
Introduction to Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*

Frank E. Sysyn

The History of Ukraine-Rus' constitutes the most comprehensive account of the ancient, medieval, and early modern history of the Ukrainian people. Written by Ukraine's greatest modern historian, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, the *History* remains unsurpassed in its use of sources and literature, even though its last volume was written sixty years ago. In the development of the Ukrainian national movement, it constitutes the scholarly proof that Ukrainians are a people with its own historical process. For Ukrainians the work is comparable in significance to František Palacký's *History of Bohemia* for the Czechs. The great work of Czech national historiography was published in the early nineteenth century, but its Ukrainian counterpart did not appear until the turn of the twentieth. To a considerable degree, the delay reflects the difficulties Ukrainians faced in demonstrating that they were not a subgroup of the Russians or Poles and that they had their own history.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the histories of Russia and Poland had already received academic treatment. The twenty-nine volumes of Sergei Solov'ev and the four volumes of Michał Bobrzyński were the culmination of a series of efforts that stretched back into the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, each of these two "national" historiographies had considerable difficulty in integrating the Ukrainians and the Ukrainian lands into its account.¹

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Russian history was defined as a development over nine hundred years of a Russian state and a Russian nation. The historians Vasilii Tatishchev (1686–1750) and Nikolai Karamzin (1766–1826) established the view that the polity and culture that emerged around Kyiv in the tenth century was the beginning of Russia and downplayed the discontinuities between Kyivan Rus', the Vladimir–Suzdal principality, Muscovy, and the Russian Empire. In the nineteenth century, Russian historiography evolved without delineating clearly the distinction between the Russian state and the “Russian” nation. Russia’s link to Kyivan Rus' was primarily dynastic: the ruling house of Riuryk and the state that emerged under its Muscovite descendants’ rule were the central theme of Russian history. Yet for centuries the dynasty (and its successors) and the state did not control the core area of the old Kyivan polity and did not hold sway over the millions of Ukrainians and Belarusians who were clearly heirs of Kyivan Rus'. Modern Russian historians considered these people Russians, but until the Second Partition of Poland (1793), the majority lived outside the Russian state. Even in the nineteenth century, the Habsburgs, not the Romanovs, held the allegiance of the descendants of the ancient Rus' principality of Halych. To include these purported “Russians” in the rubric of Russian history meant to expand Russian history to encompass the histories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Kingdom of Poland, the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Principality of Moldavia, the Cossack Hetmanate, the Zaporozhian Sich, and the Habsburg domains. It required including institutions and events of no significance to the development of the Muscovite state and the Russian Empire. It also posed the question of how to treat the “non-Russians”—the Poles, the Jews, the Armenians, the Hungarians—of these “Russian” lands.

Historians such as Sergei Solov'ev (1820–1879) and Vasilii Kliuchevsky (1841–1911) sporadically included events from the Ukrainian and Belarusian past in what was essentially a combination of the history of the Russian state and of an “all-Russian” people with the “Great Russians” at the core. Ukrainians challenged these views throughout the nineteenth century. Indeed, the debate over the legacy of Kyivan Rus' between the Russian historian Mikhail Pogodin (1800–1875) and the Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Maksymovych (1804–1873) in the 1850s even caused Pogodin to put forth the ultimately untenable thesis that the “Great Russians” had originally inhabited the Kyiv region and that only after they moved northeast in the eleventh and twelfth centuries did the Ukrainians (“Little Russians”) migrate into the area. In general, however, Russian historians could ignore Ukrainian viewpoints, in part because the government’s political persecution muted expression of the Ukrainian historical perspective.

The quandary faced by those writing Polish history was more obvious, because no Polish state existed in the nineteenth century. Therefore historians of "Poland" wrote the history of the "Polish lands," usually defined as the pre-1772 Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. They also wrestled increasingly with the question of who the "Poles" were both in the present and in the past. While the question of the present was complicated by changing and multiple identities ("Polish" Jews became "Russian" Jews) and emerging national consciousness (peasants in Silesia became Poles just as nobles in Samogitia decided that being Lithuanian excluded being Polish), they also faced problems in identifying the Polish national past. Having accepted the Commonwealth of 1772 as the territorial limit of Polish history, historians had to decide how they would treat these territories before 1569, when the Commonwealth was formed, or before 1386, when the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland entered into a dynastic union. They had to determine whether the history of the Grand Duchy was "Polish" history in the same sense that the history of the Kingdom of Poland was. They also had to define Polish history from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries, when the Piast domain fractured and reassembled in an altered geopolitical space.

In any account of the Polish lands, the Ukrainians (or Ruthenians) and the Ukrainian territories posed special problems. The annexation of the Halych principality in the fourteenth century had changed the composition of the Polish state. Polish historians had to decide to what extent the pre-fourteenth-century history of Western Ukraine was Polish history and to what degree Ruthenian culture and Eastern Orthodoxy were Polish. The transfer of the central and eastern Ukrainian lands from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Kingdom of Poland in 1569 further complicated the issue. The most difficult questions were the Khmelnytsky revolt and the formation of the polities of the Cossack Hetmanate and the Zaporozhian Sich. Were Kyiv and Poltava to be considered part of Polish history in 1610, when they were in the Commonwealth, but not in 1690, when they were not? If Polish history were confined to the 1772 borders, the history of the Ukrainians would be divided along the Dnipro, even though the close relations of Chyhyryn and Pereiaslav as late as 1700 were obvious. The insistence that Ruthenians were a mere branch of the Polish nation could prevail only if one accepted the late seventeenth-century demarcation line of the Dnipro as somehow definitive in the long perspective of history.

The Russian and Polish interpretations of the Ukrainian past clashed in the nineteenth century, and each pointed to the other's inconsistencies. That these interpretations could be maintained so long was due in part to the political and cultural situation that retarded the emergence of a Ukrainian

historical interpretation of the past. Indeed, the quite auspicious beginnings of Ukrainian historiography in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries did not develop into an academic synthesis of Ukrainian history during the second half of the nineteenth. The eighteenth century had produced the Cossack chronicles and the tracts on the rights of “Little Russia” that posited a claim for a Ukrainian historical process centered on, but not limited to, the Hetmanate. The political ramifications of this vision of the past were most forcefully expressed in *Istoriia Rusov* [History of the Rus’], which circulated in numerous early nineteenth-century manuscripts and found its way into print in 1846. If late eighteenth-century texts concentrated on the political entity of “Little Russia” (the Left-Bank Hetmanate), the early nineteenth-century histories by Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky (1788–1850) and Mykola Markovych (1804–1860) provided accounts of “Little Russia” in the broader Ukrainian sense, in part because the narrower “Little Russian fatherland” no longer existed. From the 1830s, Mykhailo Maksymovych claimed a Ukrainian history before the Cossack period and underlined the Ukrainian character of Kyivan Rus’. By the mid-nineteenth century, the Cyrillo-Methodians, above all Mykola Kostomarov, conceived of Ukraine as a unique cultural entity with its own historical past and its own political future.²

The clash of historical vision with contemporary politics, along with a language prohibition, arrested the development of Ukrainian historical studies. As the Russian authorities declared Ukrainian activities politically seditious, they censored historical writings and discouraged historians from undertaking general works that might have developed into academic syntheses. Indeed, because the very word “Ukraine” was banned, scholars had to cloak their discussions in such terms as “Southwestern Russia” or “Little Russia” so as to avoid charges of disloyalty. Consequently, historians could most easily make contributions by dealing with regional topics or fields such as numismatics and archaeology, or by publishing documents. Since writing in Ukrainian was banned by the Valuev decree (1863) and the Erms ukase (1876), historians could not even develop Ukrainian as a scholarly language.

In this environment, Kostomarov’s *Bogdan Khmel’ nitskii* (first edition, 1857), which dealt with mid-seventeenth-century Ukraine rather than with the person of the hetman, stood out as one of few synthesizing works. Most historians, including those grouped around the excellent journal *Kievskaiia starina* [Kyivan Antiquity; 1882–1907], collected a mass of information on specific people and incidents, albeit not equally on all periods and fields of history. Volodymyr Antonovych (1834–1908), the leading specialist in Ukrainian history at Kyiv University and founder of the documentary school, wrote outstanding studies on questions of demographic, social, and religious history. The “documentary school” emphasized the collection and

publication of sources, an activity invaluable for Ukrainian historical studies that was also a strategy to demonstrate the existence of the Ukrainian people in the past without openly challenging the imperial authorities. The only general work by Antonovych to appear was an outline of his private lectures, which was published in Ukrainian, but in Habsburg Bukovyna, without his express permission.

By the 1890s, Ukrainians had still not produced a history comparable to Palacký's *History of Bohemia*, which had established Czech history as an academic discipline and furthered the Czech national movement. While the impetus behind the writing of the *History of Bohemia* was to provide the Czech nation with a past, the subject of the work was the history of the Bohemian polity, which Palacký brought down only to 1526, when its integration into the Habsburg domains began. The writer of Ukrainian history faced the problem that the unity of the Kyiv-based polity had collapsed in the twelfth century, and independent political entities had disappeared in the fourteenth century. More comparable to the Ukrainian experience was the formation of Czech culture, which developed in resistance to the dominant Germans and the Catholic church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the Hussite movement and wars, which Palacký saw as the quintessence of the Czech spirit. The revival of the Eastern Church in the sixteenth century, the resistance to the Union of Brest, and the Cossack revolts that culminated in the Khmelnytsky movement could be seen as having a similar function in Ukraine.

Ukraine found its Palacký in the person of Mykhailo Hrushevsky.³ From 1894 to 1934, Hrushevsky not only wrote the *magnum opus* of Ukrainian historiography, but also organized and led the two most productive schools of Ukrainian historical studies in modern times, the Shevchenko Scientific Society of Lviv, from 1894 to 1914, and the Institute of History of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, from 1924 to 1930. Hrushevsky's more than two thousand works in history, literary history, and other fields were matched in accomplishment by his inspiration of scores of younger scholars and his leadership of the Ukrainian national movement. But while the individuals he trained and the institutions he nurtured were destroyed in the vortex of Stalinism, his *History of Ukraine-Rus'*—except for the lost volume ten, part two, left in manuscript—survived. It weathered the Soviet assault on Ukrainian culture because no collective of specialists commanded by Soviet bureaucrats was able to produce a comparable work.⁴

Born in 1866 to the family of an educator, the descendant of Right-Bank clerics, Hrushevsky spent most of his formative years outside Ukraine, in the Caucasus.⁵ Financially secure because of the success of his father's textbook of the Church Slavonic language, Hrushevsky was able to follow

the career of his choosing. Living in an environment so varied in culture, religion, and national traditions, and so different from the Ukraine of his parents' reminiscences and of his own observations during visits to relatives, Hrushevsky soon saw the national issue as a fundamental question of his age. As a young gymnasium student in Tbilisi, he was strongly impressed by the classic works of Ukrainian ethnography, history, and literature. This impression was reinforced by the appearance in 1882 of the journal *Kievskaiia starina*, which contained an abundance of material on Ukrainian affairs. After initial attempts to work in Ukrainian literature, the young Hrushevsky decided to go to Kyiv, the center of Ukrainophile activities, to study history.

The elder Hrushevsky agreed to his son's decision on condition that he refrain from student political activities. In the age of Alexander III, all student organizations were under suspicion, and manifest Ukrainian sympathies could call forth police surveillance. The Ukrainian movement, organized in the Kyiv Hromada, was still reeling from the Ems ukase and the banishment of Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841–1895), the leading Ukrainian intellectual of his generation. Although from abroad Drahomanov served as a spokesman for the Ukrainian movement and kept up a stream of criticism of the oppressive policies of the Russian government, the Hromada and Ukrainian leaders in Kyiv were withdrawing from political activities. Their goal became the mere survival of the Ukrainian movement. Professor Volodymyr Antonovych typified the trend with his decision that continuing to research and teach would be of more long-term significance than any hopeless political protest. His student Hrushevsky would prove to be the vindication of that decision.

Under Antonovych's supervision, Hrushevsky received a firm grounding in the examination of extensive sources in order to describe Ukrainian social and economic institutions of the past. Antonovych's work concentrated on the vast sources for the history of Right-Bank Ukraine in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, a time when, significantly, the area had not been part of a Russian state. Hrushevsky followed his mentor's lead in brilliant studies of the medieval history of the Kyiv region and of the early modern nobility and society of the Bar region. He might have been expected to follow Antonovych in making an academic career in the difficult political situation of Imperial Russia, but developments in the neighboring Habsburg Empire were to provide him with a much more conducive environment for furthering Ukrainian historical studies.

In 1890, the dominant Poles of Austrian Galicia showed a willingness to reach an accommodation with the growing Ukrainian national movement in the province. In the 1880s, partly under the influence of Drahomanov and

other Eastern Ukrainian intellectuals, the populist or Ukrainian movement had demonstrated new dynamism among the Ruthenians of Galicia. Challenging the more conservative Old Ruthenian movement, which had a pro-Russian wing, the populists thought in all-Ukrainian terms and were open to the liberal and radical political ideas of the Ukrainophiles in the Russian Empire. The Ukrainian leaders in the Russian Empire found the growing Ukrainian–Polish conflict in Galicia regrettable, both because Polish–Ukrainian relations were relatively better in tsarist Russia and because they saw the dispute as weakening resistance to Russian pressure. Antonovych and other Eastern Ukrainian leaders played a role in Polish–Ukrainian negotiations that resulted in the New Era of 1890, a brief lull in the Polish–Ukrainian struggle in Galicia. Although the Polish–Ukrainian accommodation proved abortive, it did yield some concessions to the Ukrainians, the most important of which was the establishment of a chair intended to be in Ukrainian history with Ukrainian as the language of instruction. The Austrian minister of education, Otto von Gauch, did not permit use of the words “Ukrainian history” in the name of the chair, because, he asserted, “Ruthenian history is not a concrete scholarly field.” Nonetheless, the chair in universal history with specialization in Eastern Europe was *de facto* in Ukrainian history. Professor Antonovych was called to the chair, but he proposed that his student Mykhailo Hrushevsky be appointed instead.

Hrushevsky's arrival in Lviv was the culmination of the process whereby the Ukrainian intelligentsia in the Russian Empire circumvented the imperial authorities' restrictions on Ukrainian activities by transferring them to the Habsburg Empire. Drahomanov, the most prominent political émigré, had greatly advanced this process by becoming a mentor to the more radical Galician populists, albeit from Switzerland. The symbiosis that emerged among the Ukrainian intellectuals furthered the formation of an all-Ukrainian perspective. Galicia offered the advantages of a territory where publishing could take place in Ukrainian, ideas could be expressed relatively freely, and political movements could be organized. Competition with the nationally minded Poles and the example of national movements throughout the Habsburg Empire stimulated interest in national issues. Galician Ukrainian society was in general more European than Ukrainian society in the Russian Empire, though its Europeanness was of a conservative, Central European, and Catholic kind. The Ukrainians of the province also possessed a religious structure, the Greek Catholic or Uniate Church, which differentiated them from the Poles and could be used in disseminating the national movement.

Galicia benefitted through its contacts with the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire in other ways. Galicia was an economic and, in some ways, a cultural backwater of the Habsburg lands. Ukrainians in the province were

disadvantaged, comprising a peasantry and a small group of clergy and professionals. By contrast, Eastern Ukraine included areas and cities of considerable economic dynamism. Although primary education lagged behind that in Austrian Galicia, higher education and intellectual life in Eastern Ukraine, often closely connected with that in St. Petersburg and Moscow, was more advanced in many fields. While most Ukrainians in the Russian Empire were peasants, significant groups of nobles and urbanites, especially in the territories of the former Hetmanate, were ethnically Ukrainian. Ukrainians also had greater chances for social advancement than in Galicia. This explains why modern Ukrainian culture developed first in Eastern Ukraine and why a greater number of intellectuals of stature emerged there than in Galicia.

The Russian imperial authorities prevented the emergence of a broad-based Ukrainian movement in the Russian Empire, but in so doing they forced Ukrainian activists to direct their attention to the Ruthenians of Galicia. These activists provided a great deal of the intellectual and cultural substance of the Ukrainian movement in Galicia, which became a mass phenomenon in Galicia before World War I.

The young Hrushevsky's inaugural lecture at Lviv University in 1894 reflected the cultural and intellectual issues of the region.⁶ Since the proclamation of Galician autonomy in 1868, the dominant Poles of Galicia had turned the university into a Polish institution not only in language of instruction but also in political attitudes. The Ukrainian students, primarily in theology, had become increasingly alienated from the university. Yet if Hrushevsky represented a field whose academic credibility was questioned and a language and people whose position was subordinate in the city and province, he also had reasons to be confident. He came from a historical school in Kyiv that had accomplishments equal or even superior to those of the Polish historians of Lviv.⁷ For all the organizational accomplishments of the Ukrainian leaders and clergymen gathered in the auditorium to hear him, they realized that no local scholar was the equal of Professor Antonovych's student. Most important, Hrushevsky was confident of his broad and modern vision of history.

In his inaugural lecture Hrushevsky sketched an image of Ukrainian history as the evolution of the Ukrainian people from ancient times to the present. He called for the application of methods and data from all scholarly fields, from anthropology to archaeography, to that endeavor. Addressing the audience in Ukrainian, he demonstrated that a scholarly language appropriate to both sides of the Zbruch River could be forged.⁸ In practice, Hrushevsky was initiating his life's project, the writing of a history of Ukraine. He was to use his lectures at Lviv University to compose this

work. He attracted students to seminars where research papers filled the gaps in the project. He reshaped the Shevchenko Scientific Society into a scholarly academy with a library and a source publication program that provided materials for his history. By 1898, he had published the first volume of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, which went up only to the end of the tenth century rather than to the end of the Kyivan Rus' period, as he had originally planned. The last of the published volumes would appear, posthumously, in 1937, bringing the project up only to the 1650s.

The very title of Hrushevsky's work was a programmatic statement. A history of Ukraine-Rus' emphasized the continuity between Kyivan Rus' and modern Ukraine. Written at a time when most Western Ukrainians still called themselves *Rusyny* (Ruthenians), the title served to ease the transition to the new name, Ukraine. In selecting a geographic name, Hrushevsky was defining the categories of his contemporaries. Ukraine was not an administrative entity at that time. In Russia the term was forbidden, and even the accepted "Little Russia" often did not encompass all the territories inhabited by Ukrainian majorities. To Galician Ukrainians, Ukraine often meant the territories in the Russian Empire. The term "Great Ukraine," applied by Galicians to these territories, implied in some way that the Habsburg Ukrainian lands were "Small Ukraine." Hrushevsky defined the borders of his Ukraine as the lands in which Ukrainians had traditionally constituted the majority of the population, the object of the striving of the Ukrainian national movement. Most importantly, his use of the term Rus' and the emphasis on continuity with Kyivan Rus' also challenged the monopoly that Russians had on that name and tradition in scholarship and popular views.

The subject of Hrushevsky's history was the Ukrainian people and their evolution, both in periods when they possessed states and polities and when they did not. Hrushevsky rejected the view that history should deal only with states and rulers. Deeply imbued with the populist ideology of the Ukrainian national movement, he saw simple people as having their own worth and history. This meant that elites in Ukrainian society, who had often assimilated to other peoples, were of little interest to him. He sought to write the history of the *narod*, and in his conceptualization it was relatively easy to conflate its dual meanings of populace and nation. This conflation has always made it very difficult for commentators to identify his orientation as either left- or right-wing on national or social issues.

In addition to his populist sentiments, Hrushevsky relied on his Kyiv training in the documentary school. He sought out all sources and perused masses of literature. His notes were replete with the latest Western works in archaeology, linguistics, and anthropology. He weighed and dissected sources in reaching a conclusion on any issue. His reader was

drawn into the kitchen of scholarship and shown the full array of ingredients and utensils.

Between 1898 and 1901, Hrushevsky published three large volumes. The first was issued in the year that Galician Ukrainian society celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the first work of modern Ukrainian literature, Ivan Kotliarevsky's *Eneida* (the travestied *Aeneid*).⁹ Hrushevsky, fully recognizing the significance of the occasion, wrote in the preface to volume one: "It is pleasing to me that the appearance of this book falls on the centenary of our national rebirth. Let it be a greeting to that event." Having taken three large volumes to cover Ukrainian history just up to the time of the Galician-Volhynian principality, Hrushevsky realized that his initial plan to encompass Ukrainian history in five to six volumes would have to be revised. In 1901, Hrushevsky wrote volume four, dealing with the political situation in the Ukrainian lands under Lithuanian and Polish rule from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. He began work on the fifth volume in 1902, but the remarkable tempo of publication slowed, in part because Hrushevsky was seeking additional ways to disseminate his research. His works could not be distributed in Russian-ruled Ukraine because they were in the Ukrainian language, and they could not be read by most Western scholars, who did not know Ukrainian. In 1900, Hrushevsky began to search for a German-language publisher in order to circumvent the Russian ban (German was not proscribed) and to increase the resonance of his work in the West. In early 1903, he found a way to increase the dissemination of his views: he accepted an invitation to lecture at the Russian school in Paris. Although he found Russian students little interested in the Ukrainian question, he used the opportunity to prepare a Russian-language outline of his lectures. He also traveled to London, Berlin, and Leipzig, where he became more familiar with Western scholarship and arranged for the publication of volume one in German. He immediately embarked on a substantial revision of that volume, incorporating recent scholarship for a new Ukrainian edition that would serve as the text for the German version. Even before the German version appeared, Hrushevsky began the revision of volumes two and three. In 1904 he had been informed that the Russian minister Petr Sviatopolk-Mirsky had reacted to his protests and given permission to import the *History* into the Russian Empire. Volumes two and three were out of print, so Hrushevsky revised them. Volume four had appeared in 1903. Deciding that he could not finish volume five under the prevailing circumstances, Hrushevsky issued its first part in early 1905, followed by the new versions of volumes two and three.

Political changes further slowed the pace of writing the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. The 1905 Revolution in the Russian Empire improved the

situation for the Ukrainian movement and for scholarship on Ukraine. Following the lapse in the ban on publishing in Ukrainian, these events offered an opportunity to repeat the Galician advances in the lands where most Ukrainians lived. During the revolutionary events Hrushevsky took an active role as a publicist. His Russian-language outline was reissued with a summary of more recent events. Hrushevsky began to transfer Ukrainian cultural and scholarly activities to Kyiv. The journal *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* [Literary-Scientific Messenger] made the move, and Hrushevsky established a scholarly society in Kyiv. Ultimately the political reaction in the Russian Empire after 1907 and the relatively less favorable conditions for the Ukrainian movement there than in Galicia—above all, the ban on Ukrainian in schools—undermined some of these initiatives. One indication of the continued opposition to the Ukrainian movement was the refusal to give Hrushevsky the chair at Kyiv University for which he applied in 1908. Beginning in the late 1890s, Russian nationalist circles had begun to see Hrushevsky as the architect of “Mazepist separatism,” and his manifest scholarly achievements infuriated them. They succeeded in denying him the chair. Taking advantage of whatever opportunities were available to him, Hrushevsky divided his energies between Kyiv and Lviv (and, to a degree, St. Petersburg) and turned his attention to writing popular histories of Ukraine.

Hrushevsky did not, however, abandon his major scholarly work. In 1905, he published the second part of volume five, followed by volume six in 1907, thereby completing his account of the Polish and Lithuanian period. Next Hrushevsky began his discussion of what he saw as the third period of Ukrainian history, publishing volume seven under the title of a subseries, “The History of the Ukrainian Cossacks,” in 1909. This volume, which covered events to 1625, was followed in 1913 by the first part of volume eight, dealing with the years 1625 to 1638. The increasing source base, due in part to Hrushevsky’s vigorous archaeological activities, was overwhelming him. In addition, mindful of the importance of public opinion for the acceptance of his ideas and interpretations in the Russian Empire, Hrushevsky issued part of volume one in Russian translation in 1910; in the course of doing so, he revised the work and put out a third Ukrainian edition of that volume in 1913. In 1913–14, Russian translations of volume seven and the first part of volume eight also appeared.

The outbreak of World War I found Hrushevsky, a Russian citizen, vacationing in the Ukrainian Carpathians of Austrian Galicia. Realizing that his presence abroad would provide propaganda for reactionary Russian forces, who had already begun a campaign against the Ukrainian movement before the war, Hrushevsky decided to return to Kyiv. He was immediately

arrested. The intervention of highly placed friends changed his place of exile from Siberia to Simbirsk. Later he was permitted to take up residence in the university city of Kazan. In 1916 the intervention of the Russian Academy of Sciences succeeded in gaining permission for him to live in Moscow under police surveillance.

Before the war, Hrushevsky had written a draft of his history up until the Zboriv Agreement of 1649. In Simbirsk he was unable to continue research on the primary sources needed for the *History*, so he had turned his attention to writing a world history in Ukrainian. In Kazan, however, he had returned to his major project, revising and publishing volume eight, part two, for the years 1638 to 1648. With access to the archives and libraries of Moscow, Hrushevsky continued to expand his draft to cover the period up to the spring of 1650 and prepared it for publication. Volume eight, part three, was printed, but the copies were destroyed during the revolutionary events in Moscow and the book reached the public only in 1922, when it was reprinted in Vienna from a single preserved copy.

The Russian Revolution of February 1917 gave Hrushevsky his political freedom. It also resulted in his becoming the president of the first independent Ukrainian state, which took him away from scholarship. During 1917 he headed the Ukrainian Central Rada, which developed into the autonomous and then the independent government of Ukraine. In taking the city of Kyiv in early 1918, the Bolshevik artillery specifically targeted Hrushevsky's house, thereby destroying his library, priceless manuscripts, and museum, as well as the materials he had prepared for the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. On 29 April 1918, he was elected president of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR), which evolved out of the Central Rada, but the German military authorities, whom he called in to protect Ukraine from the Bolsheviks, supported a coup by General Pavlo Skoropadsky to depose Hrushevsky and the UNR and to establish the monarchist Hetmanate. The fall of the Central Rada at the end of April removed Hrushevsky from power and the subsequent loss of Kyiv by its successor, the UNR Directory, in January 1919, made him a political refugee. He then served as the foreign representative of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, which he had supported since 1917. After extensive travels through Western Europe, he settled near Vienna, the initial center of the Ukrainian political emigration. He had lost considerable political authority among the tens of thousands of Ukrainian political émigrés, in part because of his failure to back the UNR fully and because of his political move to the left. He was, however, looked upon as the greatest Ukrainian scholar and was expected to organize Ukrainian scholarly and intellectual life.

Initially Hrushevsky fulfilled these expectations. He organized the

Ukrainian Sociological Institute and published a French version of his general history, a discussion of early social organization, and an account of the development of religious thought in Ukraine. In 1922, he turned his attention to his second monumental work, the *Istoriia ukrains'koï literatury* [History of Ukrainian Literature], and published the first three volumes in Lviv. Nevertheless, Hrushevsky was increasingly out of tune with the major trends in Ukrainian historical studies outside Soviet Ukraine. Already in the decade before World War I, the younger generation of Hrushevsky's students in Galicia had departed from their teacher's populist convictions. They instead saw political formations and elites as playing positive roles in historical development, and they studied these phenomena in the Ukrainian past. Thus, while Western Ukraine under Polish rule was open to Hrushevsky's activity, he was increasingly alienated from the dominant historical views. In any event, Lviv under Polish authorities hostile to Ukrainian aspirations, where academics had been forced to establish an underground university and members of Ukrainian armies were denied civil rights, including the right to study, was a far cry from Habsburg Lviv. It was Prague, then rapidly becoming the center of Ukrainian political and scholarly life, that would have seemed the likely place of residence for Hrushevsky. There the Ukrainian Free University, transferred from Vienna in 1922, was developing rapidly with support from Thomas Masaryk and the Czech government.

Hrushevsky's attention, however, was already directed to events in Soviet Ukraine. Although the Ukrainian movement had failed to maintain an independent state, it had succeeded in institutionalizing its view that Ukraine should be a distinct administrative entity and that the Ukrainian nation had its own language and culture. While the Bolsheviks had accepted these tenets, they remained a group with relatively few ethnic Ukrainians in their leadership and even fewer followers versed in Ukrainian culture. When the Soviet leadership adopted a policy of indigenization, accompanied by a reversal of its more radical ideological and social policies, the government in Kyiv sorely needed cadres who would be perceived as legitimately Ukrainian.

In 1923, Hrushevsky began seriously to consider returning to Kyiv. Rumors to that effect caused consternation in Ukrainian political circles, which saw such an action by the first president of the Ukrainian state as a major blow to the cause of Ukrainian independence. Hrushevsky was offered a professorship at the Ukrainian Free University and a number of other posts in hopes that he would abandon his plans. In 1924, however, he decided that he would go to Kyiv instead of Prague. The reasons for his decision have been debated to the present day. Certainly his assertion that he planned to bring his *History of*

Ukraine-Rus' up to 1917 and could do so only with access to libraries and archives in Ukraine weighed heavily in his decision.¹⁰

Accepting an offer by the Kharkiv government, Hrushevsky returned to Kyiv to take up a position at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. He showed his customary energy in organizing scholarship. Reinvigorating the academy's *Zapysky* [Annals], Hrushevsky also revived the journal *Ukraina* [Ukraine]. He gathered a talented group of co-workers and launched a number of new series, including *Za sto lit* [In one hundred years], a publication devoted to the nineteenth century. New journals specializing in unearthing and studying sources, such as *Ukrains'kyi arkheografichnyi zbirnyk* [Ukrainian Archaeographic Collection] and *Ukrains'kyi arkhiv* [Ukrainian Archive] were launched.¹¹ He also continued his work on the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, publishing volumes four and five. Returning to his *magnum opus*, he prepared volume nine on the period 1650 to 1658, publishing it in two separate, massive parts in 1928 and 1931. Hrushevsky's research on the *History* was indeed stimulated by his return to the academic environment and archives of Kyiv, but the city did not long provide a conducive environment for his work.

The very sweep of Hrushevsky's activities threatened the Communist leadership. They had sought legitimacy by inviting Hrushevsky to return, but then found his revitalization of non-Marxist Ukrainian historiography dangerous, particularly at a time when the Ukrainianization policy presented opportunities for the old Ukrainian intelligentsia to reach the masses. Attempts to obviate Hrushevsky by promoting the newly developing Marxist cadres led by Matvii Iavorsky did not have the desired effect. Ultimately the Communist authorities in Kharkiv did not decide the fate of Hrushevsky's historical school, for the rising tide of centralization accompanying the ascent of Joseph Stalin engulfed them, too. Ukrainian national communism was judged to be as dangerous as more traditional Ukrainian nationalism in a Soviet state that was increasingly becoming a successor to the Russian Empire. Beginning in 1928, Hrushevsky came under mounting attack by Party officials. As arrests and trials of the Ukrainian intelligentsia proceeded, Hrushevsky became an isolated figure.¹² After an all-out attack by V.P. Zatonsky, Hrushevsky was warned to leave for Moscow. Departing in early March 1931, he was arrested in Moscow and sent back to Kyiv, but then returned to Moscow. As Hrushevsky was exiled to Russia, the Institute of History was dismantled and its scholarly programs halted. Deprived of his Ukrainian context, Hrushevsky nevertheless continued his scholarly work, publishing in Russian journals and completing volume ten of his history. Illness overtook him during a trip to Kislovodsk in 1934, and he died under somewhat mysterious circumstances, as the result of an opera-

tion. The best testimony of the power of his name was that he was accorded a state funeral in a Ukraine devastated by famine and terror. His daughter Kateryna even succeeded in printing the first part of volume ten of his *History*, dealing with the years 1658–60, before she herself was arrested in the new terror. The second part, sometimes called volume eleven, which covered the period to 1676, remained in manuscript in Kyiv until the 1970s, when it disappeared.

Hrushevsky did not complete his history, but he had written more than six thousand pages outlining his vision of the Ukrainian past.¹³ His shorter histories allow us to see how he would have treated subsequent periods. He viewed the Ukrainian past as a process in which a people had evolved on a given territory under differing political rulers. Although he discussed the territory from the most ancient times, he dated the origins of the Ukrainian people to the fifth century, to the Antae, whom he viewed as Slavs. His goal was to use all available evidence to study periods of the Ukrainian past for which written evidence was sparse. Just as the nineteenth-century historians had turned to ethnography and folklore to understand the past of the common folk who had left few written records, so Hrushevsky turned to the rapidly developing disciplines of historical linguistics, archaeology, anthropology, and sociology to penetrate the distant past of the entire Ukrainian people.

Hrushevsky considered the study of the people, rather than of rulers and states, to be the major advance of nineteenth-century historiography. He was rooted in the nineteenth-century populist tradition that saw Ukrainian history as, above all, an examination of the dispossessed. Indeed, populists considered Ukrainians as doubly dispossessed. As a primarily peasant and initially serf population, Ukrainians and their history were seen as essentially a populist subject. As a people who had frequently lacked a state of their own and who had been ruled by neighbors, they were excluded from the usual historical discussions. Historians such as Kostomarov, Antonovych, and Lazarevsky had even taken great pride in this dispossession and argued that Ukrainians would not, by nature, form repressive states and elites. This view even influenced the study of periods when Ukrainians had possessed political entities and elites, so that they were described in a negative light. This tradition viewed its defense of Ukrainian nationality as intrinsically democratic and progressive, but spent little time examining the phenomenon of nation *per se*—how Ukrainians had evolved as a national community—or analyzing whether the traits it saw as endemic to Ukrainians could provide the basis for a modern national community. The backward political and economic life in the Russian Empire and the persecution of Ukrainian activities partially explain how this rather idealized version of Ukrainian identity was maintained. Even the increasing tempo of urbaniza-

tion and industrialization at the end of the century did not have as great an impact as might be expected in changing these views, because Ukrainian peasants played a relatively limited role in that process.

The political and social conditions of the Russian Empire explain in part Hrushevsky's link to this rather antiquated Ukrainian political tradition, but the connection also stemmed from his own intellectual formation. In general, radical political movements, including revolutionary populism and, by the 1890s, Marxism influenced his generation. By contrast, the Ukrainophile literature of the early nineteenth century and the Ukrainian populism of the 1860s formed Hrushevsky. The organic-work culturalism that typified the Kyiv Hromada of the 1880s and the journal *Kievskaiia starina* strengthened this link. These traditions remained vital even as Hrushevsky set out to accomplish the "nationalist" enterprise of writing a national history. Undoubtedly the move to Galicia reaffirmed Hrushevsky in the enterprise, since it placed him in an intellectual context where national issues were considered basic and where an increasingly awakened peasantry played an active role in political and cultural life. After all, Hrushevsky's close collaborator in Lviv was the literary titan of peasant stock, Ivan Franko. Yet this situation probably postponed any examination of where the populist ended and the national began. For, in practice it was primarily national history that Hrushevsky wrote. In doing so, he did not see the Ukrainian nation as a constant throughout the ages. Indeed, in contrast to his peers among Russian historians, who largely disregarded the question in writing Russian history, Hrushevsky discussed the development of nationality in historical context. He saw the Ukrainian nationality as emerging late and under difficult historical circumstances. The vision of a long process comprising leaps forward and setbacks, but with the Ukrainian people at its core, was essential to his view of history.¹⁴

Hrushevsky also brought a Hegelian structure to his vision of the Ukrainian past. He conceived of Ukrainian history as a thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. He saw Kyivan Rus' as the Ukrainian people's first historical creation, their thesis. He viewed the Cossack period as an antithesis. Both thesis and antithesis had an element of instability. In the Kyivan Rus' period he saw the tension between the princes and their retinue and communal institutions as unresolved. In the antithesis he saw the Cossacks as embodying elements of national-cultural renewal and social justice. They had led the Ukrainian people in a great surge during the Khmelnytsky revolt, but ultimately these vital forces had dissipated. In the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* he did not reach the decline, in the mid-eighteenth century, of Cossack Ukraine. Nor did he deal with what he saw as the synthesis, the modern national revival.

Around the time of his trip to Paris (1903), Hrushevsky also became interested in social theory, above all that of Durkheim.¹⁵ This interest in the newly developing discipline of sociology grew, so that in the period after the failure of Ukrainian state building Hrushevsky devoted considerable attention to establishing a Ukrainian school of sociology, even encouraging his daughter, Kateryna, to work in that field. He began to refer to himself as a "historian-sociologist." Certainly the field gave him an opportunity to examine primitive societies, and he could feel that he had a better tool for understanding the popular masses, as well as the earliest societies on Ukrainian territory. This new interest helped him in the redrafting of volume one and may have provided an underpinning for his discussion of the Ukrainian Cossacks. Durkheim's method of describing matters in great detail and avoiding synthesis may have influenced Hrushevsky's presentation in volumes nine and ten.¹⁶

In launching his history, Hrushevsky sought to challenge the accepted view on the origin of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples. Inherent in his work and broached in a number of reviews that he wrote at the turn of the century, Hrushevsky's new scheme for the study of Rus' history, or East Slavic history (a term he popularized), was most comprehensively presented in an article published in St. Petersburg in 1904. This short piece, perhaps the best known of all his writings, argued that the current, accepted framework for studying "Russian" history was illogical.¹⁷ Based on the claims of Muscovite bookmen, it accepted the theory of dynastic descent from Kyivan Rus' to Vladimir to Moscow to St. Petersburg as an appropriate framework for historical study. Hrushevsky maintained that while this approach may have had some applicability for the history of states, it was totally inadequate for the study of peoples and cultures. After the early period, it dealt with the Belarusians and Ukrainians episodically. It also did not permit examination of the Russians and their origins. Hrushevsky maintained that by appropriating Kyivan Rus'—which properly belonged to Ukrainian history—to Russian history, the traditional scheme did damage to Russian historical studies. Without denying that a collective history of all the East Slavic peoples could be written, Hrushevsky emphasized the need to reexamine each people's history. He declared that he was in the process of doing so for the Ukrainians, and that a similar project was needed for the Belarusians. He stated that the Russian historical past had generally been studied and that once the issue of the Russians' origins was reexamined, a proper national history could emerge. In issuing the third edition of volume one in 1913, Hrushevsky commented on how much acceptance his vision of Ukrainian history had gained since he had begun his project.

Hrushevsky's schema was as controversial as his opinion on the great

debate over the role of the Varangians in the formation of the early Rus' state. Deeply committed to the view that rulers had only superficial influence and that Rus' society had developed organically out of ancient roots that went all the way back to the Antae, Hrushevsky almost inevitably chose the anti-Normanist side.

The *History of Ukraine-Rus'* contains relatively few great men or heroes. Even Volodymyr and Danylo do not stand out for heroic deeds. The most troublesome figure for Hrushevsky was Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky. In some of his popular writings, he expressed rather favorable opinions of the hetman's accomplishments. In the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, however, Hrushevsky seemed to develop an aversion to the hetman as his lengthy account of Khmelnytsky's age progressed. In this he diverged from the centuries-old Ukrainian tradition that viewed Khmelnytsky as the father of the nation. He also polemicized with contemporaries who belonged to the statist school of Ukrainian historiography, in particular Viacheslav Lypynsky. This younger generation saw Ukrainian elites and politics as positive and considered Khmelnytsky a great statesman. Hrushevsky angrily replied that for him the Ukrainian masses were the only heroes of the Khmelnytsky revolt.

Hrushevsky did, however, accept the traditional Ukrainian attitude toward the Cossacks. He began his subseries on the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks with a document that had just been published by the church historian Platon Zhukovich. In the document, a protest from the early 1620s, Metropolitan Iov Boretsky described the Cossacks as descendants of the warriors of the tenth-century prince Oleh who had campaigned in their boats on the Black Sea. The metropolitan cast them as heroes of Christendom and defenders of the Rus' Orthodox church. With this epigraph, Hrushevsky affirmed a national role for the Cossacks and justified his labeling of the entire age as Cossack.

The initial reaction to the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* differed greatly between Ukrainian historians and activists, on the one hand, and foreign scholars, on the other. When Hrushevsky's colleagues and students celebrated his fortieth birthday in 1906, they were fulsome in their praise of his accomplishments. The editorial board, including Volodymyr Hnatiuk, Denys Korenets, Ivan Krevetsky, Stefan Tomashivsky, and Ivan Franko, went so far as to call the *History* "that great basis of Ukrainian historical scholarship and inexhaustible source of national-political and social-political self-understanding and consciousness, which for the first time truly brings us into the family of European peoples."¹⁸

Hrushevsky had unequivocally become the foremost Ukrainian historian. In Western Ukraine his schema was soon universally accepted. In Russian-

ruled Ukraine the *History's* influence was also great. In 1916, Mykola Vasylenko asserted that despite the ill will with which Russian nationalists such as Timofei Florinsky had greeted the work, all had to come to terms with Hrushevsky's erudition, as well as his success in what many had viewed as the questionable enterprise of writing Ukrainian history.¹⁹ Some of the most convincing testimonies to the work's significance came from the attempts of the opponents of Hrushevsky and the Ukrainian movement to discredit it. The Russian nationalists in Kyiv who plotted to deny Hrushevsky a chair at the university in 1908 argued that his work could not be evaluated because it was written in an incomprehensible jargon. A fellow student of Antonovych, Linnychenko, wrote a brochure in 1917 against Ukrainian autonomy in which he devoted considerable attention to refuting Hrushevsky's *History*. Arguing as a loyal "Little Russian," he maintained that Ukrainian history could be seen only as part of all-Russian history, in particular because, lacking a state, the Ukrainians had neither a history or culture of their own.²⁰ These were largely reactions against the political and cultural successes of the Ukrainian movement, but they testified to what degree Hrushevsky's *History* had served as an underpinning.

Hrushevsky commented that initially Russian and Polish historians had met his work with silence. Perhaps the linguistic medium he chose explains this, for the Ukrainian language obviously made his *History* less accessible to most other historians. Therefore Hrushevsky's strategy of arranging a German translation was well-justified, even though it was initially devised as much to promote access to his work in Eastern Ukraine, where Ukrainian-language books were banned, as to reach Western scholars. The publication in German of volume one seemed to have the desired effect: a major Polish scholar reviewed the work. Aleksander Brückner gave eloquent testimony to Hrushevsky's erudition and phenomenal mastery of literature. He paid Hrushevsky a great compliment: "Regrettably, we cannot take pride in a similarly voluminous, fundamental and intelligent work about Polish history. Would that its example might influence our historians, so that in this field they do not remain behind Rus'."²¹ He criticized Hrushevsky's linguistic observations, however, and lamented his adherence to anti-Normanism. He did not mention the issue of the origin of the Ukrainian people. Favorable notice of Hrushevsky's work also appeared in the Czech publications of Karel Kadlec.²² However, although the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* had published a positive review of Hrushevsky's inaugural lecture, Polish scholars came to see Hrushevsky's historical vision, as well as his political activities, in a negative light.²³ Still, Ludwik Kołankowski's negative assessment, which focused on volumes four to six, testified to the increasing attention being paid to the *History*.²⁴ Certainly the Russian translations of

three volumes of the history increased its currency in Russian historical circles, and its influence was apparent in the work of Sergei Platonov, Vasilii Storozhev, and Matvei Liubavsky.²⁵ In 1929, Aleksandr Presniakov even took up Hrushevsky's proposal to write the history of the origin of the Russian state and nation.²⁶

By the 1920s, the reception of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* had changed considerably. The publication of eight volumes had added to the *History's* authority, in particular since they were usually the most extensive and bibliographically up-to-date studies yet published on a broad array of topics and questions dating up to the mid-seventeenth century. In addition, the manifest rise of the Ukrainian movement and the attempt to establish a Ukrainian state had transformed the Ukrainian question from an obscure problem to a widely recognized issue. Finally, Hrushevsky's importance in the Central Rada had turned the historian into an internationally known figure. In 1922, the Ukrainian historians of Lviv issued another celebratory volume for Hrushevsky. His former student Vasyl Herasymchuk wrote a laudatory evaluation of Hrushevsky as a historian; indeed, the schema worked out by Hrushevsky and the data presented in his *History* were considered fundamental by all Western Ukrainian historians.²⁷ Yet, in attitude and approach, Ukrainian historians in Western Ukraine and in the emigration were increasingly alienated from Hrushevsky's populist views and negative attitudes toward Ukrainian leaders. Similar views were also held by some of the historians who gathered around Hrushevsky after his return to Kyiv in 1924.

The success of the Bolsheviks raised the prestige of Marxist thought, either because historians were influenced by the triumph of the revolution or because they were subjected to pressure. Initially the Marxists did not feel secure enough to criticize Hrushevsky directly, though Matvii Iavorsky produced his own, albeit popular, history of Ukraine. The most authoritative critical evaluation came, instead, from Dmytro Bahalii, a student of Antonovych, senior to Hrushevsky and formerly a professor at Kharkiv University.²⁸ Bahalii described the *History* as the culmination of prerevolutionary Ukrainian historiography and predicted that all future advances would come from the Marxists. More substantively, he disputed whether Kyivan Rus' belonged to Ukrainian history alone. He questioned whether there was a Cossack age in Ukrainian history. Bahalii also disputed some of Hrushevsky's statements about the context in which the *History* was written. He maintained that the professors of Kyiv University must have had a more positive influence than Hrushevsky ascribed to them. He asserted that the Kyiv circle had understood the need for a general history and had initiated a competition in 1895 that Aleksandra Efimenko had won. In the

end, Bahalii did not complete the history he himself was working on. His prediction that Marxist historiography would become dominant proved all too true, although its accomplishments have been of questionable value.

Communist forces had always seen accommodation with Hrushevsky as tactical. In 1925, the Soviet political police (GPU) in Moscow had sent out a secret circular describing the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* as "falsely scientific history, dangerous, and harmful to Soviet rule" and calling on local police units to identify all those who showed interest in the work or distributed it.²⁹ By 1926, when Bahalii published his evaluation, the campaign against non-Marxist scholarship had already begun. Led initially by Iavorsky, it gained increasing intensity in 1928 when Communist Party members were forced on the Ukrainian Academy. Simultaneously, prerevolutionary historical views were reemerging in the Moscow center, as could be seen from the publication of Aleksei Tolstoy's novel on Peter I and Boris Grekov's work on Kyivan Rus'. That development and the drive for ideological purity explains the campaign against Iavorsky and his school of Kharkiv Marxists. Iavorsky publicly recanted his views in early 1930. The campaign against him included charges of failing to act vigorously enough against Hrushevsky's influence.

The Marxist attack on Hrushevsky and his historical work attained great momentum in 1930. In articles published in Moscow and in Ukraine, Mykhailo Rubach pressed charges that would later evolve into the standard Soviet interpretation of Hrushevsky.³⁰ As one might have expected, Hrushevsky was attacked for failing to use Marxist periodization. To this was added the charge that he propagated the concept of the classlessness of the Ukrainian nation—a twisted interpretation of his populist sympathies and his statements to the effect that Ukrainians had frequently lacked upper classes and in modern times had a weakly developed bourgeoisie and proletariat. Rubach also charged Hrushevsky with attempting to sow discord between the Russian and Ukrainian peoples by overemphasizing the historical differences between them. He maintained that Hrushevsky had paid excessive attention to European influences in the Ukrainian past. By 1932, the destruction of historical studies and the atmosphere of terror had gone so far that such charges did not even need a semblance of veracity. Lev Okinshevych insisted that Hrushevsky had been fixated on the issue of Ukrainian statehood and the upper classes, and that there was no substantive difference between the views of Lypynsky and Hrushevsky.³¹ The Soviet process of demonizing Ukrainian "nationalism" as if it were a unified camp had begun. As Hrushevsky's works were removed from library shelves in Ukraine, and copies of the posthumous volume that, paradoxically, was published in 1937 were almost entirely destroyed, the public could know Hrushevsky only through these attacks.

Abroad, the reputation of Hrushevsky and his *History* had grown greatly. In his obituary André Mazon expressed a widely held sentiment in stating "L'Ukraine a perdu son historien."³² Otto Hoetzsch described Hrushevsky's influence on him as a friend and historian. Calling the *History* "a great achievement," Hoetzsch maintained that it was "the first to present the Muscovite and the Ukrainian historical process as separate. It worked out the first schema, the first truly scholarly synthesis of Ukrainian history."³³ In a warm personal obituary, Hans Koch called the work an "enormous synthesis of an abundance of details that are not overlooked despite their microscopic size and are masterfully turned to account. Everything available in printed sources and contributions to the literature, including the most recondite gymnasium and provincial reports of every language and culture, including Turkic and Arabic sources, and the collected data of archaeology, palaeontology, linguistics, even ethnology and theology, is here united and brought up to date with astonishing industry."³⁴

In the New World, George Vernadsky wrote admiringly of Hrushevsky's work in an introduction to an English translation of his popular history: "It is the work of a great scholar, based upon exhaustive research, pervaded by the spirit of keen criticism, and displaying a wealth of information with regard not only to the Ukrainian people, but to the general history of the period, as well."³⁵ Appropriate praise was rendered by Ukrainian scholars outside Soviet Ukraine, such as Ivan Krypiakievych and Myron Korduba, even though they now belonged to a different historical school and had not agreed with Hrushevsky's political accommodation with the Left.³⁶ World War II destroyed the historical centers in Central and Eastern Europe where Hrushevsky had made his greatest impact, and the Soviet victory and absorption of Western Ukraine decreased interest in Ukraine's history. Still, as soon as Stalinism receded, Polish scholars began citing Hrushevsky with admiration and Russian historians began including him in footnotes. In Ukraine, however, his works could not be cited and his name appeared only as an object of political vituperation.

The outcome of World War II also resulted in a large emigration of Ukrainian historians and intellectuals from prewar Western Ukraine and Soviet Ukraine to the West. Many eventually went on to North America, where there were well-established Ukrainian communities. Most of these historians worked in an émigré environment. They usually found Hrushevsky's historical views lacking in statist perspective. But they carried on his general schema and the tradition of his national historiography. One of the great achievements of the Ukrainian diaspora in the 1950s was the reprinting of the *History*, which made it widely available in Western research libraries. Borys Krupnytsky wrote an introduction explaining the

importance of Hrushevsky and his work, but also presenting the statist school's divergence from his views.³⁷ In the 1960s, the Ukrainian Historical Association and contributors to its journal, *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* [The Ukrainian Historian], in particular Lubomyr Wynar, began publishing large numbers of source materials and bibliographies as well as studies on Hrushevsky. In 1968, the Ukrainian community funded a chair in history at Harvard University named in Hrushevsky's honor. The Shevchenko Scientific Society, reestablished in the West after its abolition following the Soviet annexation of Western Ukraine, announced a project to translate the *History* and commissioned a number of translations, but it lacked the resources to carry out the enormous undertaking.

In Ukraine, Hrushevsky and his works remained taboo. This taboo served as a symbol of the provincial, colonial nature of Ukrainian culture. In the period of de-Stalinization and the subsequent Thaw, Russian scholars republished the histories of the "reactionary" Solov'ev and Kliuchevsky, but Ukrainian historians could not even discuss the contributions of the "leftist" Hrushevsky. In Moscow historians could cite Hrushevsky in scholarly discourse, while in Ukraine his name appeared only as a vehicle for denunciations of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism. This did not stop a select circle of historians from using his *History* in writing their works, and, in the degraded environment of Soviet scholarship, they felt free to appropriate his notes without attribution. At the end of the cultural thaw of the late 1950s and 1960s, Fedir Shevchenko attempted to return Hrushevsky's name to historical discussion, but that effort was soon suppressed.³⁸ After the pogrom against Ukrainian culture in 1972, Russian centralizing trends strengthened, suppressing Hrushevsky and his ideas even more. It was during the 1970s that the manuscript of volume ten, part two, of the *History* disappeared from the Ukrainian archives. By the mid-1980s, the state of Ukrainian historical studies was so lamentable that historians, in contrast to writers and literary specialists, were slow to react to glasnost, which in any event came later to Ukraine than to other parts of the Soviet Union.

In the late 1980s, Hrushevsky's name returned to public discussion in an increasingly free press, largely under the prompting of activists such as Serhii Bilokin and Zynoviia Franko, who had attempted secretly to preserve Hrushevsky's legacy.³⁹ By 1989, Ukrainian literary and cultural journals began publishing Hrushevsky's works: the journal *Vitchyzna* [Native Land] printed volume seven and part of volume eight of the *History* in installments, and *Kyiv* similarly began printing volume one.⁴⁰ In February 1989, the Academy of Sciences supported a decision of a meeting of Ukrainian archaeographers to publish a photo-offset edition of the *History*. In 1991, the first volume appeared, in an edition of one hundred thousand copies.⁴¹

Plans were made to conclude the reprint with a volume of indexes and bibliographic information. To date, six volumes have appeared.

The preface to the new Ukrainian edition emphasized the cooperation of Ukrainian specialists in the West in the project. The Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University and the newly formed Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, joined as sponsors of the edition. The preface also announced that the Peter Jacyk Centre had undertaken to produce an English translation of the entire *History*.

The translation of Hrushevsky's *magnum opus* into an international scholarly language is being realized ninety years after the historian sought to arrange the German translation. In issuing a work begun nearly a century ago by a scholar who died more than six decades ago, one must consider whether the work continues to have relevance and whether there is a need for a version other than the Ukrainian original. New archaeological finds have been made, new and better editions of sources have been published, new literature has appeared, and new theories and methods have emerged.

Hrushevsky's *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* is the major statement of a historian of genius. In breadth and erudition it still has no equal in Ukrainian historiography, and its examination of many historical questions remains unsurpassed. In some ways this is due to the unfortunate history of Ukraine, above all, the Soviet policies that not only imposed official dogmas but also discouraged study of pre-modern Ukrainian history and the publication of sources. This policy, as well as the relative neglect of Ukrainian history in surrounding lands and in the West, have made new source discoveries and expansion of information more limited than might have been expected. The tragic fate of Ukrainian archives in the twentieth century—above all, the losses occasioned by wars and revolutions—frequently means that Hrushevsky's discussions and citations are the only information extant. The reprinting of the *History* in Ukraine demonstrates to what degree Hrushevsky's work is the starting point for rebuilding historical studies there. Indeed, in the period after the proclamation of Ukrainian independence in 1991, a Hrushevsky cult emerged in Ukraine, as could be seen in the luxuriously published collection of Hrushevsky's essays and materials about him entitled *Velykyi ukrainets* [A Great Ukrainian]. Leonid Kravchuk, Ukraine's president, wrote the introduction.⁴² For most, the *History of Ukraine-Rus* will be the basis for understanding the period up until the seventeenth century, but others will use it as a tool to examine the thought of the Ukrainian national revival and the views of one of its greatest leaders.

The unfavorable situation of the Ukrainian language in the twentieth century also reinforces the need for a translation. Although for most of this

century Ukrainian has been the second most widely spoken language within one of the major linguistic groups in Europe, it has not received the currency one might assume is its due. In Ukraine itself it has been under siege, so that large numbers of Ukrainians have lost it as a native tongue. In the last decades of Soviet rule Ukraine became a country in which all postgraduate theses had to be written in Russian and most scholarship appeared in Russian. In essence, Ukrainian was returning to the status it had had in the Russian Empire, with the additional disadvantage that Galicia had been annexed to this reconstituted empire. Thus, even in the lands neighboring Ukraine, there was little need to pay attention to the Ukrainian language. In Western Europe and North America, university Slavic departments have given Ukrainian very low priority in their programs, and graduate students in Russian and Eastern European history have rarely developed even a reading knowledge of it. The modern-day scholar who does undertake the challenge of reading the Ukrainian original must cope with many quotes in Slavonic, middle Ukrainian, Muscovite chancery language, Polish, and the classical languages. Students of Western and Central European history, Middle Eastern history, and Eastern European history have generally not had access to this major account of the history of Ukraine. Yet the reassertion of Ukrainian independence has increased general interest in Ukrainian history and in the work of Hrushevsky.

The publication of *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* in Ukraine has given the lie to the twisted representation of the work in Soviet discussions. The appearance of the English translation now permits a wider scholarly community, which has often only known of Hrushevsky as a "nationalist" historian, to examine the type of national history that this great scholar wrote. In Ukrainian historical circles in the West, Hrushevsky is often called a populist, with little attempt to see whether the actual text of the *History* indeed reflects that self-description by its author.⁴³ Some have questioned the advisability of translating the *History* because it is out of date, which usually means that it does not reflect the statist school now dominant in the Ukrainian diaspora. Fortunately, the possibility of pursuing pluralistic approaches in Ukraine and the development of Ukrainian historiography in the West beyond the Ukrainian diaspora among a wider group of historians and students of varied descent are bound to break down the ideological nature of the field. For all, Hrushevsky's work will be a first point of reference.

In preparing the English edition, the issue of obsolescence had to be addressed and decisions had to be made about correcting "errors," providing information on current views of scholarly questions, and updating information on subsequent literature and source publications. It was decided to

render the text as Hrushevsky presented it, and to ask specialists to place his work in the context of the field in their introductions to each volume. The English version has one advantage over the Ukrainian original: bibliographies with complete bibliographic information are appended to each volume. These bibliographies permit closer analysis of the scholarly context of the *History*.

The need to continue Hrushevsky's work has frequently been broached. For those who would see such a continuation as one individual picking up where Hrushevsky left off, the example of Palacký would seem instructive: attempts to find a successor to carry on the Czech historian's work failed. A genius and titan of industriousness like Hrushevsky is a rare phenomenon among us. Then, too, the methods and style of writing history have changed, so that the grand national history based on examination of massive sources is rare. The collective history, practiced so poorly in the Soviet period, offers one possibility for a voluminous continuation, but it will always lack the spirit of one person's work. It is more likely that monographs and survey histories will prove to be the continuation of Hrushevsky's *History*. These works will undoubtedly devote considerable attention to the scholarly legacy of Hrushevsky in dealing with the period from the mid-seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth century, and they will go on to document and assess the legacy of the political and national leader Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Notes

Originally published as the introduction to Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1997), pp. xxii–xlii, with permission of the publisher.

1. For Russian and Polish writings on Ukrainian history, including an extensive bibliography, see Stephen Velychenko, *National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914* (Edmonton, 1992).

2. On Ukrainian historiography, with some attention to Polish and Russian writings, see the special issue of *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, vols. 5–6 (1957), including Dmytro Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," and Olexander Ohloblyn, "Ukrainian Historiography, 1917–56."

3. This comparison was made in a review of Hrushevsky's *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* by Dr. Karel Kadlec, *Sborník Věd Právních a Státních* (henceforth *SVPS*) 9 (1909): 298.

4. On Hrushevsky's life and political career, see Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto, 1987), as well as the concise account by L. Wynar and O. Ohloblyn in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* 2: 250–53. For his activities as a historian, see Liubomyr Wynar (Wynar), *Naivdatnishi istoryk Ukraïny Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1934)* (n.p., 1985). On Hrushevsky and his works, see the bibliographies by Lubomyr Wynar, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, 1866–1934. Bibliographic Sources* (New York, 1985) and *Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj:*

Biobibliographische Quelle, 1866–1934 (Munich, 1984), and the extensive bibliography in Prymak's book.

5. Information on Hrushevsky's early life comes largely from an autobiography that he wrote in 1906 and revised in 1926. Both of these texts are reprinted in *Velykyi ukrainets* (Kyiv, 1992), pp. 197–213 and 220–40.

6. For the inaugural lecture, see *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (henceforth *ZNTSh*) 4 (1894): 140–50.

7. Indeed, whereas the excellent scholarly journal *Kievskaiia starina*, devoted primarily to Ukrainian history, had been issued in Kyiv since 1882, the Polish historical journal in Lviv, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, was founded only in 1886.

8. This did not mean that Hrushevsky was a good stylist in Ukrainian. Ivan Franko called Hrushevsky's prose "cold" and full of abstractions. He pointed out that there were frequent jumps and lapses in presentation, as well as russicisms and polonisms. Ivan Franko, "Prychynky do istorii Ukrainy-Rusi," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, vol. 47 (Kyiv, 1986), pp. 417–55, especially 453–55.

9. The 50th anniversary of the abolition of serfdom in Galicia, the 25th anniversary of the literary activity of Ivan Franko, and the 250th anniversary of the Khmelnytsky uprising were all marked the same year. Each event was testimony to the growth of national consciousness and the mobilization of the national movement.

10. See the account by Matvii Stakhiv of his mission in 1923 to dissuade Hrushevsky from returning to Ukraine. Matvii Stakhiv, "Chomu M. Hrushevs'kyi povernuvsia v 1924 rotsi do Kyieva? (Zhmur faktiv i uryvok zi spohadiv)," and *Mykhailo Hrushev'skyi u 110 rokovyny narodzhennia 1876 [sic]–1976* (New York, 1978) (=ZNTSh, vol. 197), pp. 109–47, especially 133.

11. On Hrushevsky's archaeographic achievements, see B. Krupnyckyj, "Die Archäographische Tätigkeit M. Hruševskyjs," *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven*, n.s. 11 (1935): 610–21.

12. On the destruction of Ukrainian scholarship, see Mariia Ovcharenko, ed., *Zbirnyk na poshanu ukrains'kykh uchenykh znyschennykh bol'shevys'koiu Moskvoiu* (Paris and Chicago, 1962) (=ZNTSh, vol. 173), in particular N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Istorychna nauka v Ukraini za soviets'koï doby ta dolia istoriykiv," pp. 7–111.

13. On Hrushevsky's historical thought, see Leo Bilas, "Geschichtssphilosophische und ideologische Voraussetzungen der geschichtlichen und politischen Konzeption M. Hruševskyjs: Zum 90. Geburtstag des ukrainischen Historikers (29 September 1956)," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, n.s. 4 (1956–57): 262–92; Illia Vytanovych, "Uvahy do metodolohii i istoriosofii Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho"; Omelian Pritsak, "Istoriiosofia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho," in *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 1 (reprint: Kyiv, 1991), pp. xl–lxxiii.

14. For Hrushevsky, the concept of a nation or nationality as a collective of individuals united by common characteristics in the present, a communality in the past, and a common set of tasks and aspirations in the future, independent of territorial, political, or confessional divides, was a nineteenth-century phenomenon. He saw earlier concepts of nationality or people as often related to political, religious, and cultural unity. He believed these criteria had often worked against the emergence of the Ukrainian nation (*narod*). For his views, see his "Razvitie ukrainskikh izuchenii v XIX v. i raskrytie v nikh osnovnykh voprosov ukrainovedeniia," in *Ukrainskii narod v ego proshlom i nastoiashchem*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1914), pp. 1–36, especially 1–2.

15. Illia Vytanovych asserts that Hrushevsky became aware of Durkheim's work through contacts with Maksim Kovalevsky and directly, during his trip to Paris, but his misdating of the trip to 1905 casts doubt on his assertion. "Uvahy," p. 51.

16. This is suggested by Illia Vytanovych in "Uvahy," p. 51.

17. "Zvychaina skhema 'ruskoï' istoriï i sprava ratsional'noho ukladu istoriï skhidnoho Slov'ianstva," in *Stat'i po slavianovedeniiu*, pt. 1, ed. V.I. Lamanskii (St. Petersburg, 1904).

18. 'Peredmova' [Introduction] in *Naukovyi zbirnyk prys'viachenyi profesorovy Mykhailovy Hrushevs'komu uchenykamy i prykhyl'nykamy z nahody Ioho desiatylitn'oi naukovoï pratsi v Halychyni (1894–1904)* (Lviv, 1906), p. vii.

19. See the evaluation of Hrushevsky's historical work by Mykola Vasilenko in 1916, in which he discusses Florinsky's reaction and compares Hrushevsky's accomplishment to Solov'ev's, but points out that Hrushevsky had to search more widely for archival sources and discusses a much greater body of secondary literature. N. Vasilenko, "M.S. Grushevskii kak istorik," *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*, 1916, p. 43.

20. See O.P. Tolochko, "Dvi ne zovsim akademichni diskusii (I.A. Linnychenko, D.I. Bahalii, M.S. Hrushevs'kyi)," *Ukrains'kyi arkhieohrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, n.s. 2 (1993): 97–103.

21. A. Brückner, "Dogmat normański," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 20 (1906): 679 (the review appears on pp. 664–79).

22. See Kadlec's review in *SVPS*, pp. 298–305, in which he states: "Professor Hrushevsky's work is written with such unusual erudition, and is based on such a large literature and such a wealth of sources, that it belongs to the most distinguished products of Slavic literature of the past decade" (pp. 301–2). Also see his article "Mychajlo Hruševskij," *Slovansk Přehled* 11 (1909): 163–67.

23. See the review of A. Lewicki in *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 9 (1893): 565–67.

24. *Kwartalnik historyczny* 27 (1913): 349–65.

25. Hans Koch, "Dem Andenken Mychajlo Hruševskij's (29 September 1866–25 November 1934)," *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven* n.s. 11 (1935): 3–10.

26. A.E. Presniakov, *The Formation of the Great Russian State: A Study of Russian History in the Thirteenth to Fifteenth Centuries*, trans. A.E. Moorhouse (Chicago, n.d.), pp. 6–9. Also see Viktor Novyts'kyi, "Istorychna pratsia prof. O.Ie. Priesniakova i rozmezhuvannia velykorus'koï ta ukrains'koï istoriohrafii," *Ukraina* 40 (March–April 1930): 55–65.

27. Vasil' Herasymchuk, "Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi iak istoriograf Ukraïny," *ZNTSh* 133 (1922): 1–26.

28. Akadem. D.I. Bahalii, "Akad. M.S. Hrushevs'kyi i ioho mistse v ukrains'kii istoriohrafii (istorychno-krytychnyi narys)," *Chervonyi shliakh*, 1927, no. 1, pp. 160–217.

29. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, p. 215.

30. See M.A. Rubach, "Burzhuazno-kurkul's'ka natsionalistichna ideolohiia pid mashkaroiu demokratii 'trudovoho narodu' (Sotsiial'no-politychni pohliady M.S. Hrushevs'koho)," *Chervonyi shliakh*, 1932, nos. 5–6, pp. 115–35; 1932, nos. 7–8, pp. 118–26; 1932, nos. 11–12, pp. 127–36. Rubach later wrote the entry on Hrushevsky in the Soviet historical encyclopedia: M.A. Rubach, "Grushevskii, Mikhail Sergeevich," *Sovetskaia istoricheskaia entsiklopediia* 4 (Moscow, 1963): 857–59.

31. L. Okinshevych, "Natsional-demokratychna kontseptsii istoriï Ukraïny v pratsiakh akad. Hrushevs'koho," *Ukraina*, 1932, nos. 1–2 (January–June), pp. 93–109.

32. "Nécrologie," *Revue des études slaves* 15 (1935): 185–87.

33. Otto Hoetzsch, "Michael Hruševskij," *Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte* 9 (n.s. 5) (1935; reprint, 1966): 160–64.

34. Hans Koch, "Dem Andenken Mychajlo Hruševskij's (29. September 1866–25. November 1934)," *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven*, n.s. 11 (1935): 3–10.

35. George Vernadsky, preface to Michael Hrushevsky, *A History of Ukraine*, ed. O.J. Frederiksen (New Haven, n.d.), pp. v–vi.

36. See Miron Korduba, "Michael Hruševskij als Forscher und als Organisator der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit," *Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte* 9 (n.s. 5) (1935; reprint, 1966): 164–73; and Ivan Kryp'iakevych, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Zhyttia i diial'nist'* (Lviv, 1935), reprinted in *Velykyi ukrainets'. Materialy z zhyttia ta diial'nosti M.S. Hrushevs'koho* (Kyiv, 1992), pp. 448–83.

37. B. Krupnyts'kyi, "M. Hrushevs'kyi i ioho istorychna pratsia," in *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 1 (New York, 1954), pp. i–xxx.

38. F.P. Shevchenko, "Chomu Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi povernuvsia na radians'ku Ukraïnu?" *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1966, no. 2, pp. 13–30.

39. Establishment historians such as V. Sarbei and R. Symonenko opposed "rehabilitation." See Bohdan W. Klid, "The Struggle over Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Recent Soviet Polemics," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 33, no. 1 (March 1991): 32–45.

40. *Vitchyzna*, 1989, nos. 1–12, and 1990, nos. 1–8; *Kyïv*, 1989, no. 12, and 1990, nos. 1–10.

41. The reprint is also important for the process of integrating Hrushevsky's legacy into post-Soviet Ukrainian historiography. See the introduction by V.A. Smolii and P.S. Sokhan', "Vydatnyi istoryk Ukraïny," pp. viii–xxxix.

42. Fedir Shevchenko, who had attempted to secure Hrushevsky's rehabilitation in the 1960s, wrote the afterword (pp. 486–89).

43. For a discussion asserting that the populist label is an oversimplification, see Liubomyr Vynar (Wynar), "Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i derzhavnyts'kyi napriam v Ukraïns'kii istoriohrafii," in his *Naivydatnishi istoryk*, pp. 33–54.