts'ka retseptsiiia,' pp. 384–85.

35. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 14628, fols. 1–2.

36. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1864, fol. 42'.

37. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Ukrains'ka akademiia nauk*, 2: 16; idem, *Spohady*, comp. Valerii Shevchuk (Kyiv, 2011), p. 497.

Soon afterward, on 29 February 1932, a similar session was held to denounce the academic work of Serhii Shamrai—a nephew of Hrushevsky's, the son of his sister, Hanna—who was acting head of the Department of the History of Ukraine in the Era of Commercial Capital.³⁸ Given the previous year's episode involving Hrushevsky's gesture of respect for the memory of Stepan Tomashivsky, Shamrai was accused particularly of having expressed approval of Tomashivsky's view of the revolt of the Kyiv Cossacks (1855). The session did not, however, concentrate on Shamrai alone but took the form of a devastating assault on Hrushevsky's school as a whole. Among those initiating the session was Oleksander Ohloblyn, who asserted that the significance of the discussion lay in its demolition of Hrushevsky's whole school, now that the views of Hrushevsky himself had been criticized at the session of May 1931.³⁹

The year 1931 saw the publication of a number of documents of the Communist Party and Joseph Stalin himself on strengthening party-mindedness in the work of academic institutions and the 'need for relentless struggle against theories hostile to the dictatorship of the proletariat.' One of the most important such resolutions, which appeared in *Pravda* on 20 March, prompted the Academy's leadership, especially that of its Second Division, responsible for research in the humanities, to organize a whole series of meetings to discuss the problem. The nature of the ensuing discussion is readily apparent from the activities of the Ethnographic Commission, which took the official resolution as its point of departure for seven sessions on nationalist deviations in Soviet ethnography, on the critique of sociological schools in ethnography, and the like.⁴⁰ Once again, criticism was directed mainly against Mykhailo and Kateryna Hrushevsky. In May 1931, at a meeting of the Commission on Cultural History attached to the Department of Ukrainian History itself, the main address on 'Bourgeois Sociological Attitudes in the Works of Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Kateryna Hrushevskia' was delivered by Pavlo Hliadkivsky.⁴¹

Another document that marked a milestone in the official assault on historical scholarship appeared in late 1931 in the sixth issue of the journal *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia* (Proletarian Revolution). This was Stalin's letter 'On Certain Problems in the History of Bolshevism,' which became the subject of large-scale discussion in Soviet work collectives, schools, higher educational institutions, and academic circles. The letter amounted to a prohibition on interpreting the history of Bolshevism in any version other than that issued by the party and elaborated in its programmatic documents. The greatest stress was placed on raising the theoretical level of interpretation from the viewpoint of Marxist-Leninist ideology; developing the party line not only with regard to the history of Bolshevism but also in the humanities generally; downplaying the significance of documentary sources if they were in conflict with the official interpretation of history; and so on. This in turn came down to the vulgarization of historical study per se, involving the pernicious influence of administrative and ideological interference in such study.⁴² At the beginning of 1932, in the January issue of the journal

For an invitation to her from the Presidium of the Second Division of the Academy as secretary of the commission, see Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3845–3926, fol. 32.

38. See the stenographic record of the session in Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 14627, fol. 9ff.

39. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 14627, fol. 25. On this, see Ihor Verba, *Oleksandr Ohloblyn: Zhyttia i pratsia v Ukraïni. Do 100-richchia z dnia narodzhennia* (Kyiv, 1999), pp. 215–16.

40. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4100–4129, fol. 24; nos. 3845–3926, fol. 31.

41. Another version of the title was 'A Critique of Bourgeois Conceptions in the Works of Kateryna Hrushevskia.' See Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3662–3678, fols. 11^v, 18; nos. 4063–4099, fol. 16.

42. Leonid Babichenko, 'Pis'mo Stalina v "Proletarskuiu revoliutsiiu" i ego posledstviia,' *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, 1990, no. 6: 94–108; Ella Tsyhankova, *Skhodoznavchi ustanovy v Ukraïni: Radians'kyi period* (Kyiv, 2007), pp. 43–44, 109–10; Konstantin Shtepka, *Russian Historians and the Soviet State* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1962), pp. 88–90.

Litopys revoliutsii (Chronicle of the Revolution), Stalin's article was set forth for the benefit of Ukrainian historians with a preface by Lazar Kaganovich.⁴³

The Historical Cycle of the Academy and its commissions were not passed over when it came to discussing the article. Such discussions were scheduled precisely at the time when the activity of the Historical Cycle for 1932 was being planned, and criticism of Hrushevsky and his family members took pride of place. His students in almost every commission of the cycle were exploited in the attack on his theories (only the Commission on Near Eastern History was exempted, as the historian did not touch on problems of Oriental studies). In the Commission on the History of Kyiv and Right-Bank Ukraine, Mykhailo Karachkivsky was assigned to give a presentation on 'Problems in Studying the Towns of Right-Bank Ukraine during the Feudal Era in Bourgeois Ukrainian Historical Literature (Works of Academician M. S. Hrushevsky, Professor O. S. Hrushevsky, P. V. Klymenko, and Others),' while Serhii Shamrai was to discuss 'Bourgeois Conceptions in Historical Research on the Kyiv Region during the Feudal Era (Works of Academician M. S. Hrushevsky, Professor P. Klepatsky, S. Andriiashev, and Others).'⁴⁴ In the Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era, Viktor Iurkevych was to prepare an article on 'Academician M. S. Hrushevsky's National-Democratic Conception of the History of Cossackdom.' The Commission on Cultural History was assigned to demolish the historian's sociological views. This was planned to commence with a wide-ranging discussion of 'A Critique of Bourgeois Sociological Conceptions in the Ethnographic and Folklore Studies of Academician M. Hrushevsky and K. Hrushevska,' and Kostiantyn Shtepa (Shtepa) later undertook to write an article on 'Durkheim's Sociology and the School of Academician Hrushevsky' that was published in *Nizhen*.⁴⁵ The Ethnographic Commission developed a critique of the 'bourgeois ethnography of Ukraine' in which Hrushevsky's name figured among those of the ethnographers.⁴⁶ The Archaeographic Commission was to address Hrushevsky's 'tendentiousness' in the use of sources for his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, discussed by Mykola Petrovsky in his report on 'Academician Hrushevsky's Fascist Conception' at public sessions on 16 and 18 June 1932.⁴⁷ Other public speeches on the subject were prepared as tasks auxiliary to the plan. In 1932 Viktor Iurkevych was assigned to prepare addresses on 'Academician Hrushevsky's National-Democratic Conception with Reference to Literary History' (the original title was 'The National-Democratic Conception and Militant Nationalism in Academician M. S. Hrushevsky's History of Literature'),⁴⁸ 'Academician M. S. Hrushevsky and His Predecessors in the History of Cossackdom,' 'The Views of Academician M. S. Hrushevsky on the Origin of the Feudal Exploitation of Labor,' 'Literary History in the Feudal Era as Interpreted by

43. Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, pp. 121–32.

44. On this paper and its manuscript, see Svitlana Pan'kova, 'Iz kohorty kraieznavtsiv 1920–1930-kh rr.: Serhii Shamrai,' in *Kyiv u sotsiokul'turnomu prostori XIX–XXI stolit': Natsional'nyi ta ievropeiskyi kontekst. Materialy Vseukraïns'koi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii, 13 kvitnia 2011 r.* (Kyiv, 2011), pp. 24–32.

45. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 12168–12198, fol. 1; Kostiantyn Shtepa, 'Sotsioloohichna teoriia relihii E. Diurkheima i shkola M. Hrushevs'koho,' *Zapysky Nizhens'koho instytutu sotsiial'noho vykhovannia*, 1932, no. 12: 46–74. On the influence of Émile Durkheim's sociology on Hrushevsky's historical views, especially in the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, see Oleksii Ias', 'Monumental'nyi proekt velykoho naratyvu M. Hrushevs'koho u svitli ioho doslidnyts'kykh stratehii,' *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraïni*, no. 22 (2012), *Instytut istorii Ukraïny na zlami epokh, u svitli tradytsii ta peretvoren'*: 75 rokiv instytutsiinoho buttia, pp. 567–68, 592–93, 621–23.

46. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2798, fols. 1–18.

47. See minutes of meetings of the Archaeographic Commission, 8 May and 16 and 18 June 1932, in Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 10639–10679, fols. 21, 25–35.

48. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3547–3568, fol. 2–2^v.

Academician M. S. Hrushevsky,' and a separate address criticizing his own theories on the wars of Bohdan Khmelnytsky worked out under the influence of his teacher.⁴⁹

Such systematic attacks on Hrushevsky and especially on his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, carried out by students, most of whom he had mentored and formed as historians, astonished the civilized world with their absurdity. Academician Mykola Vasylenko made a pained reference to this in a letter of 25 December 1931 to Volodymyr Vernadsky.⁵⁰ In her memoirs, Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko noted the oppressive effect of such criticism of Hrushevsky's theories on the part of his students.⁵¹

Hrushevsky, however, was well aware of the overwhelming pressure and threats to which the secret police subjected these young scholars. Knowing that their lives hung in the balance, he magnanimously forgave them these attacks and remained in close contact with his department at the Academy. Even in his reduced circumstances, Hrushevsky not only continued to direct the department from Moscow but also offered scholarly advice to Serhii Shamrai, Sylvestr Hlushko, and others.⁵² Almost all these disciples of Hrushevsky's were later arrested by the GPU-NKVD (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs—secret police), and many of them died in prison, labor camps, or exile, or were executed. Among them were Todor Havrylenko, Kateryna Hrushevska, Varfolomii Ihnatiienko, Viktor Iurkevych, Ostap Pavlyk, Fedir Savchenko, and Serhii Shamrai.⁵³

The communist critique of Hrushevsky's Lviv school also deserves mention. Stepan Tomashivsky figured as the chief 'fascist historian' in that milieu. Immediately after the arrest of Hrushevsky and his exile to Moscow, the names of Lviv scholars who had collaborated with Hrushevsky's department in the latter half of the 1920s were dropped from all the Academy's research plans and publishing prospectuses. The documents on Cossackdom after the death of Bohdan Khmelnytsky (1657) collected and prepared for publication by Vasyl Herasymchuk (Harasymchuk) were consigned to oblivion.⁵⁴ Ivan Krypiakevych's research project on 'The Political Organization of Ukraine in the Mid-Seventeenth Century' was canceled for having no significant bearing on the dictatorship of the proletariat and deviating from Marxist-Leninist methodology.⁵⁵ The Academy's ties with Myron Korduba were severed.

Subsequently, beginning in 1933, the Academy began to develop topics that subjected the Lviv historians to devastating criticism, first and foremost as members of Hrushevsky's school. Ivan Krypiakevych figured as the chief culprit. Of all the Lviv historians he, along with Vasyl Herasymchuk, was most active in collaborating with the Academy's various commissions, not only those established by Hrushevsky. 'He is a historian of the same camp as the fascist Tomashivsky,' asserted Viktor Iurkevych at a meeting of the Academy's Historical Cycle in November 1933.⁵⁶ His ideology, along with that of Ivan Krevetsky, was

49. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3547–3568, fol. 1; nos. 1948–1963, fol. 13.

50. Mykola Vasylenko, *Vybrani tvory*, comp. Ihor Usenko et al., 3 vols. (Kyiv, 2008), vol. 3, *Spohady. Shchodennyky. Lystuvannia*, p. 539.

51. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Spohady*, p. 497.

52. IL, fond 122, spr. 19, fol. 8 (testimony of Kateryna Hrushevska).

53. On their fate and that of other students of Hrushevsky's, see Polonska-Vasylenko, 'Istorychna nauka,' pp. 28–39, 63–69; Oksana Iurkova, 'Kyivs'ka istorychna shkola M. S. Hrushevs'koho: Doli naukovtsiv,' *Z arkhiviv VUChK-HPU-NKVD-KHB*, 1998, nos. 1–2 (6–7): 263–80; idem, *Diial'nist'*, pp. 210–64.

54. Yaroslav Fedoruk, 'Vasyl' Harasymchuk ta ioho nevydani "Materialy do istorii kozachchyny XVII st.," in Vasyl' Harasymchuk, *Materialy do istorii kozachchyny XVII viku*, L'vivs'ki istorychni pratsi. Dzhherela, vyp. 1 (Lviv, 1994), pp. 21–26.

55. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 11049–11106, fols. 3, 19–20'.

56. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2486–2525, fol. 45.

defined as one of 'thoroughgoing service to the interests of Polish fascism,' according to a report on the two historians delivered in 1933 and subsequently prepared for publication.⁵⁷ Another article on a related subject, 'Hrushevsky's School outside the USSR,' was planned for a collection titled 'The Class Struggle on the Ukrainian Historical Front' that was to be assembled in 1933 and published the following year.⁵⁸ Particular mention was made of the Archaeographic Commission of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, which was denounced as 'national-democratic' and hostile to Marxist ideology.⁵⁹ In January 1934 all the full members of the Academy residing in Lviv—Filaret Kolessa, Vasyl Shchurat, Kyrylo Studynsky, and Mykhailo Vozniak—were expelled as 'enemies of the working masses of Ukraine.'⁶⁰

For the time being, these attacks had little impact on the Lviv historians themselves, as western Ukraine was still under the rule of Poland. The real tragedy of these disciples of Hrushevsky, as of the Galician intelligentsia in general, began after the second establishment of Soviet rule in Lviv in 1944. Although that subject takes us beyond the chronological frame of this introduction, it deserves brief mention here as a phase in the history of Hrushevsky's school.

The Soviet authorities were particularly brutal in their persecution of Ivan Krypiakievych, who deliberately refused to emigrate as the Red Army advanced on Lviv and chose to continue living in Ukraine. The authorities did not obtain what they wanted from him—an outright condemnation of his teacher—but he made innumerable compromises with them at the cost of his health, moral and psychological degradation, and limitations on his intellectual development. Later, in the mid-1950s and 1960s, Krypiakievych rose to the heights of his academic subject and managed to form a school of outstanding historians to whom he passed on the spirit and traditions of Mykhailo Hrushevsky, notwithstanding the hostile Soviet environment.⁶¹

Alone among Hrushevsky's disciples in both Lviv and Kyiv, Myron Korduba not only refused to condemn his teacher but categorically defended his vision of Ukrainian history in public discussions. On 15 February 1946, for example, at a plenary session of the History Department at Lviv University, Korduba came out openly against the official distortion of the concepts set forth in Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and the pejorative epithets applied to its author. According to a report to the secretary of the CC CP(B)U, on this occasion 'Professor Korduba said in so many words that he found it painful to listen to this trial or condemnation of Hrushevsky by his own Ukrainian countrymen. For a nation that does not respect its great men has no self-respect.' Korduba also protested administrative interference in his own participation in the plenum when the title of his lecture, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky as a Student of the Princely Era of Ukrainian History,' was vulgarized as 'The Bourgeois Nationalist Interpretation of Early Ukrainian History, Especially That of Kyivan Rus' and the Feudal Appanage Period, in Hrushevsky.'⁶² Such courage had its price, and Korduba prepared

57. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4622–4681, fols. 60–69^v; nos. 2236–2302, fol. 47.

58. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fols. 14, 130.

59. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2486–2525, fol. 46.

60. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Ukrains'ka akademiia nauk*, 1: 63; 2: 22.

61. Of the extensive literature on Krypiakievych, see especially Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Ivan Kryp'iakievych—istoryk Ukraïny,' in Ivan Kryp'iakievych, *Istoriia Ukraïny* (Lviv, 1990), pp. 5–21; *Ukraïna: Kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'* (Lviv), vyp. 8 (2001), *Ivan Kryp'iakievych u rodynnii tradytsii, nautsi, suspil'stvi; Arkhiv Ivana Kryp'iakievycha: Inventarnyi opys*, comp. Iaroslav Fedoruk, ed. Ivan Butych, Iaroslav Dashkevych, and Oleh Kupchyn'skyi (Kyiv and Lviv, 2005).

62. *Kul'turne zhyttia v Ukraïni: Zakhidni zemli*, comp. Tamara Halaichak et al., 2 vols. (Lviv, 1995–96), 2: 804, 807.

for repressive measures and physical persecution. According to his grandchildren's memoirs, Korduba kept a pair of felt boots, warm clothing, and a supply of food in the hallway of his residence, expecting that he would need them in the first days of his probable arrest or sudden deportation to Siberia, given the authorities' common practice at the time.⁶³ He finally succumbed to the stress of official persecution and died in early May 1947 of a stroke suffered in the reading room of a Lviv library.⁶⁴

But let us return to the era of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in the Ukrainian SSR. In all likelihood, as the campaign against Hrushevsky and the destruction of his historical institutions in Kyiv proceeded in 1931–34, the censorship began to ban his *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and order its removal from libraries. That work had long been an obstruction to the ideology and, indeed, to the very existence of Soviet rule in Ukraine. As far back as August 1925, the GPU had sent a circular to its local branches noting that the government of the USSR and the Moscow OGPU (All-Union State Political Administration—secret police) were considering a ban on Hrushevsky's *History* as a work of 'false historical scholarship, hostile and harmful to Sov[iet] rule.'⁶⁵ In his letter of 4 August 1934 to Viacheslav Molotov, Hrushevsky wrote about the systematic removal of his published works from circulation in Ukraine.⁶⁶ Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, describing events associated with Hrushevsky's funeral in Kyiv on 29 November 1934, quoted an interlocutor to the effect that it was forbidden to read Hrushevsky's works.⁶⁷ In a letter of 16 November 1935 to Kyrylo Studynsky, Dmytro Doroshenko referred specifically to the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, noting that it was no longer being given to readers at the Library of the Academy of Sciences.⁶⁸ Even though the letter was written from Prague years after the events under consideration here, in the early 1930s Soviet libraries did indeed begin to remove historical literature from their holdings that did not reflect prevailing ideological conceptions. Among the banned works were old textbooks, the writings of Nikolai Karamzin and Sergei Soloviev, and the Brokgauz-Efron encyclopedia.⁶⁹

The Academy's scholarly institutions, especially the Department of Ukrainian History, were dealt yet another blow in 1933. In April of that year Serhii Shamrai, then acting head of the department during Hrushevsky's 'assignment,' described the catastrophic situation with regard to the funding of scholarly projects in a report to the Historical Cycle of the Academy. Already deprived of adequate funding in the last quarter of 1932, the department received such a miserly sum in the first quarter of 1933 that the execution of its planned projects was under threat.⁷⁰ The State Publishing House of Ukraine in turn, citing economic difficulty and shortages of paper and technical resources, demanded that the Academy's commissions

63. Adriana Ohorchak and Borys Bilyns'kyi, 'Myron Korduba v spohadakh onukiv,' *Ukraina: Kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'*, no. 21 (2012): 864.

64. Ibid.; Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Myron Korduba ta ioho "Bibliohrafiia istorii Ukraïny,"' *UASHch*, nos. 5/6 (2001): 16–24. In a letter of 5 May 1947 to Serhii Maslov, Fedir Maksymenko mentions Korduba's funeral (Manuscript Institute, fond 33, spr. 5855). On the campaign against Hrushevsky's school in postwar Lviv, see Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Borot'ba z Hrushevs'kym ta ioho L'vivs'koiu shkoloiu za radians'kykh chasiv,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 1996, nos. 1–4: 88–141.

65. For the text of the document, see Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, *Vybrani pratsi: Vydano z nahody 25-richchia z dnia ioho smerty (1934–1959)*, comp. Mykola Halii (New York, 1960), p. 259; Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: *Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 41, p. 64. On this, see Tel'vak, 'Marksysts'ka retseptsiia,' p. 374.

66. Volodymyr Mel'nychenko, *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: 'Ia osnuvavsia v Moskvi, Arbat 55'* (Moscow, 2005), p. 420.

67. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Spohady*, p. 487.

68. *U pivstolitnikh zmahanniakh*, doc. 657, p. 652; Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: *Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 108, p. 157.

69. Dubrovskii, *Istoriik i vlast'*, p. 115.

70. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 38.

submit works for publication ‘with a decided emphasis of timely significance for socialist construction.’⁷¹ This amounted to a refusal to accept works for publication dealing with problems of Ukrainian history beyond the purview of those concerned with Stalin-era party- and state-building in the USSR.

After the first wave of imprisonment of Hrushevsky’s colleagues in 1931, the year 1933 also saw a new series of arrests and dismissals from academic positions. In February 1933 the GPU arrested Sylvestr Hlushko, accusing him of membership in the ‘Ukrainian Military Organization.’ Several months later he was sentenced to five years in a labor camp.⁷²

This was followed on 17 July by the arrest of Serhii Shamrai.⁷³ The grounds for his arrest were supplied by the transfer of Hrushevsky’s own library, archive, and other property, and probably part of the archive of the journal *Ukraïna* and a typewriter as well, from the premises of the History Section of the Academy to the Hrushevsky residence on Panko Street. While visiting Hrushevsky in Moscow, Shamrai asked him what to do with the *Ukraïna* archive and with unpublished submissions to the journal.⁷⁴ Thus, in all likelihood, Hrushevsky himself approved the transfer of those materials to his home. But the Academy raised a scandal about the matter. The vice president of the Academy, Oleksandr Palladin, sent a letter to the GPU requesting measures to return the materials from the Panko Street residence.⁷⁵ As a result, Shamrai was fired and imprisoned.⁷⁶

According to the testimony of Kateryna Hrushevaska, some of her father’s manuscripts were lost in the chaos as archives were relocated, inventories taken of property belonging to the Academy’s commissions, and libraries reorganized.⁷⁷ At this distant remove, there is little prospect of establishing which manuscripts Hrushevaska had in mind. The inspection of the Department of Ukrainian History and its associated commissions presents us with a picture of devastation at the Academy in the summer of 1933: ‘empty offices, broken locks, lost property—books, archival materials, manuscript files, and staff members arrested (Serhii Shamrai and Sylvestr Hlushko) or driven out,’ as described by Viktor Zaruba, a specialist on the period.⁷⁸

In one of his letters to Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, written in February 1934, the Ukrainian literary scholar Mykhailo Mohyliansky, who directed the Academy’s Commission for the Preparation of a Biographical Dictionary, allegorically described the repressive measures that the GPU was then carrying out at the Academy. Written with doleful irony, it offers eloquent testimony to the cruelty of those days. ‘You have doubtless seen chickens walking about a barnyard,’ he wrote. ‘Suddenly the cook comes out and begins chasing the chickens, catches two or three, and slaughters them on the spot. The chickens raise a din and start clucking, cluck-cluck-cluck, run around and try to escape... And then they gather around those that

71. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3517–3535, fol. 14.

72. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, ‘Istorychna nauka,’ p. 31; Iurkova, ‘Kyïvs'ka istorychna shkola,’ p. 265; idem, *Dial'nist'*, p. 335.

73. Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, pp. 169–76; Svitlana Pan'kova, ‘Serhii Shamrai: Vybir shliakhu (Shtrykhy do biohrafii nebozha i uchnia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho),’ *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk*, 2002, nos. 1–4: 313–38.

74. IL, fond 122, spr. 19, fol. 8.

75. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 97, p. 142.

76. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2526–2536, fol. 2–2'. Concerning this affair, with its fatal consequences for Shamrai, see receipts for his payments to workers who moved Hrushevsky’s property and the *Ukraïna* archive, dated 3 April and 25 May 1933 (Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642, fols. 596, 599).

77. IL, fond 122, spr. 19, fol. 8 (‘Shamrai came to Moscow twice concerning questions of money and the question of what to do with unused manuscripts submitted to *Ukraïna* but did not actually accomplish anything, so that during the liquidation of the last academic commissions in 1933 my father’s own manuscripts were lost.’).

78. Zaruba, ‘Rozhrom i znyshchennia,’ p. 165.

were slaughtered, and in their eyes one sees both terror and satisfaction that they were not the ones to be slaughtered... And then they suddenly quiet down, as if nothing had happened, probably trying to forget what they saw and hoping that nothing of the sort will happen again... There will be “peace and quiet”... Doesn’t this recall our Academy of Sciences and its staff?!”⁷⁹

The year 1933 was marked from beginning to end by slogans proclaiming a ‘breach’ in the Academy—the wholesale reorganization of its planned thematic research cycles in the humanities on the basis of Bolshevik Marxist methodology—as well as by purges of its academic staff and party cells. A crucial event was the reporting session of the Historical Cycle, which took place from 7 to 10 June. Its organizers intended the session to uncover ‘everything infamous’ in the Academy’s activity during the first five-year plan of 1928–33. Particularly harsh criticism was directed against Mykhailo and Kateryna Hrushevsky, who could no longer publish in Ukraine and generally submitted their works to Russian scholarly journals.⁸⁰ In the eyes of the Academy’s party hierarchy, this marked a contrast with the previous period, in which Hrushevsky, a ‘true falsifier,’ as he was called by the academic secretary of the Historical Cycle, Ivan Kravchenko,⁸¹ published a huge number of his own writings characterized by ‘national-democratic and fascist tendencies.’ In this connection, both Hrushevskys were accused of sabotaging Ukrainian historical research at the Academy.⁸²

At the plenum of the CP(B)U in November 1933, the party leaders Stanislav Kosior and Pavel Postyshev referred once again to the case of the ‘Ukrainian National Center,’ supposedly led by Hrushevsky and uncovered back in 1931.⁸³ The trial of the UNC had concluded in February 1932, when several dozen individuals accused of membership in the bogus organization were sentenced.⁸⁴ But the matter was raised again in late 1933 in connection with the fabrication in Moscow of a major campaign against Soviet academicians and members of the Russian intelligentsia—a campaign in which Hrushevsky was also targeted. The people’s commissar of education, Volodymyr Zatonsky, directed a hail of criticism against Hrushevsky at a session of the Academy in January 1934.⁸⁵ This was taken up at the higher level of the CP(B)U when its Twelfth Congress convened in the same month and Postyshev again condemned Hrushevsky as the leader of the UNC.⁸⁶

In Moscow, also in January 1934, there was a wave of arrests in connection with the ‘Case of the Slavists’ (also known in official circles as the case of the ‘Russian National Party’). Along with Hrushevsky, a number of Soviet academicians—Nikolai Derzhavin, Nikolai

79. Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv literatury i mystetstva Ukraïny (hereafter TsDALMU), fond 542, op. 1, spr. 199, fol. 38’.

80. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 153; nos. 1865–1866, fols. 4–5; Zaruba, ‘Rozhrom i znyshchennia,’ p. 162.

81. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2486–2525, fol. 47.

82. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 1859–1863, fol. 6’ (report on the work of the Second Socioeconomic Department of the Academy for 1933); nos. 1865–1866, fol. 18 (commission reports for 1933).

83. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 99, p. 145 (excerpt from Kosior’s speech of 20 November 1933); Kostiuk, ‘Taiemnytsia smerty,’ pp. 12–13.

84. Oleksandr Rubl'ov and Iurii Cherchenko, *Stalinschchyna i dolia zakhidnoukrains'koi intelihentsii: 20–50-ti roky XX st.* (Kyiv, 1994), pp. 97–102; Volodymyr Prystaiko and Iurii Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava ‘UNTs’ i ostanni roky (1931–1934)* (Kyiv, 1999), p. 97. For the memoirs of a defendant convicted in that case, an activist of the cooperative movement in the Kyiv region, with accounts of interrogations at which demands were made to testify against Hrushevsky, see O. Buzhans'kyi (Oleksander Rishchai), ‘Za gratamy GPU-NKVD,’ *Svoboda* (Jersey City), no. 258 (21 December 1950): 2.

85. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 101, pp. 146–50 (extracts from Zatonsky’s speech). Cf. the analysis in Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, pp. 136–38; Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 275, 408–9.

86. Kostiuk, ‘Taiemnytsia smerty,’ pp. 17, 23–24.

Kurnakov, Volodymyr Peretts, Mikhail Speransky, and Volodymyr Vernadsky—were implicated in the case, as were Professors Nikolai Durnovo, Grigorii Ilinsky, Vasiliï Korablev, and others. Many of them were arrested, condemned, stripped of their academic titles, and expelled from the Academy of Sciences, and some, such as Volodymyr Peretts, died in labor camps.⁸⁷

In the context of the decisions made at the November Plenum of the CC CP(B)U, the reports of the Academy's Second Division were replete with assertions that in 1933 the national-democratic and fascist leadership of the Academy had not yet reached the required 'turning point' in the struggle against the 'remnants of Hrushevskyism' in the discipline of history and was not working zealously to produce a 'timely Bolshevik plan of scholarly research activity.'⁸⁸ At the end of that year, some eighteen or twenty staff members of the Historical Cycle were dismissed, many of them condemned as 'Hrushevskyite scholars,' but that was evidently considered insufficient.⁸⁹

Living and working in Kyiv under such conditions was extraordinarily difficult. Many older scholars who had managed to avoid arrest succumbed to such moral pressure and passed away. This was 'a sign of the times, the result of the dead end into which all the so-called "humanities" have been driven in our day. In time they will, of course, revive, but I do not think that will happen soon. We are bound to be disappointed time and time again in that regard,' observed Academician Mykola Vasylenko, one of the most eminent scholars at the Academy and its second president, in September 1933.⁹⁰

The correspondence of members of the Academy, including Kateryna Hrushevka, attests to the great shortage of academic staff in the humanities at the time.⁹¹ In 1936, when the question of establishing an Institute of History and reviving the Department of Social Sciences was discussed at the Academy in Kyiv, Moscow historians wondered where scholars could be found to staff them, as the best intellectual cadres had been driven out.⁹²

In December 1933 plans were discussed for the creation of an Institute of History and Archaeography that was established on the basis of the Academy's Historical Cycle in February of the following year.⁹³ By that time, the scholarly institutions established by Hrushevsky had completely ceased to exist, and their staff members had been dismissed, arrested, or executed.

Hrushevsky's Life in Moscow and His Efforts to Organize Scholarly Research While in 'Honorary Exile' (1931–1934)

At the beginning of March 1931, Hrushevsky chaired his last meeting of the Council of the Academy's Department of Ukrainian History.⁹⁴ On 6 March he collected part of the hon-

87. Mikhail Robinson and D. P. Petrovskii, 'N. N. Durnovo i N. S. Trubetskoi: Problema evraziizstva v kontekste "dela slavistov" (po materialam OGPU–NKVD),' *Slavianovedenie*, 1992, no. 4: 68–82; Fedor Ashnin and Vladimir Alpatov, 'Delo slavistov': 30-e gody (Moscow, 1994), pp. 55, 59, 71, 195–206, passim; Iurii Shapoval, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Moscow and His Death (1931–34): New Revelations,' *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 24, no. 2 (1999): 90–91.

88. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1862, fol. 1; no. 1864, fols. 24–25.

89. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1862, fol. 2; nos. 1865–1866, fol. 19.

90. Manuscript Institute, fond 40, op. 1, spr. 1262, fol. 1'.

91. Arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii nauk (hereafter ARAN), fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 18–18^v (24 December 1936).

92. TsDALMU, fond 542, op. 1, spr. 199, fol. 39^v (Dmitrii Petrushevsky to Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, 10 January 1937).

93. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2486–2525, fol. 79; Oksana Iurkova, 'Istorychno-Arkheohrafichnyi instytut VUAN: Desiat' misiatsiv dial'nosti,' *Problemy istorii Ukraïny: Fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky*, no. 5 (2001): 268–306.

94. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2537–2619, fol. 119 (minutes of meeting of 1 March 1931).

orarium due him as a member of the editorial board of the journal *Ukraina*⁹⁵ and departed for Moscow on the following day.

This period of Hrushevsky's life and work is one of the least researched aspects of his biography, as has often been noted in studies on the subject.⁹⁶ Part of the reason for such neglect is that relevant archival materials for the period are extraordinarily sparse as compared to records for earlier years. This pertains not only to his personal documents but also to correspondence, such as the letters of Kateryna and Maria Hrushevsky after 1934. For example, the letters that the Moscow academician Dmitrii (Dmytro) Petrushevsky wrote to them at the time have not survived, nor do we have letters from Lev Peretts, Mykhailo Mochulsky, Kyrylo Studynsky, and many others who corresponded with Hrushevsky and his family during those years.⁹⁷ Those researching the subject are well aware of the problem, which has been emphasized by almost every historian writing about the Moscow period of Hrushevsky's life. Serhii Bilokin has even attempted to establish a chronology of Hrushevsky's correspondence and has commented on the mysterious fate of the Hrushevsky family archive after 1930.⁹⁸ Besides the correspondence of the 1930s, manuscripts have been lost—volumes 7 and 8 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* as edited by Kateryna Hrushevskva and her father's manuscripts of those works, Hrushevsky's manuscript of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, and others. Indeed, volume 10 of the latter work is the only one for which we do not have a manuscript (only the proofs have been preserved).⁹⁹ In all likelihood, much of this material was lost as a result of the several searches of the Hrushevsky residence in the latter half of 1938 in conjunction with Kateryna's arrest, as well as the other afflictions that the family suffered at the time, including the arrest of Hrushevsky's brother, Oleksandr, and the settlement of strangers in the building, as a result of which Mykhailo Hrushevsky's library and archive were crowded out.

Hrushevsky's departure from Kyiv was no mere research trip for work in the Moscow archives, such as he had taken before—for instance, in early 1930.¹⁰⁰ According to the testimony of eyewitnesses and contemporaries, he left for Moscow after a final parting with his department and the colleagues who worked there, expecting never to return to the Academy.¹⁰¹ A few days after his arrival in Moscow, on 19 March, he asked Oleksandr Shumsky, the head of the USSR Central Committee of educational personnel, to help him find employment in the capital.¹⁰² It is apparent from these sources that Hrushevsky was trying to avoid the ever more imminent prospect of imprisonment in Ukraine.

The tactic of avoiding arrest by moving to Russia was quite common at the time. Lev Okinshevych, for example, had made efforts in the spring of 1933 to leave Kyiv and work at the Northern Regional Pedagogical Institute in Vologda, where he was to head the Department

95. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642, fol. 59.

96. See, e.g., Kostiuk, 'Taiemnytsia smerty,' p. 9; Bilokin', 'Retsenziiia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' p. 257; Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, p. 124; Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 102.

97. See *Epistolarna spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho (Pokazhchik do fondu no. 1235 u TsDIA Ukrainy u m. Kyievi)*, comp. Ihor Hyrych (Kyiv, 1996).

98. Bilokin', 'Retsenziiia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' p. 258.

99. See Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv (hereafter TsDIAK), fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 146.

100. Manuscript Institute, fond 262, spr. 107 (postcard of 30 January 1930 to Dmytro Kravtsov).

101. Oksana Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 1981, nos. 1–4: 174; Ivan Kryp'iakevych, 'Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: Zhyttia i diial'nist',' *Ukraina: Kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'*, vyp. 8, p. 252.

102. Shapoval, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Moscow,' p. 82; Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, pp. 89–90.

of History of the Peoples of the USSR and teach a course on the subject. He also sought to remain a non-staff associate of the Ukrainian Academy. In his memoirs, Okinshevych described his psychological state at the time as follows: 'I felt the need to leave the Academy and depart from Kyiv before it was too late.... The transfer to Vologda offered hope that the NKVD would forget about me there....'¹⁰³

The same may be said of other scholars on staff at the Academy. Kostiantyn Antypovych, for example, departed for the Volga region in an attempt to escape persecution, while Oleksii Baranovych went to Symferopil [Simferopol].¹⁰⁴ In 1933 Pavlo Hliadkivsky, abandoning scholarship, made his way to Voronezh oblast, where he worked as an economic planner and then as a teacher.¹⁰⁵ Vasyl Denysenko went to the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Region of the Krasnoïarsk district, where he directed the regional museum of polar studies for a time.¹⁰⁶ Volodymyr Ievfymovsky found employment at the Novgorod branch of the Leningrad oblast archive.¹⁰⁷ The Ukrainian Orientalist Andrii Kovalivsky was obliged to move from Kharkiv to Leningrad, but that did not save him from arrest in 1938.¹⁰⁸

Many other examples could be cited. It is highly likely that, in departing for Moscow, Hrushevsky was acting on similar considerations. Thus, in 1931, it was thought in Moscow academic circles that he had settled there temporarily in order to escape the persecution then beginning in Kyiv.¹⁰⁹ But Hrushevsky's hopes of escaping the NKVD in that fashion were not borne out: on 23 March 1931 he was arrested and charged with having headed the bogus 'Ukrainian National Center.' His arrest had been authorized in Ukraine the previous day at the highest level—a meeting of the Politburo of the CC CP(B)U.¹¹⁰

Hrushevsky was arrested at the residence on 2/3 Pogodin Street, apartment 102, which the Academy had acquired for staff members of its archaeographic expedition. The arrest took place in the presence of Dmytro Kravtsov, a staff member who lived there with his family.¹¹¹ The mistreatment to which Hrushevsky was subjected between Moscow and Kharkiv (where he was taken for interrogation) from 23 March to 15 April ended with his release from confinement. He was allowed to settle in Moscow with no right to leave the city, as both he and his daughter attested.¹¹²

103. Lev Okinshevych, *Moia akademichna pratsia v Ukraïni* (Lviv, 1995), pp. 54–55. For documents of the Academy of Sciences pertaining to Okinshevych's efforts to leave for Vologda, see Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2486–2525, fols. 17^v, 27, 54.

104. Okinshevych, *Moia akademichna pratsia*, p. 53.

105. Iurkova, 'Kyïvs'ka istorychna shkola,' p. 266.

106. Oksana Iurkova, 'Denysenko Vasyl' Semenovych,' in *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukraïny*, vol. 2 (Kyiv, 2004), p. 334.

107. Iurkova, 'Kyïvs'ka istorychna shkola,' p. 268.

108. Omelian Pritsak, 'Peredmovna,' in Ella Tsyhankova, *Skhodoznavchi ustanovy v Ukraïni (Radians'kyi period)* (Kyiv, 2007), p. 9.

109. Grigorii Ilinsky to Boris Liapunov, 13 June 1931. See Mikhail Robinson, 'M. S. Grushevskii i rusaskaia akademicheskaia èlita,' *Slavianskii al'manakh 2008*, ed. Tatiana Vendina et al. (Moscow, 2009), [no. 13]: 187; idem, 'M. S. Hrushevs'kyj, la "Questione ucraina" e l'elite accademica russa,' *Slavica*, 2001, no. 4, *Pagine di ucrainistica europea*, ed. Giovanna Brogi Bercoff and Giovanna Siedina, p. 173. I wish to thank Serhii Plokhly and Myroslav Yurkevich for making the latter publication available to me.

110. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 88, p. 126.

111. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 89, pp. 126–27. For the record of the search and arrest, see Manuscript Institute, fond 357, od. zb. 20. The best works on the subject are Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, pp. 110–23; Shapoval, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Moscow,' pp. 82–85; Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 106. For details of the Academy's acquisition of the building, see Iurkova, *Dial'nist'*, p. 183.

112. IL, fond 122, spr. 19, fol. 7; V. Lykhytchenko, 'Deshcho zi spohadiv pro Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *Krakivs'ki visti* (Cracow), 3 February 1944, no. 23 (1056): 5.

Interesting data on GPU preparations for Hrushevsky's transfer to Moscow are to be found in a memoir of the Russian philosopher and historian Gavriil Gordon, a professor at the University of Moscow who was deputy head of the Council on Higher Educational Institutions in the 1920s (it was headed by Hrushevsky's friend Viacheslav Volgin, who later became an academician). The memoir has come down to us secondhand from Ukrainian engineers incarcerated with Gordon from 1936 to 1941 in a labor camp in the Volga region, where they built the Uglich hydroelectric station (this was Gordon's second period of incarceration after having been exiled to the Solovets Islands from 1929 to 1933 'for espionage').¹¹³ In one of his conversations with the Ukrainians, Gordon mentioned that he had known 'one of your countrymen who could live only in Moscow and nowhere else. Just imagine what a wonder it was: in Moscow they used a fine sieve to shake out all the politically unreliable elements, but your academician and historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who was very dangerous in Ukraine, was transferred to the city where the fear of counterrevolutionaries was greatest. And what an interesting approach they took to it! Our NKVD can do anything. So as not to disturb people in Ukraine and put a good face on it for foreigners, Hrushevsky was "elected" a full member of the All-Union Academy of Sciences, and, that being the case, it was incumbent on him to leave Kyiv for Moscow. Being close to him in Moscow because of our work, I learned from him personally that without permission he was not allowed to travel not only to Ukraine but also anywhere else in the Soviet Union.'¹¹⁴ GPU reports for 1928 mention Hrushevsky's possible transfer to Leningrad once he was elected an academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences.¹¹⁵ But it cannot be said with certainty that the CP(B)U and the secret police had such far-reaching plans when Hrushevsky's candidacy for election to the USSR Academy was put forward in early 1929.¹¹⁶ Still, Gordon's memoir attests that Hrushevsky, exiled to Moscow and forbidden even to visit Ukraine, was given to such conjectures.

The very fact of Hrushevsky's departure for Moscow created certain problems for the Academy with regard to accounting for his lengthy absence. After all, he was still head of the Department of Ukrainian History, even though the commissions he had established were gradually being dismantled and staff members dismissed. Initially, in the first days following Hrushevsky's release from imprisonment in April, it was unclear how long he would remain in Moscow. Accordingly, his 'assignment' was simply extended from month to month, and Serhii Shamrai was appointed acting head of the department in the meantime.¹¹⁷

Kateryna Hrushevka, as she noted in her annual reports and official forms, was 'assigned' to work as an assistant to her father because, 'owing to his eye disease, he could not manage without additional scholarly assistance.'¹¹⁸ But Academy officials themselves were sometimes uncertain how to manage the situation and signed papers authorizing a 'vacation' for Mykhailo and Kateryna.¹¹⁹ Shamrai was also at a loss and drafted passages in bureaucratic documents as

113. On these biographical facts, see Kristina Mironova, 'G. O. Gordon: Sud'ba i filosofskoe tvorchestvo,' *Izvestiia Saratovskogo universiteta*, n.s., Seriia: Filosofiia. Psikhologiia. Pedagogika 9, no. 4 (2009): 17–21; idem, 'Gavriil Osipovich Gordon v vospominaniakh svoikh detei,' *Kantovskii sbornik: Nauchnyi zhurnal, Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi universitet im. Immanuila Kanta (Kaliningrad)*, no. 31 (1) (2010): 59–65.

114. Lykhytchenko, 'Deshcho zi spohadiv,' p. 5.

115. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 202. Cf. Robinson, 'M. S. Grushevskii,' p. 187.

116. Sokhan', Ul'ianovs'kyi, and Kirzhaiev, *M. S. Hrushevs'kyi i Academia*, pp. 136–43; Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 249–53.

117. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 29.

118. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 22; nos. 3027–3082, fol. 63.

119. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 15156.

best he could, uncertain whether the Academy's top echelon considered Hrushevsky's absence a work assignment or vacation.¹²⁰

For a good four or five months, beginning in April 1931, Hrushevsky's departure from Kyiv remained undefined by any specific term. One thing was clear: first came his arrest, then his wife promptly went to join him, and that was followed by his release from prison and detention for residence in Moscow. As years went by, the Kyiv intelligentsia began referring to Hrushevsky's sojourn in Moscow with a term appropriate to the situation—'honorary exile' (the academician Ievhen Tymchenko and the poet Maksym Rylsky were among those who used the term).¹²¹

In Moscow the Hrushevskys led an impoverished existence in a cold, damp residence. Hrushevsky's correspondence was subject to mandatory censorship, and he was kept under secret surveillance; he also reported regularly to a GPU office. He then stopped doing so, as GPU agents began coming to his home for unannounced inspections.¹²² Soon afterward, in October 1932, the NKVD began constant surveillance of his daughter.¹²³

As time went on, Hrushevsky's eye disease became more acute, making it much harder for him to work. He did not give up hope of returning to Ukraine, considering his exile temporary. Hrushevsky sought support for such plans from the president of the Ukrainian Academy, Oleksandr Bohomolets, when the latter visited Moscow, as well as from the head of the USSR Council of People's Commissars, Viacheslav Molotov, and others.¹²⁴ He wrote in a letter that he wanted to visit Ukraine at least briefly in order to take part in an Academy session and give a paper on 'Eighteenth-Century Ukrainian Historiography: Some Considerations.'¹²⁵

To be sure, Hrushevsky was not of one mind about the matter. Volodymyr Vernadsky, who met with Hrushevsky in Moscow in the summer of 1932 and visited his home on Pogodin Street, noted in his diary that the political authorities had demanded as a condition of Hrushevsky's return to Kyiv that he repent of his historical views and renounce his convictions. Hrushevsky's refusal to do so and his courage in adversity aroused Vernadsky's sincere respect and admiration.¹²⁶ Oksana Stepanyshyna also mentions Hrushevsky's refusal to write such a 'declaration' at the demand of Lazar Kaganovich. She probably learned of the episode from Kateryna or, even more likely, from Maria Hrushevka.¹²⁷

But we also have contrary testimony on the subject dating from about the same time as Vernadsky's last meeting with Hrushevsky. One of the sources of such testimony is the reporting of Kostiantyn Shtepa, an agent of the NKVD from 1927–28, who began writing denunciations of Hrushevsky, his family, and his own colleagues in the Academy in the early 1930s (later, in the 1950s and 1960s, bearing the aura of a political prisoner, Shtepa became an émigré historian of Soviet scholarship).¹²⁸ Visiting Moscow in early September 1932 and

120. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3498–3516, fol. 2.

121. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 103; idem, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava 'UNTs'*, p. 113.

122. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 176; Kostiuik, 'Taiemnytsia smerty,' pp. 12–13; Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, pp. 102–3.

123. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava 'UNTs'*, p. 102; Iurii Shapoval, 'Zahadka smerti Mykhaila Hrushevskoho,' *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2006, no. 5: 89.

124. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' pp. 176–77.

125. Matiash, 'Zirka pershoi velychyny,' pp. 189–90.

126. Vladimir Vernadskii, *Dnevniky: 1926–1934*, ed. V. P. Volkov (Moscow, 2001), p. 355.

127. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 177.

128. Cf. his above-mentioned book, *Russian Historians and the Soviet State*. See also Shtepa's testimony about his collaboration with the NKVD (his code names were 'Lokhvitsky' and 'Medvedev') given at his trial on 16 April 1939, following his arrest in 1938: 'In 1927 I began working as a secret operative of the NKVD.... I also uncovered and unmasked

failing to find Hrushevsky at home—the historian was then in Kislovodsk—Shtepa met with the academician Mikhail Speransky. The latter told him that Hrushevsky was categorically opposed to going back to Ukraine, ‘even if they should begin to insist on it in Moscow, for he feels more at peace here.’¹²⁹ Considering the depths of vulgarity to which the anti-Hrushevsky campaign had then descended at the Academy, such considerations seem quite understandable.

Although it is hard to reconcile such disparate reports, an explanation may lie in Hrushevsky’s changing moods and his indefinite status ‘on assignment’ in a chilly residence in a foreign city. Although the Hrushevskys did everything in their power to resist the pressure of the NKVD and the All-Union Communist Party, it is hardly surprising that their morale was low. ‘So this difficult year is now coming to an end,’ wrote Maria Hrushevskya to Hanna Shamrai on 29 December 1933. ‘I think the new year will have begun by the time you receive this letter, but I offer no greetings and express no wishes, as all that would be bitter and inappropriate irony... What sort of greetings and wishes!! Better to make no mention...’¹³⁰ Hanna Shamrai was then a guest at her brother’s residence in Moscow, having arrived to make appeals on behalf of her son, Serhii, who was under arrest.¹³¹

In both scholarship and daily life, Hrushevsky’s daughter, Kateryna, was his faithful helpmate. In the summer of 1932 Volodymyr Vernadsky attested to the cheerlessness of their life in Moscow as follows: ‘Weary and ill, he is surrounded by the touching concern of his family—his wife and daughter. His daughter is, to all appearances, his faithful friend and scholarly assistant... He has begun to go blind; his strength was broken. He could not do archival work, but still he went on working.’¹³²

Kateryna Hrushevskya left for Moscow along with her father on 7 March 1931 and summoned her mother from Kyiv once he was arrested. A number of interesting if inconspicuous documents have been preserved—several receipts made out to the department, most of them bearing Hrushevsky’s forged signature (or, in some cases, original, but backdated), for editing fees received from the journal *Ukraina* during the period of his arrest (23 March–15 April 1931) and initial settlement in Moscow.¹³³ The family obviously lacked the funds required for

the nationalist organization headed by M. S. Hrushevsky. The NKVD gave me particularly important assignments, and I carried them out. I was dispatched to Moscow to [uncover] M. S. Hrushevsky’s anti-Soviet nationalist activity and carried out that assignment. I had to work under difficult circumstances.’ Cited in Serhii Bilokin’, *Masoviyi teror iak zasib derzhavnoho upravlinnia v SRSR (1917–1941 rr.): Dzhereloznavche doslidzhennia* (Kyiv, 1999), p. 246, n. 1585. Also cited in Ihor Verba and Mykhailo Samovalov, *Istoriya Kost’ Shtepa: Liudyna, vchenyi, pedahoh* (Kyiv, 2010), p. 104; cf. pp. 93–106 for an analysis of Shtepa’s trial. The authors seek to explain Shtepa’s forced actions as a secret NKVD operative and even to justify him (p. 105), but the attempt is highly unconvincing. Cf. Iurkova, *Diialnist’*, p. 262.

129. Shapoval, ‘Zahadka smerti,’ p. 89; Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi: Sprava ‘UNTs,’* p. 102. See also the report of 10 September 1932 to the head of the Secret Political Department of the OGPU attached to the Main Administration of State Security of the All-Union NKVD, Georgii Molchanov, concerning an agent of the Secret Political Department of the Kyiv Oblast Branch of the GPU who was departing to visit Hrushevsky in Moscow. The agent was also a close colleague of academic staff members of Hrushevsky’s department in Kyiv, and his report was a denunciation of two such staff members, Vasyi Denysenko and Sylvestr Hlushko, who had asked him to pass on information about the great famine of 1932–33 to Hrushevsky. Russian text in *Rozsekrechena pam’iat’: Holodomor 1932–1933 rokiv v Ukraini v dokumentakh HPU-NKVD*, ed. Serhii Bohunov et al., comp. Valentyna Borysenko et al. (Kyiv, 2007), doc. 7, p. 291. English translation in *The Holodomor Reader: A Sourcebook on the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine*, comp. and ed. Bohdan Klid and Alexander Motyl (Edmonton, 2012), pp. 240–41.

130. TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 1425, fol. 33.

131. Stepanyshyna, ‘Ostanni roky,’ p. 176.

132. Vernadskii, *Dnevniki*, p. 355. For significant details of Hrushevsky’s life in Moscow, cf. Stepanyshyna, ‘Ostanni roky,’ pp. 175–76.

133. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642, fols. 105 (4 April), 113 (14 April), 118 (6 June), 124 (Kateryna Hrushevskya,

the journey to Moscow and living expenses there when news of Hrushevsky's arrest came as a bolt from the blue. That was even more the case when all hope of reviving *Ukraina* seemed lost following Hrushevsky's arrest (cf. his above-mentioned letter of 20 January 1931 to Lev Peretts),¹³⁴ and the fees might have been lost irretrievably. The secretary of the Department of Ukrainian History, Ivan Shchitkivsky, preparing a financial document for Shamrai's signature in June 1931, asserted that work on *Ukraina* had come to a halt in April of that year, and there were no more staff members in the editorial office.¹³⁵

Having gone to Moscow for an extended stay to help her father, Kateryna had to begin by establishing the formal terms of her employment at the Academy. On 1 October 1931 she applied to have her planned research project, 'The Organization of Exchange in Primitive Societies,' canceled and to be transferred from the Commission on Cultural History to the post of senior scholar at the Department of the History of Ukraine in the Era of Commercial Capital.¹³⁶ Officially she was still considered to be on assignment by the Academy to help her father with his scholarly work in Moscow.

As noted earlier, Hrushevsky officially remained head of the department. With his departure from Kyiv, his students were deprived of the great solicitude he had shown them in organizing scholarly work at the Academy. Students continued to apply to Hrushevsky for consultations; he sent reports on his own work and Kateryna's to the department, but problems of communication between Kyiv and Moscow almost always delayed the department's general annual report to the Academy's Historical Cycle. For example, the late receipt of reports from Hrushevsky and his daughter for 1931 created problems in formulating the research plan for the following year. On this occasion it was decided to postpone the review of the plan.¹³⁷ The same situation occurred in 1932, when reports from Moscow were not received on time.¹³⁸ That made it difficult to meet bureaucratic deadlines for the preparation of documents. When it came to formulating annual plans or, still worse, a five-year plan, the consequences could be serious. That was the situation, for instance, in January 1932, when the department secretary, Ivan Shchitkivsky, wrote to the office of the Historical Cycle that research work for the second five-year plan could not be allocated until Hrushevsky's instructions were received concerning the problems to be studied.¹³⁹ Tardiness in formulating a five-year plan was a political matter, as department staff could be charged with sabotaging socialist planning at the Academy.

Without Hrushevsky's knowledge, the authorities at the Historical Cycle did not dare to change the name 'Department of the History of Ukraine in the Era of Commercial Capital' to 'Department of the History of Ukraine in the Era of Feudal Formation,' which they considered

8 June).

134. See n. 23 above.

135. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 15161. It is generally accepted in the scholarly literature that the journal ceased to exist in the autumn of 1930, but that represents only the factual aspect of the matter. As we have seen from Hrushevsky's letter to Lev Peretts, he had plans to continue publishing the journal. Such hopes were finally abandoned only after his arrest. The question then arose of what to do with the journal's archive: for his attempt to preserve it during the Academy's move in 1933, Serhii Shamrai would pay with his arrest and labor-camp sentence.

136. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fols. 1 (report of Kateryna and Mykhailo Hrushevsky on work accomplished in the department in 1931), 43 (minutes of department meeting of 1 October 1931); nos. 3498–3516, fol. 18 (letter of 18 November 1931 from the department to the Historical Cycle of the Academy's Second Division).

137. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 62 (department meeting of 17 December 1931); nos. 3027–3082, fols. 2, 65.

138. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3517–3535, fol. 2 (Ivan Shchitkivsky's letter of 10 January 1933 to the office of the Historical Cycle on the department's tardiness in submitting its report for 1932).

139. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3447–3497, fol. 4.

better suited to Marxist scholarly historical terminology and communist ideology.¹⁴⁰ Even so, the change of name was finally effected in 1932.

Thus, at least for the first two years after Hrushevsky's departure, the Academy's leadership had to reckon with him despite the great distance between them. That paradoxical situation continued notwithstanding the harsh voluntarist criticism of Hrushevsky and his students at the Academy. It became even worse in late 1932, when the Academy began to prepare for the previously mentioned June session of 1933, which was supposed to mark a turning point in the 'breach' with Hrushevsky's historical institutions. And that clear tendency to remove Hrushevsky from participation in the Academy's business was ineluctable.

At the Academy's session of 9–11 January 1934 it was decided to abolish the Department of History and Philology, which included the Historical Cycle along with Hrushevsky's department, and to establish twenty-one academic institutes instead. Mykhailo and Kateryna Hrushevsky were formally assigned to the Institute of History and Archaeography but not given paid staff positions. Thus the Hrushevskys in Moscow were threatened with losing their very means of existence. After several appeals, however, an Academy directive was issued on 22 March 1934 retroactively appointing both Hrushevskys to the Institute of History and Archaeography as of 1 January of that year.¹⁴¹

Hrushevsky's assignment to a salaried position in the reformed Academy now appeared settled. But the previous difficulties were followed by new ones initiated by government representatives. In May 1934 the people's commissar of education, Zatonsky, wrote an official letter to the party leaders of Ukraine, Kosior and Postyshev, proposing that 'organizational conclusions be drawn on the basis of what is known and already published with regard to Hrushevsky's counterrevolutionary activity' and that he be expelled from the Academy.¹⁴² But this time, too, the proposal was not approved at the highest political level.

Under the circumstances, Hrushevsky could have no thought of publishing anything in Ukraine. That applied not only to such fundamental works as the first part of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* or volume 6 of the *History of Literature* but even to articles in academic periodicals. From March 1931 until Hrushevsky's death, party officials and the GPU imposed an informal ban on the publication in Ukraine of anything written by him or Kateryna. The ban was in force even though Hrushevsky, continuing to direct the department and remaining an academician of the Ukrainian Academy, was still formally obliged to submit his publication plans to the State Publishing House. Given the change of thematic priorities there, it was now extremely difficult—and, for Hrushevsky, quite impossible—to publish a book on such a subject as seventeenth-century politics. In 1933—the year that would prove decisive in leading up to the final destruction of Hrushevsky's institutions—the department wrote to the Academy's publishing house about its publication plans. How were Hrushevsky's disciples to compose such an obligatory letter so as to mention their director by name while taking account of the informal ban on the publication of his work? The solution to such an apparently impossible task proved very simple: knowing which subjects were being given priority in the communist 'cultural revolution,' Hrushevsky submitted no publishing plans whatever, even though he had more than enough material ready for publication. The same may be said of Kateryna. 'The publication plans for 1933 of the director of the Department,

140. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 66; no. 963.

141. Iurkova, 'Istorychno-Arkheohrafichnyi instytut VUAN,' pp. 272, 279–80.

142. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: *Mizh istoriïeiu ta politykoïu*, doc. 102, p. 151 (text of the letter); cf. Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, pp. 138–39; Shapoval, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Moscow,' p. 91.

Acad[emician] M. S. Hrushevsky, and the research scholar K. M. Hrushevskia will be sent later,' read the laconic reference in the letter.¹⁴³

One can only wonder how it came about that in this period of incredible pressure for communist publications at the department permission was obtained to publish Viktor Iurkevych's monograph *Emihratsiia na skhid i zaliudnennia Slobozhanshchyny za B. Khmel'nyts'koho* (Emigration to the East and the Settlement of Sloboda Ukraine under Bohdan Khmelnytsky; Kyiv, 1932). The author had submitted a request for the publication of the book to the Presidium of the Academy's Socioeconomic Division as early as October 1930.¹⁴⁴ Despite the threatening situation at the Academy, the decision to publish the book was probably made because of its subject, Ukrainian-Russian relations.

Hrushevsky's critics turned the problem of his publications in Ukraine upside down, maintaining that he was deliberately refraining from submitting his writings to the State Publishing House and thereby sabotaging Ukrainian scholarship. Such accusations were particularly rife after the above-mentioned June 1933 session of the Academy, when the hallways were abuzz with news of an allegedly final 'breach' with the Academy's historical institutions. Hrushevsky was then accused of 'demonstratively' publishing his 'insignificant articles in Russian' in Leningrad.¹⁴⁵

But the ban on publishing Hrushevsky's work in Ukraine is confirmed not only by the context of the Academy's official attitude to him and his historical conceptions but also by documents of the period. Hanna Shamrai, for example, spoke about it with an NKVD agent recruited from among people trusted by the Hrushevsky family and sent to talk to her.¹⁴⁶ In 1934 Hrushevsky wrote about it in his letter to Molotov and even sought permission for the publication of his works with the assistance of Nikolai Bukharin, who, as Kateryna attested, 'promised to clarify the question of publications but did nothing.'¹⁴⁷ All this shows how desperately Hrushevsky was trying to bring his scholarly work to public attention at the time.

Serhii Ploky has advanced the hypothesis that while in Moscow Hrushevsky may have considered publishing his *History of Ukrainian Literature* in Russian translation. The hypothesis was based on one of Kateryna Hrushevskia's letters to her mother, written from internal exile in 1941, in which she asked: 'Have you heard anything about the translation of the sixth volume?'¹⁴⁸

Available materials concerning Hrushevsky's collaboration with the Institute of Slavic Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Leningrad shed some light on the question. The institute was headed by the academician Nikolai Derzhavin, who was also later interrogated by the NKVD in the case of the 'Russian National Party,' although he was not arrested. In the 1930s Hrushevsky published articles, notably about the Eyewitness Chronicle, in the *Trudy*

143. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 44–44^v.

144. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3084–3128, fol. 53.

145. See the report of the History Cycle for 1933 and for the whole five-year plan (Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 154; no. 1864, fol. 41^v). For a citation of one of these reports in the scholarly literature, see Zaruba, 'Rozhrom i znyshchennia,' p. 162.

146. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, pp. 103, 285.

147. Mel'nychenko, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 420; IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 9. Like Hrushevsky, Bukharin was elected an academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1929, but he was included in the quota for socioeconomic disciplines. See *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 78, p. 113; Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, p. 240.

148. Ploky, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, p. 429. The text of the letter appears in Matiash, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka*, p. 208.

Instituta slavianovedeniia AN SSSR (Works of the Institute of Slavic Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences).¹⁴⁹

There are suggestions in the scholarly literature that the article about the Eyewitness Chronicle was taken from volume 4 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*.¹⁵⁰ But these suggestions are based on a simple error: the Roman numeral VI was mistakenly read as IV. In a footnote to his article, Hrushevsky stated that he was presenting ‘...the content of a chapter devoted to that monument [the Eyewitness Chronicle] in volume VI of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, which I am currently completing.’¹⁵¹ But the text of that article, whose chronological range is the mid- and late seventeenth century, is not to be found in volume 6 of the *History*, published in 1995: the volume deals with the literary, cultural, and national movement from the late sixteenth century to the times of Petro Mohyla.¹⁵² We can therefore conclude that the article was taken from volume 7 or 8 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*. The mistaken reference in Hrushevsky’s footnote was due either to a mere typographical error in the typesetting of that issue of the *Trudy Instituta slavianovedeniia* or to Hrushevsky’s unwillingness to reveal his continuing work on the *History* in Moscow. The latter explanation is quite plausible, given the unrelenting criticism to which Hrushevsky’s work was being subjected at the Ukrainian Academy.

Nevertheless, Hrushevsky’s footnote shows that parts of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* were being translated into Russian and that prospects of translating volume 6, whose text had been completed long since, may have been under serious consideration. And, as Kateryna’s question in the above-mentioned letter indicates, some practical measures were taken to that end.

In any event, it may be said with certainty that after 1931 specialists in early history, even those lacking Hrushevsky’s scope and stature, could hardly manage to publish their works in Ukraine. They sought the slightest opportunities to make their way into Russian periodicals. A good example is that of Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, who made strenuous efforts for several months in 1934 to publish some of the material that had accumulated ‘in her desk drawer’ on the history of Zaporizhia and the Crimea in the second half of the eighteenth century, enlisting the help of the Moscow historians Boris Grekov (Borys Hrekov) and Dmitrii Petrushevsky. She wrote to Grekov on 18 February 1934: ‘It is clear that at present and for the next few years it will be impossible to count on placing such material in Ukrainian publications. Other subjects attract interest at present.’¹⁵³

It may also have occurred to Hrushevsky to send some of his work for publication abroad, but that would have been impractical and extremely dangerous. In the summer of 1934 an NKVD agent in Kyiv learned from Hanna Shamrai that Hrushevsky was taking care to avoid publishing any of his articles abroad because of the consequences that would inevitably ensue.¹⁵⁴ She had probably heard this directly from her brother: as noted earlier, she had visited him in Moscow in 1933.

149. Mikhail Grushevskii, ‘Samovidets Ruiny i ego pozdneishie otrazheniia,’ *Trudy Instituta slavianovedeniia AN SSSR* (Leningrad), no. 1 (1932): 157–92.

150. Elena Aksenova, ‘Institut slavianovedeniia AN SSSR,’ in idem, *Ocherki iz istorii otechestvennogo slavianovedeniia: 1930-e gody* (Moscow, 2000), p. 79; Robinson, ‘M. S. Grushevskii,’ p. 200; idem, ‘M. S. Hruševs’kyj,’ p. 173.

151. Grushevskii, ‘Samovidets Ruiny i ego pozdneishie otrazheniia,’ p. 157, n. 1.

152. Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi, *Istoriia ukrains’koï literatury*, vol. 6 (Kyiv, 1995).

153. TsDALMU, fond 542, op. 1, spr. 84, fol. 1^o; spr. 199, fol. 4.

154. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi*, pp. 103, 285.

Such conversations took place at a time when information was reaching the NKVD about the possibility of Hrushevsky's escaping to Finland in the course of a research trip to Leningrad.¹⁵⁵ To be sure, there was no real prospect of Hrushevsky and his family carrying out such a plan. Yet there were efforts of some kind in the Ukrainian diaspora in England to bring Hrushevsky over from Moscow—a fact not yet noted in the scholarly literature. In a review of news from the English press, a Lviv newspaper noted that 'the Ukrainian Bureau in London has made efforts through English academic circles to bring Professor Hrushevsky to England from Moscow.'¹⁵⁶ The article goes on to say that an English university had agreed to give Hrushevsky a professorial position. Although it is known that such offers had been made to him by the University of Oxford in 1923,¹⁵⁷ it is hardly likely that similar offers could have had any practical effect in the 1930s: snatching someone of Hrushevsky's stature from the jaws of the Soviet secret police was impossible.

Regardless of the extremely difficult conditions at the Academy after Hrushevsky's departure, he would not give in to circumstance and kept thinking about the organization of scholarly research. 'Almost the whole time he spent in Moscow, my father tried to revive his publications—if not the journal, then at least his own works—but those efforts were unsuccessful and reduced him to a mood of severe depression in which he considerably lost interest in his former community work,' wrote Kateryna in testimony given in the course of her interrogation in 1938.¹⁵⁸

A huge problem that faced the Academy immediately in March 1931 was the fate of the materials collected by its archaeographic expeditions in Moscow, Kyiv, Lviv, Cracow, Warsaw, Leningrad, and elsewhere.¹⁵⁹ After all, those documents were not intended for use only in the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and the *History of Ukrainian Literature*. The Department of Ukrainian History had developed a huge project for the publication of historical sources. Most significant here were the documents on the history of the seventeenth-century Ruin collected by Vasyl Herasymchuk that were lost by the Archaeographic Commission in 1931 and soon dropped from planned publication in *Ukraïns'kyi arkhiv* (Ukrainian Archive).¹⁶⁰ The great corpus of Muscovite sources on the period from the 1650s to the 1670s was planned, inter alia, as a continuation of the work of Mykola Kostomarov and Panteleimon Kulish on the *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (Documents on the History of Southwestern Russia).¹⁶¹ Given the change of priorities in the work of the Academy's Historical Cycle, where subjects constituting 'weapons in the struggle for socialism' were favored, this important project was also consigned to oblivion.

The selection of sources in Moscow was halted in the spring of 1931. This was done very abruptly, for the Archaeographic Commission had presented proposals to the Academy concerning the further selection of documents as recently as December 1930.¹⁶² Dmytro

155. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 104.

156. 'Zhadka pro prof. M. Hrushevs'koho v angl[iis'kii] presi: "Taims" pro smert' Velykoho Vchenoho i Patriota,' *Novyi chas* (Lviv), 23 December 1934, no. 285: 1.

157. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, p. 203.

158. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 8.

159. For detailed accounts of these expeditions, see Iurkova, *Diial'nist'*, pp. 176–90; Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 256–60, passim.

160. Fedoruk, 'Vasyl' Harasymchuk,' pp. 25–26. See the more detailed discussion in the next section, nn. 300–306.

161. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 18622, fol. 8; Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 259–60.

162. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 10705–10807, fol. 137.

Kravtsov, the principal executor and coordinator of the project in Moscow, was then consulting with the Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era on further plans to establish the chronological framework for the selection of material. There seemed to be no indication that the project was to be scrapped completely. On the contrary, there was so much work in the offing that Kravtsov asked the head of the commission, Viktor Iurkevych, in a friendly letter of 7 January 1931 not to include the copying of documents of 1675 in the plan but to limit it to the years 1673–74.¹⁶³

On 23 March Kravtsov became a witness to Hrushevsky's arrest. Once the latter was released, the two families huddled together for some time in the same residence on Pogodin Street. Given the uncertain conditions, Kravtsov was obliged to cease copying archival documents and move to Leningrad in late 1931. As officially formulated in the departmental report for 1931, the reason for ceasing work on the selection of documents for copying in the Moscow archives was 'lack of funds.'¹⁶⁴ In the first quarter of 1931 the Academy was seriously in arrears in paying the salaries of those staff members who had copied documents while engaged in the expedition.

In the spring and summer of 1931 Hrushevsky continued the archival work himself (his residence was fairly close to the archives), but it proceeded very slowly.¹⁶⁵ It became necessary to reorganize the archaeographic project, reducing its scope very considerably. Almost immediately after his release from prison, Hrushevsky demanded that his department continue the copying of sources held in the Kyiv archives (prior to his departure for Moscow, that work had been carried out by the department secretary, Ivan Shchitkivsky).¹⁶⁶ In the spring of the following year Hrushevsky insisted successfully that an assistant at the department, Liudmyla Shevchenko, be dispatched to the Moscow archives to undertake a new selection of documents.¹⁶⁷ It seemed to Hrushevsky that matters were proceeding tolerably well, for on 4 December 1932 he wrote to Lev Peretts that in a few days the Academy would provide him with funds to cover additional research expenses.¹⁶⁸

In this connection, it is important to pursue the little-known subject of Hrushevsky's organization of work on the archaeographic expedition in Leningrad. Special studies of the work of the Department of Ukrainian History emphasize that the plans of that continuing expedition were not carried out for lack of time.¹⁶⁹ That is not entirely true, although in comparison with the Moscow expedition the one in Leningrad appeared to be much less active.

The documents selected for Hrushevsky in Leningrad pertained mainly to his *History of Ukrainian Literature*. Searches were also made and catalogs compiled of old imprints, and Vladimir Peretts was involved in organizing that activity. In 1926–27 Sofia Shcheglova, a scholar of religious verse of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, copied documents to be used in volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*. These were copies of documents held mainly at the State Public Library and the Leningrad Central Historical Archives.¹⁷⁰

163. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3547–3568, fol. 28.

164. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 1. Cf. the report of the Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era on work accomplished during the first five-year plan (Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 3).

165. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 1.

166. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fols. 2, 9^v.

167. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3447–3497, fol. 27.

168. RGALI, fond 398, op. 1, d. 1, fol. 20.

169. Iurkova, *Diial'nist'*, p. 178.

170. Hrushevskyyi, *Istoriia ukrains'koï literatury*, 6: 177, 223, 225, passim. See Shcheglova's receipts for payments made

Shcheglova's collaboration with Hrushevsky was not limited to her participation in the Leningrad archaeological expedition: she also contributed articles to publications of the Ukrainian Academy in the latter half of the 1920s.¹⁷¹

Another scholar who made copies in Leningrad at Hrushevsky's behest was the above-mentioned Lev Peretts. Their correspondence for the years 1930–33, preserved in the Russian State Archives of Literature and Art in Moscow, has not yet been used by students of Hrushevsky's work, but it casts some light on the subject at hand. It is apparent from Hrushevsky's letters that Peretts carried out some work for him in 1930–31, although it did not necessarily involve the copying of documents.¹⁷² Peretts belonged to the Society of Scholars of Ukrainian History, Literature, and Language in Leningrad.¹⁷³ He was closely involved with the journal *Ukraïna*, and Hanna Shamrai translated his Russian-language articles for publication in that journal.¹⁷⁴ Other materials of his were prepared for publication in the seventh issue of *Za sto lit* for 1930, which never saw print.¹⁷⁵

Other remarks of Hrushevsky's, however, particularly in his letter of 4 December 1932, suggest that at the time Peretts was helping him collect material for the *History of Ukrainian Literature*. Hrushevsky asked: 'Would you be willing and able, at my direction, to carry out some searches for the purposes of my work, make notes, and so on in the materials of the Pub[lic] Libr[ary], the f[ormer] Pushkin House, the libr[ary] of the Academy of S[ciences] and the l[ike]?'¹⁷⁶ Peretts appears to have accepted the proposal and helped gather material for volumes 7 and 8 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, as discussed below.

But Hrushevsky's hopes, expressed in his letter of 4 December 1932, that the Academy would fund these searches for material and archaeological work proved premature. Correspondence between the Department of Ukrainian History and the Academy's accounting office in 1933 reveals the actual state of affairs. On 14 December 1932 the department notified the Academy of arrears in the amount of 200 rubles in payments due to Peretts 'for selecting material in Leningrad for the work of the head of the department.'¹⁷⁷ There was no change in the situation as of January 1933, and the department still owed salary arrears to Peretts and other staff members.¹⁷⁸ In April, when it was already clear that the department had received only minimal financing from the Academy for the first quarter of 1933, Serhii Shamrai wrote a sharply worded letter to the academic secretary of the Historical Cycle. 'These miserable sums,' he wrote, 'can in no way cover the work to be done by the commission and pose a threat first and foremost to the department, for whose work material is being selected in both Kyiv and Leningrad, with regard to the timely fulfillment of its plans.'¹⁷⁹

to her for copying documents (Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642, fols. 543, 719, 805, 880).

171. See *Vydannia Akademii nauk URSS: 1919–1967: Suspil'ni nauky* (Kyiv, 1969), pp. 20, 36, 282; Hrushevsk'kyi, *Istoriia ukrains'koï literatury*, 6: 50, 106ff.

172. RGALI, fond 398, op. 1, d. 1, fol. 20 (letter of 4 December 1932).

173. Viktor Dudko, 'Prospekt nevydanoho zbirnyka Tovarystva doslidnykiv ukrains'koï istorii, pys'menstva i movy u Leninhradi,' *Kyïvs'ka starovyna*, 1997, nos. 1–2: 48–57.

174. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642, fol. 397. On advances to Peretts for his work in mid- and late 1930, see RGALI, fond 398, op. 1, d. 1, fols. 2, 5.

175. Pan'kova and Shevchuk, "'Za sto lit': Pokazhchyk zmistu,' pp. 247–48, 251.

176. RGALI, fond 398, op. 1, d. 1, fol. 20; cf. fol. 33.

177. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3517–3535, fol. 13 (draft of 11 April 1933, written in the hands of Ivan Shchitkivsky and Serhii Shamrai).

178. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fols. 14, 40.

179. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 38.

Hrushevsky generally attempted to maintain the closest possible ties with the Department of Ukrainian History, especially in the first two years of his exile. Few of his and Kateryna's letters to the department (mainly requests for publications)¹⁸⁰ have been preserved, but the large number of receipts for printed matter and packages sent to Moscow that remain in the department's archive attest to a fairly active correspondence between Hrushevsky and his students.¹⁸¹

Hrushevsky's lack of access to his private library, which was left in Kyiv, was a great obstacle to progress in his research and writing. He sometimes admitted this in letters written from Moscow to the people closest to him.¹⁸² He was obliged to borrow books from Moscow acquaintances, often from the academician Mikhail Speransky.¹⁸³ Not all the books borrowed from Speransky could be duly returned, especially after his arrest in April 1934, when the Hrushevskys lost contact with him.¹⁸⁴ After her father's death, Kateryna took some of Speransky's books to Kyiv and expressed regret in one of her letters to Dmitrii Petrushevsky that she had not yet been able to return them to their owner.¹⁸⁵

Another way of filling lacunae in the texts on which Hrushevsky worked in Moscow was his wide-ranging correspondence with individuals in Ukraine whom he asked to find references in the scholarly literature. The Kyiv residents to whom he appealed most often in such matters were his sister, Hanna, and his brother, Oleksandr.¹⁸⁶ Of those living in Lviv, he wrote most often to Mykhailo Vozniak as long as the latter, also the author of a history of Ukrainian literature, remained a member of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.¹⁸⁷ After Vozniak's expulsion from the Academy, it became dangerous to write to him directly. During her interrogations by the NKVD in 1938–39, Kateryna commented on the matter as follows: 'From Moscow I wrote several times to my sister [i.e., cousin Olha] Mochulska, asking that she request a number of literary references from [Mykhailo] Vozniak. I did not venture to write to him after he was expelled from the Ac[ademy] of Sciences. I had also repeatedly turned to him, to V[olodymyr] Doroshenko, and to J[irí] Polívka in Prague with such requests for literary references on behalf of various people.'¹⁸⁸

Living in exile, Hrushevsky remained fairly well acquainted with developments in Ukraine, not only in the academic sphere. He had a general idea of the tragedy then unfolding in the Ukrainian countryside. Thus, when a member of the Academy (not then known to be an agent of the NKVD) set out for Moscow in September 1932, Hrushevsky's students asked him to tell their teacher that whole villages were dying of hunger in Ukraine, with a particularly striking rate of child mortality. The students characterized this as a deliberate policy intended to 'break

180. See, e.g., Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3498–3516, fols. 3, 4; no. 18945, fol. 1^v.

181. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642 (passim; documents mainly for 1931–32).

182. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho (1901–1933)*, comp. Roman Dziuban (Lviv, 2004), doc. 116, p. 115; doc. 199, p. 122.

183. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, pp. 103–4; idem, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava 'UNTs'*, p. 103.

184. Mikhail Speransky was arrested on 12 April 1934 in connection with the case of the 'Russian National Party.' On 16 June he was sentenced to three years' internal exile in Ufa, but the sentence was suspended on 17 November. See Ashnin and Alpatov, *'Delo slavistov': 30-e gody*, pp. 95–97.

185. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 5^v (letter of 17 November 1935).

186. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 103.

187. Myroslava Diadiuk, 'Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Vozniaka: 1909–1932 rr.,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 2006–7, nos. 4 (172) / 1–2 (173–74): 152–53 (letter of 26 December 1932).

188. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 21, fol. 5. Letters from the Hrushevskys to Olha and Mykhailo Mochulsky written in 1932–33 often included requests for a variety of scholarly information. See *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, docs. 115–20, pp. 107–24.

the Ukrainian nation once and for all,' as the peasantry was the only national force strong enough to mount resistance against Soviet rule.¹⁸⁹

Hrushevsky also knew of the decision of the Galician community and cultural activists Iuliiian Bachynsky and Antin Krushelnytsky to move to the Ukrainian SSR for permanent residence and was taken aback by such imprudence at a time of tremendous upheaval.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, as early as December 1934 they and other Ukrainian activists were arrested and sentenced to internal exile or execution during the wave of repression that followed the murder of Sergei Kirov.¹⁹¹

Such news reached Hrushevsky when he was visited by relatives, friends, and other guests from Ukraine. True, there were not many who came to visit, for 'it was dangerous,' as Oksana Stepanyshyna wrote.¹⁹² Those who came from Ukraine to visit the Hrushevskys on Pogodin Street included Serhii Shamrai (twice); his mother, Hanna; the art scholar and ethnographer Natalia Kotsiubynska, a former member of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries and then a graduate student at the Academy who worked closely with Danylo Shcherbakivsky; Arkadii Stepanenko, another Socialist Revolutionary who was arrested in 1931 in the case of the 'Ukrainian National Center'; and Isydora Kosach, passing through Moscow on the way to visit her husband, Iurii Borysiv, in a labor camp.¹⁹³ When Hrushevsky arrived in Moscow, he met Iurii Iaroslav, another activist who had been arrested in the case of the 'Ukrainian National Center' in 1931.¹⁹⁴ One of those who did not fear to visit the Hrushevsky residence—for other reasons, to be sure—was Kostiantyn Shtepa.¹⁹⁵ As we have seen, after such visits he would write reports to the NKVD about the historian's mood. Among Hrushevsky's students, we have information about Sylvestr Hlushko and Viktor Iurkevych, who made official research trips to the Moscow archives in 1932.¹⁹⁶ One can only speculate about meetings they may have had with Hrushevsky, as no documentary evidence has been discovered.

Such was the academic and general Ukrainian milieu with which Hrushevsky maintained contact during his exile. Sources shedding light on such contacts are very scarce. We can say with certainty that this was the circle of his family, students, close friends, former comrades from the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, and others. He did not fear to receive relatives of exiled Ukrainian activists or those who, having served their sentences, passed through Moscow on their way back to Ukraine. The NKVD continued its surveillance of such people, and showing support or sympathy for them in word or deed was dangerous, especially for such politically unreliable individuals as Hrushevsky. Aside from the historian's civic courage, which the NKVD was unable to break, this attests to his human qualities and conscience.

It is also important to take account of the Russian academic milieu with which Hrushevsky maintained contact in Moscow. This makes it possible to identify the circle in which he sought

189. *Rozsekrechena pam'iat'*, doc. 7, p. 291; *The Holodomor Reader*, p. 241.

190. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 9.

191. Ukrainian political parties issued a declaration against these and other repressive measures: 'Proty bol'shevyts'koho teroru na Vel[ykii] Ukraïni: Rezoliutsii Prezydii UNDO i UPR,' *Novyi chas* (Lviv), 23 December 1934, no. 285: 3; 16 December 1934, no. 280: 1.

192. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 176.

193. *Ibid.*; IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fols. 8–9.

194. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 9.

195. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 8. On Shtepa's assignment from the Academy to spend July and August 1934 in Moscow, see Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 40.

196. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3497–3747, fol. 30; nos. 3498–3516, fol. 19.

the relief of intellectual company. These were mainly people whom he had come to know in the course of his work in Ukraine or even in his university days. His closest contacts were probably those with the above-mentioned academicians Mikhail Speransky and Dmitrii Petrushevsky.

Speransky, an established historian of Old Rus' literature, had contributed not only to the periodicals that Hrushevsky edited at the Academy after his return to Ukraine in 1924 but also to the festschrift in his honor.¹⁹⁷ Moreover, as a result of his collaboration with Speransky, Hrushevsky had nominated him as a full member of the History Section of the Academy, which was ratified at one of its sessions.¹⁹⁸ Once Hrushevsky arrived in Moscow, the two men grew even closer. Contributing to this were Speransky's 'Mondays'—informal meetings with members of his close circle who were welcome to visit him at home without invitation and converse on a variety of intellectual affairs. Speransky had established such a routine even before the revolution and continued it in the Soviet period.¹⁹⁹ When the NKVD accused him of belonging to the 'Russian National Party,' Speransky's 'Mondays' were represented as conspiratorial meetings. As Nikolai Durnovo later said under interrogation, Hrushevsky attended those gatherings quite often.²⁰⁰ He did not, of course, come for the sole purpose of making use of Speransky's library. When Speransky was interrogated in April 1934, he said that when visiting his home Hrushevsky 'spoke of Ukraine, but only of the difficult situation of scholarship in Ukraine; of the difficult situation of the Academy; of the fact that scholarly activity, having made such a good start, had decreased considerably over the last few years.'²⁰¹ For Hrushevsky, those 'Mondays' may well have been the sole opportunity to share reminiscences and exchange ideas with trusted colleagues about the state of scholarship in Ukraine.

Later, in 1933–34, when arrests took place in Moscow and Leningrad in the 'Case of the Slavists,' Hrushevsky could hardly have known that he, too, was in the NKVD records as one of those who might be implicated, although he may have surmised as much. Besides Speransky, his Leningrad friends Volodymyr Peretts and Sofia Shcheglova were among those arrested.²⁰² But Hrushevsky was not arrested or interrogated in connection with the case, although the sword of Damocles hung over him the whole time. Today some Russian historians write that only Hrushevsky's death saved him from arrest in 1934.²⁰³ Whatever the degree of truth in such claims, it seems beyond doubt that the NKVD had plans for Hrushevsky, especially given the fact that he died under circumstances never fully ascertained.²⁰⁴

The academician Dmitrii Petrushevsky was probably one of the historians who most frequently visited Hrushevsky at home. 'His old friend of student years in Kyiv, the academician D. M. Petrushevsky, who wrote to us frequently and in detail about him, visited him almost daily,' wrote Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko in her memoirs.²⁰⁵ Along with her husband,

197. *Vydannia Akademii nauk URSS: 1919–1967*, pp. 19, 26, 36. Cf. Robinson, 'M. S. Grushevskii,' pp. 187, 190.

198. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2537–2619, fols. 103, 108.

199. Ashnin and Alpatov, *'Delo slavistov': 30-e gody*, pp. 90–91.

200. Robinson and Petrovskii, 'N. N. Durnovo i N. S. Trubetskoi,' p. 81.

201. Cited in Ashnin and Alpatov, *'Delo slavistov': 30-e gody*, p. 95; idem, "'Delo" M. N. Speranskogo,' *Izvestiia RAN. Seriya literatury i iazyka* (Moscow) 52, no. 2 (1993): 83.

202. Ashnin and Alpatov, *'Delo slavistov': 30-e gody*, pp. 127–31, 206.

203. Ashnin and Alpatov, "'Delo" M. N. Speranskogo,' p. 79.

204. Svitlana Pankova, the director of the Mykhailo Hrushevsky Historical and Memorial Museum in Kyiv, is currently preparing a detailed article on the subject on the basis of new material from TsDIAK.

205. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Spohady*, p. 485; Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, p. 253. Searches for these letters in the fonds of Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, Mykola Vasylenko, and Dmitrii Petrushevsky have yielded no positive results to date.

Mykola, she was a very close friend of Petrushevsky's. Oksana Stepanyshyna also mentioned the latter's frequent visits to Hrushevsky's residence on Pogodin Street.²⁰⁶

Hrushevsky and Petrushevsky both graduated from the Department of History and Philology at Kyiv University (Petrushevsky in 1886, when Hrushevsky was beginning his first year of study). In 1894 Petrushevsky left for Moscow, where he stayed, while Hrushevsky went to Lviv. It is hard to say anything definite about their subsequent relations, but they must at least have followed each other's careers. In 1929 both men were elected academicians of the USSR Academy of Sciences. But it would appear that they reestablished close relations late in life, probably owing in part to Speransky's 'Mondays.' The cordial relations between their families are also attested by Kateryna's and Maria's letters to Speransky written after 1934, now preserved in Moscow.²⁰⁷

Hrushevsky's milieu in Moscow also included Volodymyr Vernadsky and Gavriil Gordon, already mentioned above. Vernadsky visited him at home, notably in 1932 to say goodbye before going abroad.²⁰⁸ Gordon, a university professor, was a highly colorful figure and so erudite that meetings with him were not forgotten. Boris Pasternak gave a literary depiction of Gordon in his *Safe Conduct* and *Doctor Zhivago*. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Dmitrii Likhachev recorded their impressions of him in memoiristic works.²⁰⁹ The return of such a remarkable individual from the Solovets Islands in 1933 cannot have gone unnoticed in Moscow intelligentsia circles. According to Gordon's own testimony, he was close to Hrushevsky 'in Moscow because of our work' and knew details of the latter's scholarly life that he could only have learned through personal contact.²¹⁰

In 1931 the academician Nikolai Derzhavin planned to involve Hrushevsky in the Institute of Slavic Studies, which began its activity in September of that year. Derzhavin, who had been appointed director, expected that if Hrushevsky were to move to Leningrad from Moscow, he would head the history and economics sector of the newly established institute.²¹¹ Hrushevsky also met with many Ukrainian and Russian scholars, writers, and other cultural figures while vacationing at the Kislovodsk sanatorium in 1932 and 1933.²¹²

The picture of Hrushevsky's milieu in Moscow would be far from complete if we were to omit his relations with party officials. It was, after all, thanks to the intervention of certain party leaders that the NKVD left him alone in Moscow.

As far as Hrushevsky was concerned, the most influential individuals in those circles were his cousin Georgii Lomov of the Oppokiv family (Lomov's father, Ippolit, and Hrushevsky's mother, Hlafira, were brother and sister in the Oppokiv family).²¹³ Lomov was highly placed

206. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 176.

207. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, 57. For a survey of these letters, see Oksana Iurkova, 'Kateryna Hrushevs'ka: Shtrykhy do biohrafii cherez pryzmu lystiv do Dmytra Petrushevs'koho (1934–1938),' in *Istorychna ta literaturna spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho (Materialy mizhrehional'noi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii)* (Kyiv, Lviv, Vinnytsia, Kamianets-Podilskyyi, and Bar, 2005), pp. 224–27.

208. Vernadskii, *Dnevniky*, p. 355; Nowacki, Telwak, and Telwak, *Biohrafichni narysy*, pp. 206–7.

209. Mironova, 'G. O. Gordon,' p. 18.

210. Lykhytchenko, 'Deshcho zi spohadiv,' p. 5.

211. Aksenova, 'Institut slavianovedeniia AN SSSR,' p. 66. See also Robinson, 'M. S. Grushevskii,' p. 200; idem, 'M. S. Hrushevs'kyj,' p. 172.

212. On these meetings, see Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava 'UNTs*, 'pp. 106–7. Cf. Iurii Smolych, *Rozpovid' pro nespokii: Deshcho z knyhy pro dvadtsiati i trydtsiati roky v ukrains'komu literaturnomu pobutti*, bk. 1 (Kyiv, 1968), pp. 66–69.

213. Serhii Bilokin', 'Lyst Heorhiia Lomova do kuzyny—Hanny Hrushevs'koï-Shamrai,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 1995, nos. 1–4: 184; Mykola Kucherenko, Svitlana Pan'kova, and Halyna Shevchuk, *Ia був ikh starshyi syn (Rid Mykhaila*

in the all-Union party and government as a member of the Politburo of the CC CP(B)U, head of the All-Union Oil Industry Association, and deputy head of the USSR State Planning Agency, among other posts. Having entry to the offices of the top-level Soviet *nomenklatura*, he helped Hrushevsky out of difficulties associated with his arrest and subsequent life in Moscow.²¹⁴ Hrushevsky appealed to Lomov's authority, as for example in his letter to Molotov, telling the latter that Lomov could personally supply him with all the information required.²¹⁵ Lomov also helped the Hrushevsky family in 1933, when Serhii Shamrai was arrested. Twice in August of that year and once in December, Hrushevsky met with a public prosecutor of the USSR, Ivan Akulov, and presented him with appeals to release his nephew. Once a variety of information and bureaucratic paperwork had been assembled, Lomov met with Akulov on 20 December,²¹⁶ but the effort proved futile, and Shamrai served all three years of his first incarceration in the camps.

The Hrushevskys maintained family relations with Lomov in Moscow, and Mykhailo visited him at home.²¹⁷ In November 1934 Kateryna informed Lomov of her father's death by telegram from Kislovodsk, treating him as one of the closest members of her circle.²¹⁸

Hrushevsky's contacts with Oleksandr Shumsky and Nikolai Bukharin concerning his scholarly work have already been mentioned. He also had a long association with Fedir Konar, who was deputy people's commissar of agriculture, as well as head of the financial sector and member of the collegium of the USSR People's Commissariat of Agriculture, and a friend of Nikolai Yezhov. Born in Galicia, Konar studied at Lviv University as a young man, served in the Legion of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen, and belonged to the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries. According to Hrushevsky's own testimony given in the course of his interrogation in April 1931, they had been acquainted in prerevolutionary Lviv, when Konar was a student.²¹⁹ Konar was arrested in early 1933 and charged with espionage and counterrevolutionary 'organization of wreckers' in a rural area whose activity had supposedly set off the famine that swept the country. Before his arrest, however, according to Kateryna's testimony, Konar had repeatedly urged Hrushevsky to appeal his situation to the CC CP(B)U, promising to arrange a meeting with a highly placed party official. In fact, nothing was done in the matter.²²⁰

All this gives a general idea of Hrushevsky's life in Moscow and his efforts to maintain relations with the Academy, the Russian intellectual milieu, and party and state officials. Unfortunately, it is impossible to describe this important aspect of Hrushevsky's life in detail, as there is a dearth of surviving material on the subject. Faced with constant NKVD surveillance and worsening eye disease, he lived out his last years in Moscow. Deprived of the opportunity to publish in Ukraine and driven out of the Academy for which he had done so much, Hrushevsky pressed on with his scholarly work and strove to continue the activity of the archaeological expeditions in Kyiv, Moscow, and Leningrad.

Hrushevs'koho (Kyiv, 2006), pp. 384–87.

214. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' pp. 175, 177; Kostiuk, 'Taiemnytsia smerty,' pp. 25–27.

215. Mel'nychenko, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 422.

216. TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 1425, fols. 426–27.

217. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, doc. 105, p. 267.

218. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava 'UNTs*, ' p. 111.

219. Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, doc. 105, p. 267.

220. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 9.

Hrushevsky's Work in Moscow and His Plans for Research and Writing

Before addressing this subject, it is important to determine the status of Hrushevsky's two basic multivolume projects, the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, as of March 1931, the month of his departure for Moscow. This is crucial to establishing what exactly Hrushevsky worked on in exile and for specifying what work Kateryna Hrushevka carried out in Kyiv between her father's death in November 1934 and her arrest in July 1938, which is the subject of the next section of this introduction.

According to Hrushevsky's information accompanying the table of contents of volume 9, book 1 of the *History*, the printing of that book began in September 1928 and was completed in March 1929. Immediately afterward, in April 1929, the printing of volume 9, book 2 began.²²¹ But the printing of book 2 dragged on for more than a year and a half. By December 1930, the final proofs were being corrected, and indexes of personal names and toponyms were being prepared. As of early 1931, before Hrushevsky's departure for Moscow on 7 March, the second book of volume 9 had been printed.²²²

Serhii Plokyh has addressed problems associated with the preparation of volume 10, attempting to establish its chronological limits (1657–65) and the approximate year in which Hrushevsky intended to complete it (1932) according to the plan presented in his article of 1929, 'The Department of Modern History of the Ukrainian People.'²²³ As is often the case in reports, this plan was highly exaggerated. Hrushevsky notes in the article, for example, that the publication of volume 9, book 2 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* was expected in 1928–29,²²⁴ which is hard to imagine even under the most favorable conditions.

Documents preserved in the archive of the Academy of Sciences in Kyiv make it possible to correct this data in certain important respects. First and foremost are the minutes of the meeting of the Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era of 17 July 1930, chaired by Hrushevsky himself, where the formulation of the commission's five-year plan was discussed. There we read: 'The commission was advised by Acad[emician] M. S. Hrushevsky that the first half of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* is being printed.'²²⁵

What does this statement mean? It can hardly signify that as of July 1930 the volume was already being printed by the State Publishing House of Ukraine. Such a conclusion, which seems warranted at first glance, would not be based on a critical assessment of the source. As we know, volume 9, book 2 was being printed at this time, and until it appeared, the State Publishing House was highly unlikely to accept the next volume in the series. This is corroborated by at least two sources in the archive of the Academy of Sciences: documents that the History Section of the Academy received from the State Publishing House in June 1930 in response to its proposals for the printing of its publications and the work plan of Hrushevsky's Department of Ukrainian History for 1930.

In June 1930 Viktor Iurkevych took the History Section's publishing proposals for 1931 to Kharkiv. In the same month, he reported on his trip at a meeting of the Council of the History Section chaired by Hrushevsky. It is apparent from this source that in 1931 the section proposed to present for publication a volume of Hrushevsky's *History of Ukrainian*

221. See Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 9, bk. 1 (New York, 1957), p. 871.

222. Serhii Plokyh, 'Writing the *History* in the USSR,' in Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 9, bk. 1 (Edmonton and Toronto, 2005), pp. xxxviii–xxxix; idem, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 261–62.

223. Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 262, 424; cf. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 18652, fol. 8.

224. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 18652, fol. 8.

225. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3084–3128, fol. 31.

Literature, a volume of his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, and an issue of the collection *Za sto lit* (no. 7, which was never printed).²²⁶ The publishing house accepted the proposal.²²⁷ It is quite certain that the volume of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* meant here was the first part of volume 10. This may be seen from another document—Hrushevsky's response to 'general directives' of 25 April from the Academy's Division of History and Philology concerning his department's work plan for 1930. In this response Hrushevsky noted that volume 9, book 2, comprising about sixty signatures, was to be published by 1 January 1931.²²⁸ Consequently, it was the first part of volume 10 that was to be submitted for publication in 1931.

At all costs, Hrushevsky wanted to complete the publication of volume 9 in 1930. The adverse circumstances created by the political and structural changes at the Academy caused him great emotional turmoil. Hence the bitterness with which he wrote to Ivan Krypiakievych in December 1930 about the delay in the printing of volume 9, book 2, which was due mainly to the labor-intensive compilation of indexes of names and toponyms by Serhii Shamrai and Kateryna Lazarevska.²²⁹ Under such conditions, the plans of which Fedir Savchenko wrote to Kyrylo Studynsky in January 1930 to reprint particular volumes of Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* were quite unrealistic.²³⁰ The State Publishing House was unable to keep up with the printing of volumes already written and ready for publication, let alone to reprint those that had already appeared.

Thus the minutes of the above-mentioned meeting of 17 July 1930 show that by that time Hrushevsky's manuscript of the first part of volume 10 was complete. This minimal but significant information suffices to establish the period in which the volume was written. It is corroborated by other documents as well. For instance, in one of his reports on the department's activity Hrushevsky wrote that in 1929–30 he had worked on the era of Ivan Vyhovsky, that is, on volume 10.²³¹ By that time, the requisite sources for the period had already been copied by the archaeological expedition in Moscow: documents for the years 1657–59 had been selected back in 1927.²³² By 1929–30, Dmytro Kravtsov was already copying materials for the years 1660–68, augmenting the selections for previous years, and making a thorough check of sources that Hrushevsky intended to cite in toto in his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.²³³

Having established that the first part of volume 10 was complete by midsummer of 1930, it is also important to determine the state of affairs with regard to the rest of its text. The question is particularly significant, as the assertion of the late historian Ivan Butych that he had occasion to see an unpublished manuscript continuation of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* has given rise to a prevailing conviction in the scholarly literature that the entire text of

226. Pan'kova and Shevchuk, "'Za sto lit': Pokazhchyk zmistu," pp. 242, 247–48; Polons'ka-Vasylenko, 'Spysok vydan' Akademii nauk,' p. 93.

227. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2537–2619, fols. 102, 107, 109–10.

228. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 1948–1963, fol. 7.

229. Roman Kryp'iakievych, 'Mykhailo Hrushevskiy ta Ivan Kryp'iakievych (Za materialamy neopublikovanoho lystuvannia ta memuariv),' *Ukraina: Kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'* (Lviv), vyp. 8, doc. 45, p. 360; Yaroslav Fedoruk, 'Nevidoma stattia Ivana Kryp'iakievycha pro ukraïns'ko-turets'ki vzaiemny 1648–1657 rokiv; Komentari,' *UAShch*, nos. 10/11 (2006): 187.

230. Plokhyy, 'Writing the *History* in the USSR,' p. xxxix; idem, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, p. 263.

231. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 18652, fol. 10 ('In 1929–30 Academician Hrushevsky worked on the Vyhovsky era.')

232. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2642, fols. 510, 519, passim.

233. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2985–2991, fol. 1; nos. 3547–3568, fol. 21.

volume 10 was written in Moscow. Moreover, it is sometimes thought that both parts of the volume were completed. Serhii Bilokin, for example, mentioned the second part in a list of Academy publications destroyed at the publishing house or at the proof stage.²³⁴ Iryna Matiash, Frank E. Sysyn, and other historians have written of this volume as a finished work, its narrative supposedly complete up to the year 1676.²³⁵

Such assertions would appear to be exaggerated, given the statements of Kateryna and Maria Hrushevskya on the matter in their letters of January 1937, which are discussed below. But let us return to what Ivan Butych had to say about the manuscript continuation of volume 10 that vanished without trace under mysterious circumstances in the 1960s and 1970s. What, specifically, did Butych have in mind, and when did he make his public statement on the matter? We can reconstruct his testimony with a high degree of accuracy on the basis of two articles, one by the deputy editor of the journal *Kyïv*, Larysa Kopan, the other by the Kyiv historian Serhii Bilokin.

The Archaeographic Commission of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR held its third session on the study and popularization of Hrushevsky's scholarly legacy on 16 October 1989.²³⁶ A month and a half later, the above-mentioned article by Larysa Kopan appeared in Ukraine's leading literary newspaper. In November of that year, the journal *Kyïv* was completing its serial publication of Hrushevsky's memoirs, edited by Serhii Bilokin. In the following month the journal announced a vast undertaking: it would begin serializing the entire text of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.²³⁷ Although Hrushevsky's work was almost unknown to the Ukrainian public at the time, the editorial board of the journal, quite understandably, wanted to begin publishing the *History* not with its first volume but with the one that had never been issued—the eleventh. Butych had said at the academic session that in the 1950s he had seen a previously unknown manuscript continuation of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in the Manuscript Department of the State Public Library; consequently, the editors inquired at the library about the manuscript. According to the reply received by the editors of *Kyïv*, there was no such material at the library.²³⁸

It was in this connection that Larysa Kopan related Butych's testimony. By her account, decades earlier he had searched the library for letters and proclamations of Bohdan Khmelnytsky for a documentary collection that he was preparing with Ivan Krypiakievych.²³⁹ The period in question, then, was the 1950s, for Butych had begun working on *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho* (Documents of Bohdan Khmelnytsky) after 1953, having completed work on the three-volume collection of sources *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: 1648–1654* (The Reunion of Ukraine and Russia, 1648–1654). By that time Butych had a reputation not only as a conscientious and established archivist dedicated to scholarship but also as an expert on the history of the mid-seventeenth century and on the work of Mykhailo Hrushevsky. In particular, when preparing his documentary collection about Khmelnytsky, Butych made use of all the

234. Bilokin, 'Pro vydannia, zaboroneni na stadiï verstky,' pp. 580–81.

235. Matiash, *Kateryna Hrushevskya*, p. 107; idem, 'Zirka pershoï velychyny,' p. 195 ('But the fate of the second part of that volume, which was preserved in the Manuscript Department of the Central Academic Library of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (now the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine), still remains unknown'); Sysyn, "'Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy' Mykhaila Hrushevskoho,' p. 17 ('The second part, or, as it is sometimes called, volume 11, which was brought up to the year 1676, remained in manuscript in Kyiv but was lost in the 1970s').

236. Boriak, 'Naukova spadshchyna M. S. Hrushevskoho povertaiet'sia narodovi.'

237. Holovnyi redaktor [Petro Perebyinis], 'Do nashykh chytachiv,' *Kyïv*, 1989, no. 12: 125.

238. Kopan, 'Kudy zh podivsia rukopys Hrushevskoho?'

239. See *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*, comp. Ivan Kryp'iakievych and Ivan Butych (Kyiv, 1961).

hetman's letters and proclamations cited in volumes 8 and 9 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Later, when the collection was submitted for publication, the censors accused the compilers of including too many references to Hrushevsky's *History* in their headnotes to the documents. To demonstrate the legitimacy of such references, Butych made a special visit to the censor and showed him citations from Hrushevsky in Boris Grekov's monograph *Krest'iane na Rusi* (Peasants in Rus'), for which the author had received the Stalin Prize in 1946.²⁴⁰ But the censors in Kyiv received much more exacting circulars from the KGB about Ukrainian subjects than did those in Moscow. Ultimately, when the book was published in 1961, Krypiakievych and Butych had to delete all their headnote references to Hrushevsky's work.²⁴¹

In the course of his work, Butych happened upon manuscripts of Hrushevsky's in the Academy of Sciences Library—a thick folder, as he said, of the size of two volumes of the *History*, containing unsewn and unbound sheets of 1930s format. The text was handwritten on the back of old bureaucratic papers. 'There were texts of Hrushevsky's, inquiries that he had written to Moscow archives, and annotations on documents sent from Moscow with the instruction "Copy" in Hrushevsky's hand. And copies of the documents ordered were pinned to the sheets,' as Kopan reported Butych's words. The copies pertained to the period from the mid-seventeenth to the early eighteenth century; of these, Butych recalled one of Pavlo Polubotok's proclamations toward the end of the file.²⁴²

The information given in Kopan's article is wholly corroborated in the notes of Serhii Bilokin, who also took part in the session.²⁴³ And Yaroslav Dashkevych attested at that session that he had heard the same story from Butych decades earlier, at the very time when the collection *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho* was in preparation.²⁴⁴ There is no reason to doubt these assertions of Butych's.²⁴⁵

How could this file of Hrushevsky's unpublished texts and other materials have found its way into the Manuscript Department of the Academy of Sciences Library? It has been surmised in the scholarly literature that this may have happened after the military tribunal in the case of Kateryna Hrushevskya, meeting on 15–16 April 1939, pronounced its sentence.²⁴⁶ At that meeting Kateryna made an appeal concerning her father's scholarly writings, many of which had been confiscated during the searches that followed her arrest. Surprisingly enough, the tribunal found in her favor: 'the works of the historian M. S. Hrushevsky, the father of the defendant, K. M. Hrushevskya, which were subject to confiscation, are to be transferred to the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR for inspection and possible use for scholarly purposes.'²⁴⁷

240. See Boris Grekov, *Krest'iane na Rusi s drevneishikh vremen do XVII veka*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1952), 1: 291, 303, passim.

241. Ivan Butych, 'Deshcho pro spivrobotnytstvo I. P. Kryp'iakievycha z arkhivnymi ustanovamy Ukraïny,' *Ukraïna: Kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'* (Lviv), vyp. 8, p. 639; idem, 'Publikatsiia dokumentiv Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho v "Istorii Ukraïny-Rusy" Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' in *Osiahnennia istorii: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu prof. Mykoly Pavlovycha Koval's'koho z nahody ioho 70-rychchia* (Ostrih and New York, 1999), pp. 175–78.

242. Kopan, 'Kudy zh podivsia rukopys Hrushevs'koho?'

243. Bilokin, 'Retenziia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' p. 259.

244. Kopan, 'Kudy zh podivsia rukopys Hrushevs'koho?' See also Yaroslav Dashkevych's testimony on the matter in Bilokin, 'Retenziia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' pp. 258–59.

245. For a memoir of Butych, with whom the author of this introduction was closely associated during the last ten to fifteen years of his life, see Yaroslav Fedoruk, 'Liudyna zi svitlym oblychchiam,' *Pam'iatky Ukraïny*, 2008, no. 3: 132–36.

246. Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 429–30.

247. Iurii Shapoval, 'Nevidomi dokumenty HPU-NKVD pro zhyttia i diial'nist' M. Hrushevs'koho u 1924–1934 rr.,'

Noteworthy in this connection is a particular feature of Hrushevsky's way of writing (at least, of the volumes on which he worked toward the end of his life). He would leave blank spaces for quotations that he planned to include but did not have at hand. This cannot be verified with regard to the first part of volume 10: as noted earlier, that is the only volume of the *History* whose manuscript is not known to have survived. In the case of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, however, we have a detailed statement from Kateryna Hrushevaska, who edited her father's works after 1934. In a letter of 17 November 1935 to Dmitrii Petrushevsky, she wrote: 'I am putting in order volume 8 of the Hist[ory of Ukrainian] Lit[erature], which my father wrote in Moscow, and I am fully occupied with this. I am filling in the blank spaces left for various quotations th[at] my father did not have at hand.'²⁴⁸

That way of proceeding is highly reminiscent of the one described in Larysa Kopan's account of Ivan Butych's statement. But the excessively broad chronological range of material in the file, encompassing the period of Pavlo Polubotok in the early eighteenth century, shows that by no means all the manuscript material found there could have been a continuation of the first part of volume 10. We are dealing here with material for subsequent volumes of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. After all, in 1923, before returning to Ukraine, Hrushevsky had spoken of his intention to bring his account in the *History* up to the year 1725.²⁴⁹ Given Butych's clear statement that the file contained not only copies of documents to be used in the *History* but also manuscripts in Hrushevsky's hand, we may speculate that some of those manuscript pages may have pertained to the second half of volume 10.

Having completed the first part of the volume in July 1930, Hrushevsky clearly had no thought of abandoning work on the rest of the Vyhovsky era. He probably wrote something on the subject in Kyiv and intended to continue the volume in Moscow. We shall return to this point below. What should be noted here is that at the time of Hrushevsky's death, his manuscripts continuing the *History* were so far from completion that Kateryna did not take them into account when editing the first part of the volume for publication. She was already at a disadvantage in that task, as she was poorly acquainted with the historical events in question: as we shall see, that would cause her considerable difficulty. The fact that she had no thought of preparing the second part of the volume for publication is apparent from her correspondence of 1934–38, particularly with Dmitrii Petrushevsky, with whom she shared her plans concerning her father's scholarly legacy. Since she makes no mention of a continuation of volume 10, it is clear that no such continuation existed in finished form. On the contrary, immediately upon receiving the first copies of volume 10 from the printer in January 1937, Kateryna stated that she would begin preparing the manuscript continuation of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* for publication.²⁵⁰

We have a similar statement from Maria Hrushevaska, who wrote to Olha and Vikentii Myklasevych on 17 January 1937 as follows: 'In the past few days a book, the *His[tory] of Uk[raine]-Rus'*, volume 10, edited by Kuliunia [Kateryna], has come out... this is the first book of the legacy. Many other works remain, but they pertain to the history of literature, although that, too, is actually part of history.'²⁵¹ According to Maria's testimony in a subsequent letter,

Ukrains'kyi istoryk, 1996, nos. 1–4, doc. 23, p. 348. See also Matias, 'Zirka pershoi velychyny,' p. 208.

248. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fols. 4^v–5.

249. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Kyryla Studyns'koho (1894–1932 rr.)*, comp. Halyna Svarnyk (Lviv and New York, 1998), doc. 149, p. 136.

250. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 6.

251. *Lystuvannia Mykhaila, Marii ta Kateryny Hrushevs'kykh*, comp. Mariia Mahun' (Lviv, 2006), doc. 14, p. 50. I wish to thank Svitlana Pankova for indicating this source to me. See also her article including this citation: Svitlana Pan'kova,

she knew all about her husband's scholarly work and plans because she was constantly with him.²⁵² Hence her letter, along with Kateryna's information, takes on considerable importance with regard to the continuation of volume 10.

There is documentary evidence that Hrushevsky did not stop working on the Vyhovsky era after July 1930. In 1930 he included that period in the department's five-year work plan and sought funds for the requisite research.²⁵³ Reporting on his own work for 1931, Hrushevsky wrote that, having published volume 9, book 2 at the beginning of the year, he was concurrently 'working on the social and political history of Ukraine after the death of Khmelnytsky, dwelling mainly on manifestations of the differentiation of Cossackdom and the struggle among its strata in the years 1657–59.' It is apparent from the context of this report that he completed that research prior to his 'assignment to Moscow.'²⁵⁴ It cannot be ruled out that this was included in the manuscript material that Butych saw in the file. After all, in July 1930, when the Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era was planning its scholarly activity for the next two years, it set the task of researching and preparing material 'of the period close to the third quarter of the seventeenth century.'²⁵⁵ Moreover, the emphasis was on elucidating national and political relations in Ukraine, which was the main subject of volume 10. At its meeting of 7 February 1931, the commission agreed to schedule a paper by Hrushevsky on this period titled 'From the History of the Ruin,'²⁵⁶ but he was unable to deliver it because of his abrupt departure for Moscow exactly one month later.

Hrushevsky's work on the text of the second part of volume 10 did not proceed as rapidly as on previous volumes. As Serhii Plokyh has observed, 'Most likely, Hrushevsky was unable to resume his work on the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in Moscow or, if he did so, his progress was quite limited.'²⁵⁷ This is not a new idea in the literature. The first report to the effect that Hrushevsky completed the first part of volume 10 in Kyiv occurs in a memoir by his student and colleague at the Academy, Oksana Stepanyshyna. After delivering the memoir in the form of a lecture at the Scholars' Building in Kyiv on the occasion of a session dedicated to Hrushevsky in December 1942, she published it under a cryptonym the following year in the Lviv journal *Nashi dni* (Our Days). The article was later reprinted by Lubomyr Wynar in the journal *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* (Ukrainian Historian), this time with proper attribution.²⁵⁸ On the basis of Stepanyshyna's article, Hryhorii Kostiuk wrote in 1954 of Hrushevsky's completion of the first part of volume 10 of the *History* before he left for Moscow.²⁵⁹

From all this the general conclusion may be drawn that no text of the second part of the volume was ever completed in a form ready for publication. Between July 1930 and early March 1931 Hrushevsky was only beginning work on it, but he was making very slow progress and never completed the task.

“‘Ne spivpratsiui iz Kompartiiu. Shchob maty vil'ni i chysti ruky.’” Iedyna don'ka Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho zahynula v radians'kykh konststaborakh, *Kraïna: Tyzhnevnyi zhurnal*, 25 June 2010, no. 23 (26): 54–55.

252. Volodymyr Serhiichuk, 'Nove pro rodynu Hrushevs'kykh,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 1996, nos. 1–4, doc. 2, p. 380.

253. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 18652, fol. 8; nos. 3084–3128, fol. 9: 'It is expected that (until 1933) attention will be focused on the history of Cossackdom in the second half of the seventeenth century.'

254. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 63.

255. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3084–3128, fols. 9^v–10, 29–30.

256. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4100–4129, fol. 8.

257. Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, p. 426.

258. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 177. On this scholar and her association with Hrushevsky's Kyiv school, see Iurkova, *Diial'nist'*, pp. 152–54; Bilokin, 'Lyst Heorhiia Lomova,' pp. 181–82; Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 1865–1866, fols. 14–15; nos. 3701–3722, fols. 21, 50; nos. 2667–2770, fol. 76; nos. 1525–1548.

259. Kostiuk, 'Taiemnytsia smerty,' p. 13.

It is much easier to establish where Hrushevsky's work on the *History of Ukrainian Literature* stood when he left Kyiv. The author himself pointed out in a footnote to volume 6, which was then being prepared for the press, that 'work [on the volume] took a long time, four years (with interruptions),' and went on to specify: 'From the summer of 1926 to the end of 1929, rewritten and corrected for print throughout 1930.'²⁶⁰ This corresponds to what Kateryna wrote in a letter to Dmitrii Petrushevsky: her father completed volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* before volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.²⁶¹

The draft cover of the sixth issue of *Za sto lit*, accepted by the State Publishing House on 24 July 1930, announced that the first part of volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* was in press.²⁶² Hrushevsky himself wrote from Moscow to Kyrylo Studynsky and Mykhailo Mochulsky that he had submitted the first part of that volume to the publisher in the autumn of 1930, and that it had gone for composing, but the work was halted in the spring of 1931.²⁶³ This tallies with what Hrushevsky would later write to Molotov in his letter of 4 August 1934. According to the latter document, some publications being prepared for print in Kyiv were halted and their type scattered after Hrushevsky's departure for Moscow, even though they had been vetted by all the requisite authorities and approved for print.²⁶⁴

Hrushevsky's article 'The Department of Modern History of the Ukrainian People' also notes that volume 6 was to appear in 1930 and would encompass the period 'of the revival of the Kyivan milieu in the first half of the seventeenth century.'²⁶⁵ In his letters from Moscow, Hrushevsky gave a more precise time frame—the years 1630–32.²⁶⁶ We do not, however, encounter information about that volume in the above-mentioned official plans of Hrushevsky's department produced in the spring of 1930 and covering the rest of the year, which were submitted to the Academy's Division of History and Philology.²⁶⁷ Yet there was mention of one of the volumes of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* that the State Publishing House was prepared to accept for publication in 1931 at a meeting of the Council of the History Section held in June 1930 and chaired by Hrushevsky. The point was raised in the course of Viktor Lurkevych's report on his trip to the publishing house in Kharkiv.²⁶⁸ In all likelihood, the reference was to volume 6, which the publisher accepted in the summer or autumn of 1930 (according to various sources) and planned to publish in the following year.

Thus, as of Hrushevsky's departure from Kyiv on 7 March 1931, volume 9, book 2 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* had been published, the manuscript of the first part of volume 10 was complete, an insignificant portion of the second part had been written, and the first part of volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* had been prepared for print and submitted to the publisher. This is the indispensable minimum required for the study of Hrushevsky's writing in the years 1931–34 and his daughter's editorial work on his scholarly legacy from 1934 to 1938.

260. Hrushevsk'kyi, *Istoriia ukrains'koï literatury*, 6: 668, n. 1.

261. ARAN, fond 293, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 6^v (letter of 19 January 1937).

262. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 2235, fol. 2.

263. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Kyryla Studyns'koho*, p. 250 (letter of 12 November 1932); *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 117, p. 115 (letter of 18 September 1932).

264. Mel'nychenko, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi*, p. 420. See Oksana Stepanyshyna's recollection that Hrushevsky left the text of volume 6 in Kyiv ready for submission to the press (Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 176).

265. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 18652, fols. 9–10.

266. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Kyryla Studyns'koho*, p. 250.

267. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 1948–1963, fol. 7.

268. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2537–2619, fols. 102, 107, 109–10.

* * *

Having settled in Moscow, Hrushevsky had many plans for creative activity, the most fundamental of which was the continuation of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*. We have a good deal of information about his work on it from eyewitnesses, as well as from Hrushevsky himself and his daughter.²⁶⁹ As we have seen from Kateryna's letter of 17 November 1935 to Petrushevsky, it is quite certain that Hrushevsky began and completed the writing of volume 8 of that work in Moscow.²⁷⁰ By her account in the same letter, the volume concluded with an account of the *History of the Rus' (Istoriia Rusov)*, that is, the late eighteenth century.

Hrushevsky noted in a letter that in 1931–32 he continued the work on literary history begun in Kyiv and 'treated the literature of the schools in cursory fashion, ending with Skovoroda and omitting the episodes for which I could not obtain material and literature.'²⁷¹ He was probably referring here to the second part of volume 6 and volume 7, given that volume 8 dealt with a later period, including the *History of the Rus'*. Moreover, in a letter of 10 December 1935 Kateryna wrote about her father's analysis of the literature of the schools in volume 7.²⁷² It is also important to note that Oksana Stepanyshyna's claim about Hrushevsky's completion of volume 9 and certain chapters of volume 10 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* in Moscow²⁷³ finds no confirmation in Kateryna's letters of 1934–38, in which she noted the progress of her editing. Volumes 7 and 8 are now both considered lost.

Certain details of Hrushevsky's work on the *History of Ukrainian Literature* may be gleaned from his letters to relatives and friends, such as Mykhailo Mochulsky and Kyrylo Studynsky. Another category of sources consists of the reports and work plans submitted by Mykhailo and Kateryna Hrushevsky to the Academy in 1931–32: their annual reports for those years (for some reason, the report for 1932 is given in a questionnaire about the work plan for 1933); a questionnaire that Kateryna filled out about work accomplished in 1932; the 1932 work plan for the Department of Ukrainian History; and the department's research proposals for the second five-year plan (1933–37).²⁷⁴ In these reports Hrushevsky never detailed the extent of his work on projects destined for the 'desk drawer,' nor did he specify the volumes of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and the *History of Ukrainian Literature* on which he was working. He only noted the subjects on which he was reporting or planning to work. Despite such lacunae, these are among the most important sources for the study of Hrushevsky's plans for research and writing in the years 1931–34.

The general subject on which he worked in Moscow was more or less clearly formulated in 1933, when the department's second five-year plan was being established. The title of Hrushevsky's research project, which continued and built on his work of 1931–32, was 'Social differentiation and class struggle in Ukraine during the decline of feudalism and its reflection in culture and the arts of the seventeenth and eighteenth [centuries] up to the

269. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 115, p. 107; doc. 117, p. 115; Vernadskii, *Dnevniki*, p. 355; Kryp'iakevych, 'Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Zhyttia i diial'nist', p. 252; *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Kyryla Studyns'koho*, p. 250.

270. See p. lxxvii and n. 248 above.

271. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 117, p. 115.

272. ARAN, fond 293, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 5.

273. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 177.

274. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 46^v; nos. 3027–3082, fols. 43–43^v, 63; no. 4063–4099, fols. 22, 34–35, 42, 43.

beginning of the nineteenth century.²⁷⁵ In this title Hrushevsky managed to combine his plans with regard to the *History of Ukrainian Literature* and the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.

In a letter of September 1932 to Mykhailo Mochulsky, Hrushevsky noted his intention to complete his extensive survey of the literature of the schools, study its relation to the oral tradition of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and research the national movement of the Cossack officers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.²⁷⁶ In his report on work accomplished during his first year in Moscow, he gave a somewhat broader description of this complex subject: as of spring 1931 he had begun to study 'the history of schools, the arts, and literary standards of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.' This, according to the official papers, was the task with which his daughter was sent to assist him, and it remained the basic subject of their work for the following year as well.²⁷⁷

Thus Hrushevsky's chief research interest was the orientation of Kyivan schools and literary circles on the Commonwealth nobility or the Cossack officer stratum in the mid- and late seventeenth century, as well as the development of eighteenth-century Cossack officer literature on the basis of the education offered in Ukrainian schools—'Kyiv scholastics at the service of officer class aspirations,' as Hrushevsky briefly formulated the subject in his work plan for 1933–37. The next step in his research was to be a synthetic account of the influence of the literature of the schools on eighteenth-century literature for the masses, with subsequent study of the new Ukrainian arts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Hrushevsky set himself the task of studying the changing attitudes of the Cossack officer stratum in connection with current socioeconomic developments. He expected this research to reveal the influence of those new attitudes on Ukrainian literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.²⁷⁸

In 1932 Hrushevsky noted his interest in the development of regional studies as a particular aspect of his research plans. He was especially interested in early folklore studies, as well as the historiography of that subject and the literary history of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.²⁷⁹

In planning his research on the development of Ukrainian historiography from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, Hrushevsky associated it with the problem of the Cossack officers' changing political attitudes, studying the works of the Eyewitness, Hryhorii Hrabianka, Samiilo Velychko, the *History of the Rus'*, and the writings of Nikolai Gogol/Mykola Hohol, Mykola Markevych, Mykola Kostomarov, and others.²⁸⁰ In the winter of 1931–32, along with his daughter, Hrushevsky began studying the last group of writers and historians associated with the nineteenth-century revival 'before Shevchenko,' as he termed it.²⁸¹

As noted, Hrushevsky did not report to the Academy on the number of volumes of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* that he had written. He did not even specify the volumes on which he was working, although it is known for certain that in Moscow he completed at least volumes 7 and 8. There was no point in sending reports to Kyiv when all his historical and literary concepts were being subjected to the deadliest criticism. Consequently, when the

275. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 43.

276. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 117, pp. 115–16.

277. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 63; nos. 4063–4099, fol. 22.

278. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 46^v; nos. 4063–4099, fols. 22, 43; nos. 3027–3082, fol. 43–43^v.

279. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 46^v; nos. 4063–4099, fol. 22.

280. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 63.

281. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 117, p. 116.

Academy's History Cycle was preparing its report on work accomplished during the first five-year plan, Hrushevsky was severely admonished for not having prepared anything other than the sixth volume of his *History of Ukrainian Literature* for publication.²⁸²

Hrushevsky's broad interest in the literature and historiography of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries gave rise to at least two articles, one on Ivan Kotliarevsky and the other on Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky.

Kotliarevsky's *Eneida* (Travestied Aeneid) as a symbol of the Ukrainian national revival was particularly significant in Hrushevsky's work. In publishing the first volume of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in 1898, exactly a century after the appearance of Kotliarevsky's poem, Hrushevsky excitedly noted the centenary in his preface.²⁸³ Oleksii Ias has described Hrushevsky's declaration of such a link between his *History* and the work that initiated modern Ukrainian literature as a significant and even crucial moment of his life.²⁸⁴

Very little is known about Hrushevsky's article on Kotliarevsky, and it is now considered lost. Nevertheless, a few mentions of it occur in his letters and in reminiscences of others about his life in Moscow. As Hrushevsky conceived it, this was to be not so much an article as a novelized biography or 'historical tale,' to cite his own definition of the genre. The author allowed himself, as he wrote in a letter to Mykhailo Mochulsky, to 'fill in' details that he did not find in the documents, 'but with a minimum of the usual romantic intrigue about Kotliarevsky's unfortunate love affair as narrated in the well-known "reminiscences of Mr. Strova" (only I have related it otherwise, not considering that "Mr. Strova" a source sufficiently reliable in detail).'²⁸⁵ Kateryna also mentioned her father's work on the writer's life story in letters to her relatives.²⁸⁶

In connection with the appearance of volume 10 of the *History* in 1936, Mochulsky, using an alias, mentioned Hrushevsky's tale about Kotliarevsky in a list of his works written in Moscow but not published.²⁸⁷ Oksana Stepanyshyna added a personal detail that she could have learned only from Hrushevsky's immediate family: given the difficult circumstances of his life in Moscow, which were not conducive to creativity, he had found 'relief and satisfaction' in working on the tale.²⁸⁸

There is much more information available about Hrushevsky's work on Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky than on Kotliarevsky. His interest in the subject was probably aroused by his study of the development of historiography in Ukraine in the early nineteenth century. Of greatest significance today is the fact that this lengthy Ukrainian-language article, titled 'A Historiographer of Little Russia,' has come down to us and is preserved in the Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences. In describing the work, archivists termed it a monograph because its length exceeded that of a standard article.²⁸⁹ There is data about the article in Hrushevsky's letters to family members in Kyiv, and especially in Kateryna's correspondence

282. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 1864, fol. 41^v.

283. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, 1: lxi.

284. Ias, 'Monumental'nyi proekt,' pp. 571–72.

285. *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 118, p. 120 (letter of 28 December 1932).

286. Bilokin, 'Retseziia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' p. 258, n. 2.

287. M. M-s'kyi [Mykhailo Mochul's'kyi], 'Nadmohyl'nyi pam'iatnyk i literaturna spadshchyna M. Hrushevs'koho,' *Dilo* (Lviv), 7 February 1937, no. 27: 5–6; repr. in an émigré weekly: 'Novyi i ostannii tom "Istoriï" M. Hrushevs'koho,' *Tryzub* (Paris) 13, no. 6 (556) (14 February 1937): 29.

288. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 177; Kostiuk, 'Taiemnytsia smerty,' p. 13.

289. ARAN, fond 359, 'Institut istorii Kommunisticheskoi Akademii,' op. 2, d. 278, 140 fols. Oksana Iurkova and Oleksii Ias are currently preparing this work for publication at the Institute of Ukrainian History, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

with Dmitrii Petrushevsky. In preparing the work for publication after her father's death, Kateryna supplied a good deal of important information about the process of its composition.

On 2 September 1934 Hrushevsky wrote to the wife of his brother Oleksandr, Olha Hrushevskia, that the article about Bantysh-Kamensky was finished. 'It came out longer than I wanted; now it has to be typed, as they will not be able to compose it from the Ukrainian manuscript,' he wrote.²⁹⁰ The statement is interesting because it shows that Hrushevsky planned to publish the article in Ukrainian in Russia. In the summer of 1934 he arranged with the academician Viacheslav Volgin, who served as permanent secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to have the article appear in Ukrainian in the *Izvestiia AN SSSR. Otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk* (News of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Division of Social Sciences) in Leningrad.²⁹¹ Some of the articles that Hrushevsky wrote or completed during his years in Moscow, including work done in the last year of his life, were published there.²⁹²

While making sacrifices to help her father with his work in Moscow, Kateryna sought to develop her own scholarly interests. She continued to study Ukrainian *dumy* (epic songs) and their performers and worked on the history of scholarship on that subject, particularly on the writing of Izmail Sreznevsky. More broadly, she described the subject of her research as the use of material from the Ukrainian oral tradition in the development of historical conceptions of the early nineteenth century.²⁹³ In 1932 she completed a longer study, on which she had begun to work immediately after arriving in Moscow, 'about professional singers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and their groupings; the decline of landlords' singers in connection with social and cultural changes and the organizational association of prof[essional] singers with beggars.'²⁹⁴ However, as she herself noted, she published nothing on the subject in that period, and the article remains unknown to scholars in the field.²⁹⁵

The last subject to be addressed in this section is that of Hrushevsky's plans concerning the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. It has deliberately been left for last, as Hrushevsky devoted considerably less attention to the *History* than to other research problems in the last phase of his life. Yet he never forgot this most important of his life's undertakings, and the *History* found reflection in documents of the period that command attention.

The first such documents to consider are copies of sources collected by the Academy's various archaeological expeditions up to 1931. Hrushevsky's work on the *History* for the period after the death of Bohdan Khmelnytsky is also evident in almost all reports and plans submitted at this time, both his own and those of the Department of Ukrainian History as a whole. Such sources should, of course, be read with a critical eye, as the reports do not always reflect actual work accomplished.

290. TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 1409, fols. 103–4.

291. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 2^v (Kateryna Hrushevskia to Dmitrii Petrushevsky, 8 March 1935).

292. Mikhail Grushevskii, 'O tak nazyvaemoi L'vovskoi letopisi (1498–1648) i ee predpolagaemom avtore,' *Izvestiia AN SSSR. Otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk* (Leningrad), 1931, no. 5: 260–89; idem, 'Samovidets Ruiny i ego pozdneishie otrazheniia,' pp. 157–92; idem, 'Ob ukrainskoi istoriografii XVIII veka: Neskol'ko soobrazhenii,' *Izvestiia AN SSSR. Otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk*, 1934, no. 3: 215–33.

293. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 2236–2302, fol. 46^v; nos. 4063–4099, fols. 22, 34–35, 43; nos. 3027–3082, fol. 63; *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Mykhaila Mochul's'koho*, doc. 117, p. 116; *Lysty Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho do Kyryla Studyn's'koho*, p. 250.

294. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 22.

295. Ibid. Kateryna Hrushevskia published her last works in 1931. See Matiash, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka*, pp. 130–36; Vasyl' Horyn', *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka (1900–1943). ...Shcho stoiala na storozhi 'ohniu v svitohliadi ukrains'koho narodu'* (Lviv, 2000), pp. 96–101.

Hrushevsky's work on the period 1657–59 is mentioned in his report for 1931, and, as noted above, it is clear from the context of that document that the work was done in Kyiv.²⁹⁶ According to the 'Brief Report on the Work of the Department of Ukrainian History of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences for 1931,' Hrushevsky was working independently on the 'economic, social, political, and cultural history of Ukraine after the Khmelnytsky era (1660–85).'²⁹⁷ The department staff greatly exaggerated the chronological framework of the subject here, for no reports had been received from Mykhailo or Kateryna Hrushevsky as of December 1931, when the 'Brief Report' was written. An almost identical formulation of the subject, but with the years under study reduced to 1657–74, appears in the minutes of a meeting of Hrushevsky's department held on 1 October 1931, when research plans for the following year were being approved.²⁹⁸ It appears yet again, stated in very similar terms—'The socioeconomic and political history of Ukraine during the decline of feudalism, mainly after the Khmelnytsky era'—in the preparation of research projects for the second five-year plan (1933–37).²⁹⁹

When leaving for Moscow, Hrushevsky took with him certain documents that had been copied by the archaeographic expeditions, especially for the period of Ivan Vyhovsky's rule. This applies particularly to the 'Materials on the History of Seventeenth-Century Cossackdom,' pertaining to the years 1657–65, collected by the Lviv historian Vasyl Herasymchuk in the archives of Cracow, Warsaw, Lviv, and elsewhere. As these were among the most basic archival sources used by Hrushevsky in the first part of volume 10 of the *History*, they are worth considering in some detail.

In 1929–30 these documents were rapidly being prepared for publication in the third issue of *Ukrains'kyi arkhiv*, and in the autumn of 1929 the Academy sent Herasymchuk (in Lviv) several signatures of proofs for correction. But their publication was postponed from one year to the next because of communication problems between Kyiv and Lviv, which then belonged to different states, and because of the time required to work out principles for editing macaronic Polish-Latin texts. At a meeting of the Archaeographic Commission in February 1931, Hrushevsky finally announced that Herasymchuk's documents given to the head of the commission, Viktor Romanovsky, for checking had been lost and not yet located.³⁰⁰ He was probably referring to the proofs prepared for *Ukrains'kyi arkhiv*.

In 1933, when the Archaeographic Commission was searching for this material for use in its collection 'Materials on the History of the Peasant Revolution of 1648,' the commission's secretary, Kateryna Lazarevska, inquired of the Department of Ukrainian History on 16 March concerning the whereabouts of the sources collected by Herasymchuk.³⁰¹ Responding to the inquiry, Serhii Shamrai wrote that the material had been 'delivered to the Archaeographic Commission some three years ago but not returned.'³⁰² Romanovsky was the member of the commission who had established editing principles for the publication of the documents in 1930.³⁰³ Thus it seems perfectly logical that he was the one to whom the documents were

296. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 63.

297. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 1.

298. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3027–3082, fol. 43.

299. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 4063–4099, fol. 43.

300. Fedoruk, 'Vasyl' Harasymchuk,' pp. 23–26. See Iurkevych's explanation of 10 January 1932 to the Archaeographic Commission: 'difficulties in communication made it impossible to carry out this work in 1931' (Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 10323–10380, fol. 13).

301. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3517–3535, fol. 10.

302. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3517–3535, fol. 12 (reply of 11 April 1933).

303. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 11049–11106, fol. 7 (report of the Archaeographic Commission for 1930).

given for checking at a time when he and other members of the commission were engaged in lengthy discussions about editing principles.

An important source that shows some of Herasymchuk's documents to have been in Hrushevsky's possession in 1931 is the Archaeographic Commission's report on work accomplished that year. According to the report, Hrushevsky took the documents 'for further work.'³⁰⁴ Clearly, this is a reference to drafts of some kind, for Hrushevsky himself, as we have seen, reported the loss of the proofs that were ready for publication.

On 2 February 1932, while an inventory was being taken of material in the department's possession, some 100 pages of copies from the Ossoliński Institute in Lviv and 185 pages of copies of documents from 'archives of western Ukraine' were found.³⁰⁵ It is not to be ruled out that the latter were copies of the sources rediscovered in the early 1990s and published in 1994 (182 pages of typescript).

The subject matter of this material and the period to which it pertains, from the death of Khmelnytsky to the Union of Hadiach (1657–59), coincide with that of the first part of volume 10 of the *History*, in which Hrushevsky often cites the documents as items in an already published text.³⁰⁶ This in turn may attest indirectly that some of the copies of documents found during the inventory of early 1932 were drafts of documents from Herasymchuk's collection that Hrushevsky had already used in writing the first part of volume 10. Accordingly, Hrushevsky may indeed have taken the rest of the draft copies of documents from Herasymchuk's collection, covering the years 1659–65, to Moscow for use in continuing work on volume 10 of the *History*. If so, then the statement in the Archaeographic Commission's report for 1931 to the effect that Hrushevsky took Herasymchuk's material 'for further work' would appear to be accurate.

Hrushevsky, however, had at his disposal not only copies of Herasymchuk's sources but also some of the copies prepared by the archaeological expedition to Moscow. The latter material encompassed the period approximately from the late 1650s to the early 1670s, as we know from the correspondence between Kateryna Lazarevska and Serhii Shamrai. Responding to her above-mentioned inquiry of 16 March 1933 about sources copied in Moscow, Shamrai wrote: 'this material is being worked on and in the possession of Ac[ademician] M. S. Hrushevsky, whom you should address concerning the matter.'³⁰⁷

The question of the return of these documents to the Archaeographic Commission had been raised at some of its meetings even earlier, and in that connection inquiries had been addressed to Dmytro Kravtsov, who was carrying out the work of the expedition in Moscow, and Viktor Iurkevych as head of the Commission on the History of Cossackdom and the Cossack Era.³⁰⁸ The heads of the Archaeographic Commission did not venture, however, to address Hrushevsky himself in that connection. The matter was finally resolved by the commission's decision that it was inappropriate to use the material collected by Hrushevsky in its own work, as that material was intended for use in developing his bourgeois conceptions in the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*—conceptions hostile to Marxist methodology.³⁰⁹

304. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 11049–11106, fol. 75.

305. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 1490–1493, fol. 4.

306. Compare sources in Herasymchuk's collection and their use in Hrushevsky's work, with the same numbering as in no. 3 of *Ukraïns'kyi arkhiv*: Herasymchuk, *Materialy do istorii*, doc. 26, pp. 45–46; doc. 65, pp. 85–87; doc. 80, pp. 103–4; doc. 85, pp. 108–9; doc. 88, pp. 112–19; Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoria Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 10 (New York, 1958), p. 273, n. 91; pp. 306–9; p. 309, n. 374; p. 312; p. 333, n. 327, passim.

307. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 3517–3535, fols. 10, 12.

308. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 10705–10807, fol. 152^v (minutes of meeting of 4 July 1931).

309. Manuscript Institute, fond X, nos. 10610–10634, fol. 26; no. 11759.

The detailed account given above shows that Hrushevsky did indeed intend to continue work on his *History* while living in Moscow from 1931 to 1934. Further corroboration appears in the memoir published by Oksana Stepanyshyna, who wrote that in those years he organized material and searched for sources on which further volumes of the *History* were to be based.³¹⁰

While the sources cited in our account show, at a minimum, Hrushevsky's intention to continue work on the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in Moscow, his concentration on writing further volumes of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* left him little opportunity to fulfill his intentions with regard to the main scholarly undertaking of his life. If in fact he continued work on volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, then he did so in highly unsystematic fashion, producing little and approaching the task without the absorption that he devoted to literary history in this period.

Kateryna Hrushevskya's Editing of Her Father's Legacy (1934–1938)

Mykhailo Hrushevsky passed away at the Kislovodsk sanatorium on 24 November 1934. For his wife and daughter, the trip from the Caucasus on 28 November to take Hrushevsky's remains back to Kyiv proved a difficult ordeal.³¹¹ Throughout the period of their residence in Moscow, beginning in March 1931, the Hrushevskys had never once visited Ukraine (disregarding Mykhailo's interrogation in the Kharkiv prison). On 29 November, after their protracted and vicious persecution of the historian and the de facto prohibition on his work, the authorities held a solemn funeral for him in Kyiv, acting on the principle 'no person, no problem.'

On the day immediately following Hrushevsky's death, the Council of People's Commissars issued a special resolution on the organization of his funeral and provisions for the material security of his family. The resolution was discussed at an extraordinary meeting of the Presidium of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences chaired by its president, Oleksandr Bohomolets. A resolution was adopted there to establish a commission, jointly with the People's Commissariat of Education, for the study of Hrushevsky's scholarly legacy. His daughter was nominated as the only candidate to take part in the commission's work.³¹² As of that date, Kateryna Hrushevskya was considered a staff member of the Institute of the History of Material Culture, to which she had been transferred two days before the closing of the Institute of History and Archaeography on 17 November 1934.³¹³

In Kislovodsk, as he felt his life slipping away, Hrushevsky instructed his closest family members on the publication of his manuscripts and advised them to leave the USSR for Galicia if they could manage to do so.³¹⁴ There were a good many manuscripts, including volumes of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, and various articles and research works, so that Kateryna was initially at a loss, with no clear idea of where to begin her editing. Much later, after the arrest of her daughter and the searches of the Hrushevsky residence on Panko Street in 1938, Maria Hrushevskya would assert that the Academy had also raised the question of editing her husband's epistolary legacy.³¹⁵ Writing

310. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 177.

311. For a detailed discussion, see Prystaiko and Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: Sprava 'UNTs'*, p. 111.

312. TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 49, fol. 1; Matiash, 'Zirka pershoi velychyny,' pp. 192–93. The document appears with the incorrect date of 26 November in *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: Mizh istoriieiu ta politykoiu*, doc. 104, pp. 152–53.

313. Iurkova, 'Istorychno-Arkheohrafichnyi instytut VUAN,' p. 299; Matiash, 'Zirka pershoi velychyny,' p. 193.

314. Stepanyshyna, 'Ostanni roky,' p. 178.

315. TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fol. 1.

to Volodymyr Vernadsky on 22 December 1934 to express thanks for his condolences, Kateryna also told him of the great problems facing her in connection with her plans for editing and publication. ‘My father passed away in the heat of intensive and varied work on history, literature, and the history of Ukrainian culture,’ she wrote, ‘and our grief for our irreplaceable loss, which has completely devastated our lives, is deepened by our sorrow over all that unfinished work, so necessary and, at present, bereft of workers who might continue it. A chance at least to publish those fragments and particular completed sections would be our only consolation.’³¹⁶

After the funeral and the subsequent difficult weeks of adjustment to the unaccustomed conditions of life without her father, with whom she had spent all her life, Kateryna had to return to Moscow and bring back the books, manuscripts, and other remaining possessions.³¹⁷ In Kyiv, Maria and Kateryna isolated themselves from most of their acquaintances and lived as recluses, keeping to themselves and bearing their grief with only family members for comfort. Kateryna’s testimony to their severe and ascetic way of life survives in a number of sources. ‘Mother and I live as best we can, seeing almost no one else: there are so few people close to us, and seeing strangers is difficult,’ she wrote.³¹⁸ Later, under interrogation by the NKVD, Kateryna would explain such behavior by her unwillingness to be distracted from the painstaking work of editing her father’s manuscripts and by fear of compromising herself and her editorial work.³¹⁹ The state of her health also obliged her to spend more time at home. Confiding in close friends about such personal matters, she wrote about completely refraining from going out at night: ‘somehow I have begun to orient myself poorly by streetlight—either my vision has grown weaker or the influence of vertigo, to which I am subject, has increased lately.’³²⁰

Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s study in the Panko Street residence stood untouched after his death. Maria Hrushevskya said that she ‘wanted to preserve [the study] as a memorial to his great work... as a reserve.’ Nothing was altered in the study until Kateryna’s arrest in 1938.³²¹

In this oppressive spiritual and physical condition, at great sacrifice to herself, Kateryna embarked on her editorial work. The seemingly positive attitude of the political authorities, including particular resolutions of the Council of People’s Commissars about issuing the *History of Ukraine-Rus’* and the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, gave her hope that the books completed in manuscript would be published. She therefore began with volumes completed in manuscript and prepared for publication in Kyiv back in 1930.

After about half a year of intensive editorial labor, in June 1935 Kateryna completed work on the first half of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus’* and submitted it to the State Publishing House for typesetting. Concurrently, while still editing the *History of Ukraine-Rus’*, in March of that year she began to prepare volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* for publication.³²²

316. ARAN, fond 518, op. 3, d. 484, fol. 1–1^v. My thanks to Serhii Kirzhaiev for the opportunity to make use of this document and for his advice on questions of relations between Vernadsky and Hrushevsky.

317. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 30^v.

318. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fols. 2^v, 13. See also TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fols. 2, 5; Serhiichuk, ‘Nove pro rodynu Hrushevs'kykh,’ doc. 2, p. 381.

319. IL, fond 122, op. 1, spr. 19, fol. 10.

320. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 7^v (letter of 19 January 1937 to Dmitrii Petrushevsky).

321. TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 933, fols. 9, 19^v. See Serhii Bilokin, ‘Sadyba Hrushevs'kykh—sertse latyns'koho kvartalu,’ *Kyiv i kyiany: Materialy shchorichnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii*, no. 6 (2006): 115–19.

322. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 3–3^v.

At this point, however, hopes for the publication of these and other works were completely dashed. Under various pretexts, the publishers kept delaying their appearance until the waiting became intolerable. Such uncertainty made the Hrushevsky family's life unpredictable, anxious, and tense. Writing to Dmitrii Petrushevsky in the autumn of 1935, Kateryna told him about these publishing problems. A sudden onset of the grippe, from which she suffered very often, had 'upset my routine, so that I have even had to stop visiting the publisher's offices, which is my occupation and "raison d'être." After eight months of such visits, the manuscript of the sixth volume of my father's "Hist[ory of Ukrainian] Literature" has made it to the threshold of typesetting. But it is a high threshold!... As for the tenth volume of the "History [of Ukraine-Rus']" (the Vyhovsky era), about which there is also a [government] resolution, it is even more distant from the goal, although I checked the manuscript and submitted it back in June.'³²³

The publishers kept delaying from one month to the next, giving no definite explanation for putting off the appearance of volume 10. There was a promise that printing would begin in March 1936, but nothing came of it. Kateryna had hopes that after the Academy's March session work on her father's books would resume, but it was delayed again.³²⁴

Finally, toward the end of August 1936, Kateryna received the long-awaited proofs of the first half of volume 10 and immersed herself in checking them. Even at that stage, however, not everything went smoothly. 'There [would be] a great deal of corrected text at once, then long delays in the course of which I would be told repeatedly: "Come in the morning; come at the end of the day," and so all my time was spent coming and going.'³²⁵ The publication data given in the book confirm her statement: it was submitted for publication on 13 September but not authorized for printing until 9 December 1936.

Aside from correcting Hrushevsky's text itself, Kateryna supplied a number of running heads and carefully checked documentary quotations, with particular attention to the use of Old Slavic characters.³²⁶ Her scant acquaintance with the political history of the Vyhovsky era further complicated her task, and, as she herself admitted, the whole text had to be checked twice, for she was uncertain of the accuracy of her work after the first round of editing.³²⁷

At the same time, Kateryna kept up a furious pace of work on the volume, hoping to publish it in time for what would have been her father's seventieth birthday, which fell in 1936.³²⁸ The book was printed in mid-December 1936 but remained in the printshop. Sewing and binding took another month, until Kateryna was finally able to write in a letter of 19 January 1937 that she had received copies of the volume 'yesterday.'³²⁹

The academic community of the day, even at the level of junior staff members of the Academy of Sciences, could not fail to note the cardinal change in the attitude of government, party, and state officials to Hrushevsky after his death. Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko described an incident that occurred as she was returning home after respects had been paid to the historian's memory on the day of his funeral. The secretary of one of the Academy's commissions approached her in confusion, noting that the academician, who only yesterday had still been proclaimed an 'enemy of the people' and the reading of whose works had been prohibited,

323. Ibid.

324. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 12–12'.

325. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 17–17'.

326. The proofs have come down to us and are preserved in TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 146.

327. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 7'.

328. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 17.

329. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 6. Cf. Maria Hrushevskya's statement in a letter of January 1937 (*Lystuvannia Mykhaila, Marii ta Kateryny Hrushevskyykh*, doc. 14, p. 50).

was now being honored with pomp and circumstance. “It’s the dialectic,” I replied curtly, hastening to end the dangerous conversation,” wrote Polonska-Vasilenko about the incident.³³⁰

In studying Kateryna Hrushevska’s editing of her father’s scholarly legacy after 1934, many historians have puzzled over a similar question: how did the state come to support such large-scale popularization of the works of a historian who had been regarded for several years prior to his death as one of the greatest enemies of the cultural revolution and socialist construction in Soviet humanities scholarship? In their efforts to answer that question, Serhii Bilokin, Iryna Matiash, Serhii Plokyh, and other scholars have noted a certain shift in Moscow’s policy toward the humanities in 1934 and a lessening of repressive measures.³³¹ Although it seems very strange, given that the murder of Kirov on 1 December 1934 was followed by the arrest and execution of several dozen prominent political, scholarly, and cultural figures, the answer probably lies in just such a shift of official policy. To be sure, the fact that Hrushevsky was no longer among the living was crucial. Otherwise, the granting of permission to publish any more volumes of the *History of Ukraine-Rus’* and the *History of Ukrainian Literature* in Ukraine would have been unimaginable.

This did not entail a revitalization of Ukrainian historical studies. On the contrary, in early 1935 Kateryna wrote that there was ‘complete silence, at least in our department’ of the Academy, and that Kyiv was generally ‘quiet.’³³² As of late 1934, the Academy had undergone cardinal organizational changes, and most of the staff who had worked there in the 1920s had either suffered persecution or gone to Russia.

A new wave of mass political persecution—the Great Terror—began in 1937, following the plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik). By that time, fortunately, volume 10 of Hrushevsky’s *History* had already been published.

Meanwhile, there were changes in Kateryna’s status at the Academy. She had written back in December 1935 that organizational changes were imminent at the Institute of the History of Material Culture, where she worked.³³³ It is hard to say what changes she meant, but they did not leave her unaffected: by the following year, she had already left and begun work at the T. H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature, established at the Academy according to a resolution of the CC CP(B)U adopted on 23 July 1936.³³⁴

For Kateryna, editing her father’s *History of Ukrainian Literature* was a much more interesting task than editing volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus’*, and one that she considered far more important. As she herself said, she valued literary history far more than the political history of the Vyhovsky era.³³⁵ After her father’s death, there were three volumes—the sixth, seventh, and eighth, covering the period from the early seventeenth century to the late eighteenth—to be prepared for publication.

As we have seen, Kateryna began to work on the sixth volume of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* in the spring of 1935, concurrently with her work on volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus’*, and by November she was ready to submit it to the publishers. Immediately

330. Polonska-Vasilenko, *Spohady*, p. 487; idem, *Ukrains'ka akademiia nauk*, 2: 43; cf. Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, p. 280.

331. Bilokin, ‘Retsenziiia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,’ p. 257; Matiash, *Kateryna Hrushevska*, p. 107; idem, ‘Zirka pershoi velychyni,’ p. 195; Plokyh, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 276–77.

332. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 2^v (letter of 8 March 1935).

333. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 6^v.

334. Iurkova, *Diial'nist'*, p. 223; *Instytut istorii Ukraïny NAN Ukraïny: Dokumenty i materialy, 1934–1991*, comp. Oleksandr Rubl'ov and Oksana Iurkova, vol. 1, 1936–1941 (Kyiv, 2011), doc. 4, p. 25.

335. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 6–6^v.

afterward, in the same month, she was already editing volume 8, which Hrushevsky had written in Moscow.³³⁶ She could hardly have completed work on it by August 1936, when she received the proofs of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, and probably returned to it early in the new year. There is an indirect indication of this in a later letter from Maria Hrushevskya, who wrote to a prosecutor of the Ukrainian SSR to ask for a review of her daughter's sentence of 1939, noting that Kateryna had worked on volume 7 'for the last academic year, up to the day of her arrest.'³³⁷ Although Maria uses the term 'academic year' rather vaguely and loosely, it offers an approximate notion of the period when Kateryna began work on volume 7, that is, probably late summer or early autumn of 1937.

Thus, between the publication of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in January 1937 and the beginning of her work on volume 7 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* in the middle of that year, Kateryna probably completed her editing of volume 8, on which she had been working, with lengthy interruptions, since November 1935. In a letter written to Dmitrii Petrushevsky in that month, she clearly stated her intention to begin work on the seventh volume after completing the eighth. In the same letter she spoke of the problems involved in locating the texts of quotations that her father had not supplied in volume 8. Comparing the two volumes, she wrote that the seventh was better prepared than the eighth and would require less work, although she found the literature of the schools a complex and unfamiliar subject.³³⁸

Little has been written to date in the scholarly literature about volume 8 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* as a finished work ready for the press, except for very general references to such information in Oksana Stepanyshyna's memoir. It is an established fact, however, that Kateryna was working on volume 7 at the time of her arrest in July 1938 (as noted in her mother's above-mentioned letter).³³⁹ Thus scholars have overlooked the fact that Kateryna did not edit the volumes in order but began work on volume 8 after completing volume 6, and only then turned to volume 7.

Throughout that period, the publishers would not accept volume 6, and Kateryna probably kept the typescript as long as she worked at the Institute of the History of Material Culture. Following her transfer to the Institute of Literature, she submitted the typescript to the authorities there in order to hasten its publication. We have her own statement to this effect in a letter written to her mother from the labor camps. In the same letter, she mentioned having submitted other manuscripts to the Institute of Literature, but we have no further information about them.³⁴⁰

The publishers made no progress, however, as they were probably awaiting the publication of volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. On receiving copies of that volume in January 1937, Kateryna wrote: 'Now I should occupy myself with the "History of [Ukrainian] Literature"; although I have been talking about it for a long time, I am afraid that while the "History [of Ukraine-Rus]" was being printed they have managed to forget about it.'³⁴¹

Throughout 1937 the State Publishing House did not accept volume 6 for publication, which caused the Hrushevskys a great deal of anxiety.³⁴² Kateryna in particular began to doubt

336. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 4^v.

337. TsDIAK, f. 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fol. 5.

338. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 4^v-5.

339. TsDIAK, f. 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fol. 5.

340. Matiash, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka*, p. 208. On this, see also Maria Hrushevskya's letter in TsDIAK, f. 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fol. 5.

341. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 6.

342. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 11-11^v.

whether she had done well to begin editing the *History of Ukrainian Literature* while employed at an institute of literature rather than history. As she herself observed, it seemed to her at first that publishing the volume would be easier under the aegis of an institute of literary studies, given the sharp decline of historical institutions.³⁴³ But the same resolution of the CC CP(B)U that established the Institute of Literature also established an Institute of History, and historical scholarship again began to take on organized form.

Toward the end of 1937, the reprinting in Moscow of Vasiliï Kliuchevsky's five-volume *Course of Russian History* gave Kateryna some hope that volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* might be approved for publication. Having learned of the reprint of Kliuchevsky's work from a Kyiv newspaper, she interpreted it as an indication of change in Moscow's policy toward the humanities, heralding a reevaluation of historians of the old prerevolutionary generation. That is apparent from the mood of her letter, in which she sought details of the reprint—what publisher had issued it, who had edited the work, and so on.³⁴⁴

At the session of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences in December 1937, plans for the coming year were discussed, arousing new and highly uncertain hopes of stirrings in the Division of Social Sciences. 'Perhaps we will manage to publish Father's "[History of Ukrainian] Literature.'" That is what we are dreaming of on the eve of the New Year,' she wrote on 28 December 1937.³⁴⁵

Indeed, in the first half of 1938 the Institute of Literature showed serious intentions of publishing volume 6. The typescript was finally given for review to the deputy director of the institute, Professor Oleksandr Biletsky, who stressed the need to publish it. Although the review has come down to us with no precise date, its editor, Serhii Bilokin, dates it approximately to 1938. He bases this dating on Kateryna's written statement, preserved together with the review, that if the publishers were to begin work on volume 6 during her vacation of 1938, she was prepared to interrupt her rest period and return to Kyiv.³⁴⁶ This was the first time since 1934 that Kateryna was to leave Kyiv with her mother in an effort to improve her health.³⁴⁷

Kateryna's correspondence indirectly corroborates these observations of Serhii Bilokin's, which are very important for the analysis of her editorial work on her father's legacy. On 9 June 1938, a month before her arrest, she wrote that the Institute of Literature had deemed the publication of volume 6 'extremely desirable, interesting, and necessary.' She associated this with the intensive work then being conducted at the institute on the preparation of a history of literature for schools. Hrushevsky's sixth volume, which analyzed literary developments of the early decades of the seventeenth century, therefore seemed very timely, as did his other volumes.³⁴⁸

Since similar thoughts are expressed in Biletsky's review, it is most probable that Kateryna wrote this letter to Petrushevsky after reading the review. Biletsky himself stressed the great significance of the volume for the study of early seventeenth-century literature from the viewpoint of its rich store of facts, mentioning teachers among those who would find it valuable. This was somewhat similar to Kateryna's association of the volume with the history of literature that was being prepared for schools. In the last paragraph of his review, Biletsky summarized his view that publication of the volume would be 'highly desirable,' as would

343. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 9–9'.

344. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 12.

345. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 12'.

346. Bilokin, 'Retsenziia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' p. 257.

347. Cf. her mother's statement about this in TsDIAK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fol. 1.

348. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 14'.

publication of the subsequent volumes, which brought the history of Ukrainian literature up to the end of the eighteenth century.³⁴⁹

Nothing came of this, however. Soon after the review was written, Kateryna was arrested, and the *History of Ukrainian Literature* was deemed a hostile work. In early August 1938, a month after her arrest, the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences issued a resolution assigning the Institute of Literature to prepare a new course in the history of Ukrainian literature.³⁵⁰

In January 1937 Kateryna wrote bitterly of how little she had managed to accomplish in two years to publish her father's legacy.³⁵¹ In that very period, however, volume 10 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* had been published, volume 6 of the *History of Ukrainian Literature* fully prepared for publication, and volume 8 of the same series partially edited. If we add that in 1935 Kateryna managed to edit her father's lengthy article about Bantysh-Kamensky, titled 'A Historiographer of Little Russia,' and submit it for publication, then it is clear how much of her purpose she actually managed to accomplish in the first two years after Hrushevsky's death.

Kateryna's earliest mentions of her editorial work on the Bantysh-Kamensky article date from March 1935.³⁵² She also mentions Viacheslav Volgin, who had promised Hrushevsky to help publish it in Leningrad, and Kateryna soon sent him the edited text. Later, however, it turned up in the possession of Boris Grekov, who was responsible for seeing it through to publication. Clearly, the idea of placing such a long article in a scholarly journal and publishing it in Ukrainian in Leningrad was less than inspired. With Hrushevsky gone, there was no one to take decisive action and put the matter back on track. Academician Petrushevsky, to whom Kateryna appealed constantly about the article in 1935–36, was not influential enough to settle the issue. Volgin also ceased to concern himself with it. Grekov, to whom Ukrainian historians often turned, probably because of his Myrhorod origins, did nothing to promote publication. It was particularly frustrating that he gave no clear answer on the matter even when he came to Kyiv and met with Kateryna, as he did in December 1935.³⁵³ Judging by one of her letters, Kateryna had no copy of the article, and the whole problem troubled her deeply, especially as there was no progress on the publication of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*. 'He [Grekov] might at least return the manuscript to me if it is so "impossible," rather than mystify me with that silence of his,' she wrote on 5 May 1936.³⁵⁴

Yet another ordeal awaited the Hrushevskys at that time: Serhii Shamrai again became a target of the NKVD. Having served a three-year sentence after his first arrest, he was sentenced in August 1937 to another eight years' imprisonment. He never returned.

The secret police came for Kateryna on 10 July 1938, dashing all hopes for her life and scholarly work in a single moment. In the course of the arrest, her home was searched and left in total chaos. Somewhat later, Maria Hrushevaska wrote that as a result of the search, all Kateryna's editorial work had gone for naught: many manuscripts that she prepared for

349. Bilokin', 'Retseziia Oleksandra Bilets'koho,' p. 264. The stylistic resemblance between Biletsky's review and Kateryna's letter to Petrushevsky is also noteworthy. Biletsky had referred to the publication of volume 6 as 'highly desirable,' while she called it 'extremely desirable.' This may also be an indirect indication that Kateryna wrote her letter soon after Biletsky showed her the review.

350. Manuscript Institute, fond X, no. 12629, fols. 8–9.

351. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 56, fol. 7^v.

352. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 2^v.

353. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fol. 10; cf. fols. 3^v, 5^v, 6; d. 56, fol. 5^v.

354. ARAN, fond 493, op. 3, d. 57, fols. 16^v–17.

publication had been mixed up and taken away. ‘Arrest and a search of the whole apartment—not only of my daughter’s room, but of mine as well. Everything was turned upside down and thrown together: manuscripts, notes, copied passages, so that the result of long and strenuous effort was lost! They put some of those papers in a sack and took them away; they took others into my late husband’s study and library, telling me to open it, and sealed it up afterwards,’ she wrote in her letter to a procurator of the Ukrainian SSR, seeking to win Kateryna’s release.³⁵⁵

During the subsequent search on 23 August 1938, carried out in Maria’s absence, the NKVD operatives ‘cleaned out’ Hrushevsky’s study. All his manuscripts were taken off the shelves and thrown together, scattered on the floor; some of them, along with books, were put into boxes for removal ‘to the depot,’ as the NKVD men put it. Many other items and some of the furniture were put into sheds. Some of the books were returned to the Hrushevsky residence in October. At the same time, a policeman named Didenko was quartered in the historian’s empty study as a permanent resident.³⁵⁶

Confessions were beaten out of Kateryna under torture in the course of nocturnal pretrial interrogations. The dean of the Geography Department of the Kyiv Pedagogical Institute, Professor Mailis, who was arrested along with her, was one of those who left testimony about Kateryna’s spiritual and physical suffering during the interrogations. Mailis shared his memories of that period in the late 1950s, when Kateryna Hrushevka was being politically rehabilitated in the USSR.³⁵⁷ At a session of the Military Tribunal on 15–16 April 1939, she was sentenced to eight years of correctional labor in the camps, with five years’ loss of political rights and confiscation of property. On 5 June 1939 the Military Collegium of the USSR Supreme Court left that sentence in force.

Kateryna was transported to the camps of the GULAG on ‘female assignment’ (*zhenkomandirovka*), as her mother addressed letters to her in Magadan.³⁵⁸ Maria’s numerous appeals to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Ukrainian SSR Council of People’s Commissars, the prosecutors’ offices of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, the NKVD, and other official bodies to strike down the unjust sentence were of no avail. Several moving letters from Maria to her daughter in the camps have been preserved, as have fragmentary memoirs of Kateryna’s companions in misfortune in the Siberian labor colonies.³⁵⁹

Kateryna died in the camps, most probably in March 1943. According to Olha Hrushevka, she was rehabilitated by court resolution on 30 July 1959 ‘for lack of corpus delicti.’

* * *

After Kateryna’s arrest, there was no further possibility of editing and publishing her father’s legacy at the Academy of Sciences. For the Soviet leaders of that day, the only way to rid

355. TsDIAK, f. 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fols. 2, 5–5^v; spr. 933, fol. 7.

356. TsDIAK, f. 1235, op. 1, spr. 934, fols. 5^v, 11^v; spr. 933, fol. 7. Cf. Malyk, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka* (lecture), pp. 19, 22; Matiash, *Zirka pershoi velychyny*, ' pp. 201, 203–4.

357. Pyrih, *Zhyttia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, pp. 155–56, 158–59. For details of the interrogations of Kateryna, reconstructed on the basis of the investigation records, which are preserved in the archives of the Security Service of Ukraine, see Malyk, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka* (lecture), pp. 19–23; idem, ‘Kateryna Hrushevs'ka,’ *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 1991–92, nos. 3–4, 1–4: 272–73; Horyn', *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka (1900–1943)*, pp. 52–55; Matiash, *Zirka pershoi velychyny*, ' pp. 204–8, 214.

358. TsDIAK, f. 1235, op. 1, spr. 1015, fol. 17.

359. Vasyli' Horyn', ‘I den', i nich v beznastannim strakhu i zhurbi...,’ in *Zbirnyk prats' i materialiv na poshanu Larysy Ivanivny Krushel'nytskoi* (Lviv, 1998), pp. 275–76.

themselves of Hrushevsky and his family was that of physical persecution: arrest, interrogation, concentration camps, and internal exile. The logical continuation of such inquisitorial policy was a ban on the published works of Mykhailo and Kateryna Hrushevsky and the destruction of copies of their books and unpublished manuscripts.

The tenth volume of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, whose publication Kateryna managed to arrange, was promptly taken out of circulation.³⁶⁰ For many years, copies of the volume lay in storage at the Academy and survived the German occupation of Kyiv. There is documentary evidence that they were still there in May 1947. Fedir Maksymenko wrote to that effect from Lviv, expressing his sorrow that the stock of Kateryna Hrushevskya's *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy* (Ukrainian Folk Dumy) and *Naukovi zapysky Biblioteky AN URSR* (Scholarly Proceedings of the Library of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences) had already been destroyed by that time.³⁶¹

It is not hard to guess that ultimately almost the whole stock of volume 10 at the Academy of Sciences also went under the knife, and copies registered in public library inventories and catalogs were sedulously removed and locked up in special collections. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, all publications associated with Hrushevsky's authorship or editorial work held in Ukrainian libraries were destroyed.³⁶² On 14 October 1946, for example, the Press Section of the CC CP(B)U issued the following directive to the Main Administration of Literature and Publishing attached to the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR: 'All nationalist literature of Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Volodymyr Vynnychenko discovered in the course of censors' inspection of public libraries and the book trade in Ukraine must be removed.'³⁶³

In the following decades, libraries were scoured again and again for 'harmful literature,' with Hrushevsky's works invariably near the head of the list. Even in the early 1980s, overloaded trucks were still taking books from special collections of academic and archival libraries to be destroyed.³⁶⁴

In the diaspora, however, Knyho-Spilka Publishers of New York propagated Hrushevsky's works in the 1950s, producing facsimile reprints of his *History of Ukraine-Rus'* (10 vols. in 11 books, 1954–58) and *History of Ukrainian Literature* (5 vols. in 4 books, 1959–60). As of July 1958, a list of cities and a world map prepared by Hryhorii Kolodii registered the distribution of this reprint of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* to libraries in Europe, North and South America, and Australia.³⁶⁵ In the same period, at the initiative of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and other Ukrainian scholarly and community organizations throughout the non-communist world, plans were made to translate the *History* into English, but they remained unrealized at the time.³⁶⁶

In Ukraine itself, the project of publishing Hrushevsky's scholarly legacy was resurrected exactly half a century after Kateryna's arrest. In 1988 the press, scholarly associations, and popular-education societies spoke loud and clear about the importance of Hrushevsky's work

360. Malyk, *Kateryna Hrushevs'ka* (lecture), p. 16; idem, 'Kateryna Hrushevs'ka,' 270.

361. Manuscript Institute, fond 33, op. 1, spr. 5855.

362. Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Pislia pohromu (Pro doliu i nedolii biblioteky NTSh),' in *Biblioteka Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka: Liudy i knyhy. Materialy kruhloho stolu*, comp. L. Il'nyts'ka (Lviv, 1996), p. 10.

363. *Kul'turne zhyttia v Ukraïni: Zakhidni zemli*, vol. 1, doc. 158, p. 353.

364. Iaroslav Fedoruk, 'Knyhozborni ta arkhiv Dmytra Doroshenka: Slidamy odnogo inskryptu V' iacheslava Lypyns'koho,' *UASHch*, no. 12 (2007): 288–89.

365. Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 10 (New York, 1958), pp. 595–99.

366. For a detailed discussion, see Sysyn, 'Introduction to the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*,' pp. xxxix–xl.

for research on Ukrainian, Slavic, and world history.³⁶⁷ In 1989 the Archaeographic Commission of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences (now the Mykhailo Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine) was charged with the task of reprinting his *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and searching for his unpublished manuscripts. At the same time, work began in Canada on the translation of the *History* into English at the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta.

As noted at the beginning of this introduction, no historian who has dealt with Mykhailo Hrushevsky's last years has remained indifferent to the fate that befell him and his family during that period in Moscow. One such scholar, Thomas Prymak, summarized his impressions in an apt phrase: 'The last period of Hrushevsky's life, the period of his second Moscow exile, was at the same time both tragic and heroic.'³⁶⁸

The Soviet system did not know what to do with an individual of Hrushevsky's stature, for whom there was no place in its scheme of the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialist construction, and the radiant communist future. That system subjected him to great pressure, using its refined, well-trying methods of breaking its subjects physically, morally, and spiritually. In that unequal struggle Hrushevsky did not betray his convictions or historical views, nor did he bear false witness against imprisoned friends or former enemies, as others did, but forgave students and members of his close circle their unjust public criticism. It was no easy matter to withstand such pressure in the 1930s, but Hrushevsky managed it. The work that he accomplished in the adversity of exile stands as witness to his indomitable spirit.

367. Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Pro Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho: Dopovid' l'vivs'koho istoryka na zasidanni tovarystva "Spadshchyna" u Kyievi u hrudni 1988 roku,' in idem, *Postati: Narysy pro diiachiv istorii, polityky, kul'tury*, 2d ed. (Lviv, 2007), pp. 366–73; Serhii Bilokin, 'Iaroslav Dashkevych: Shliakh u nautsi,' *UASHch*, no. 15 (2010): 723–35.

368. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, p. 260.