

**MYCHAJLO HRUŠEVSKY
AND HIS RELATIONS TO BOHEMIA
AND TO THE CZECH SCHOLARSHIP**

BOHDAN ZILYNSKYJ

In autumn 1996 Ukraine, Czech Republic and some other countries have commemorated the 130th anniversary of the Ukrainian university professor, Mychajlo Hruševsky's birth.³³¹ An exhibition providing basic information on the founder of the Ukrainian national historiography, his life as well as his literary works took place in the National museum of Prague. To a certain extent, documents proving Hruševsky's long-lasting relation to the Czech environment, Prague in particular, were on exhibit too. A newly unveiled tablet on a house in Prague 7, where Hruševsky stayed several times, is to remind of it as well. The Czech president handed over his Ukrainian counterpart, L. Kučma an entire collection of copies of documents concerning Mychajlo Hruševsky discovered in the Czech archives.

All these celebrations contributed to presenting this essay, which attempts to summarize documents on Mychajlo Hruševsky's relations and bonds to the Czech environment. This preliminary image is based on sources partly forgotten, or unknown yet, originating mostly from

³³¹ From the large bibliography on Mychajlo Hruševsky published in Ukraine in the last decade, a book to be mentioned is *Velykyj ukrajinec (Materialy z žytt'a ta dijlnosti M. S. Hruševskoho)*, Kyjiv 1992.

Czech archives. This essay presents Hruševsky's correspondence to the Czech historians as well as his stays in Bohemia in the early phase of the First republic, and last but not least, Czech reflections on Hruševsky's scholar and political activities. Each of these issues would deserve to be dealt with more closely. Nonetheless, a seemingly very personal topic turns out to be one of the most important expressions of the Czech-Ukrainian relations as they were dramatically and inconsistently shaped from the end of 19th century up to 30s of the 20th century.

So far, everything seems to prove the fact that the first Czech comments on Hruševsky's historiographic achievements only date back to the year 1894 when he entered the Lvov university. At that time, Hruševsky's phenomenal work in the field of research, publishing, and organization broke out and lasted for another 20 years before moving his activities to the Eastern Ukraine after 1905. In 1896 Josef Pekař, then young Czech historian, recognized Hruševsky's activities in a short note.³³² The same author made another honorable mention in the updated version of the rapport nine years later.³³³ Hruševsky's work was positively, though more briefly, commented on by Lubor Niederle and shortly annotated by Čeněk Zíbrt.³³⁴

Despite the number of comments on Hruševsky, Czech historians' attention paid to his work is only fragmentary until 1905. At least, Czech historiography started to recognize the existence of independent Ukrainian historiography, something unheard of till 1890s.

The revolutionary events of 1905 shifted understanding of the Ukrainian question in the Czarist empire to a more political level. Current Russian censorship precautions concerning the Ukrainian writings were partly lifted. The political challenge opened up for

³³² J. P., In the year 1893 *Tovarystvo imeny Ševčenka*, a Small Russian publishing house was reconstructed..., the *Český časopis historický* (Czech Historical Review) 2, 1896, pp 132–133.

³³³ J. P., We often hear that of all Slavic nations, dialects repectively, the Ukraine people stand closest to us, the *Český časopis historický* 10, 1911, pp 468–469.

³³⁴ Niederle commented on two minor works by Hruševsky in *Bibliografie české historie* for the year 1904, Prague 1905, pp 30 (nr. 956 and 957). Zíbrt's short annotations were published in the *Časopis českého muzea* (Journal of the Museum) 79, 1905, pp 197 and 80, 1906, pp 484.

Hruševsky on the political battle field in Russia, and the way he was able to seize the opportunity draw attention of the Czech historians who studied his scholar work. In years 1908 and 1909 the first two major reviews on so far published volumes of Hruševsky's History of Ukraine, or rather its German translation, appeared. Their authors represented two generations of scholars – Karel Kadlec (1865–1928) and Jan Slavík (1885–1978).

Kadlec was Hruševsky's peer, and was able to follow the whole spectrum of contemporary scholar literature published in the Slavic countries as well as in Hungary in the field of juristic history that was familiar to him. His interest in the Slavic juristic history, however based on scrupulous scientific work in Kadlec's case, originated from the prevailing post-romantic Slavonic enthusiasm shared and promoted by Kadlec during his university years in mid 1880s. Already then he expressed interest in the Ukrainian question.³³⁵

Jan Slavík, on the other side, belonged to the generation of Kadlec's and Pekař's pupils, and failed to share the all-Slav enthusiasm in his professional and researcher's interest. Instead it was replaced with more profound interests in Russian historiography while the Ukrainian question was only mentioned randomly as a part of it.³³⁶

Despite his words of acknowledgement, Slavík expressed discontent with some of Hruševsky's thesis, especially with historian's interpretation of the very beginning of the Ukrainian national history.³³⁷ Kadlec on the other hand was undoubtedly the most distinct and very enthusiastic promoter of the work of the Ukrainian historian,

³³⁵ See Kadlec's article from "Z literatury rusinské" (O literárním obrodu Rusinův rakouských a o rusínských čítárnách národních), Literární listy (Velké Meziříčí) 10, 1888–1889, pp 23–24, 46, 63–64.

³³⁶ The work of Jan Slavík has been most consistently studied by Jaroslav Bouček who is also the author of Slavík's detailed bibliography.

³³⁷ Slavík's review of the first volume of Hruševsky's *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*, Leipzig 1906, was published in the *Český časopis historický* 14, 1908, pp 214–217; the review of the seventh volume of *Istorija Ukrajinny – Rusi* was published in the *Český časopis historický* 16, 1910, pp 335–339 (together with his evaluation of Ivan Krypjakovyč's similarly focused edition that was published at the same time).

and his evaluation of Hruševsky's work is very positive.³³⁸ He also showed deep understanding and consent to the political aspirations of the Ukrainians, while Slavík was more sceptical. Sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation was, however, an indisputable fact for him as well.

Besides the above mentioned reviews, Kadlec's article on Hruševsky published in the Slavonic Review (*Slovanský přehled*) has to be mentioned, too.³³⁹ Kadlec closely followed all scholar and popular works by Hruševsky until 1914, and thus became the most dedicated Czech historian to promote the Ukrainian author in Bohemia.³⁴⁰

All above mentioned materials suggest that Hruševsky was one of the leading spirits of the Ukrainian nation whose activities before 1914 were a key for some Czech humanists to understanding political and intellectual aspirations of the Russian and Austrian Ukrainians. The Czech perception of Hruševsky's activities could not be threatened by the unusual appearance of the poet, journalist, ethnographer, historian and literary historian, Ivan Franko who entered the Czech intellectual world in his specific way already in 1890s.³⁴¹

Hruševsky was highly praised for his scholar work by Czech historians. The First class of the Czech Academy (ČAVV) suggested Hruševsky to become a foreign member on 11th November 1911. The Austrian Kaiser Franz Joseph didn't approve of his membership for unknown reasons on 1st December, and thus Hruševsky's membership

³³⁸ Kadlec co-reviewed the same German translation of Hruševsky's work and the 6th volume of *Istorija Ukrajiny – Rusi* in *Sborník věd právních a státních* 9, 1908–1909, pp 298–305.

³³⁹ K. KADLEC, Mychajlo HRUŠEVSKYJ, *Slovanský přehled* 11, 1908–1909, pp 163–167. This study became the basis of an anonymous entry on Hruševsky in *Ottův slovník naučný* encyclopedia, volume 28 (attachments), Prague 1909, pp 603.

³⁴⁰ See reports on the Russian version of *The Illustrated History of Ukraine* in *Sborník věd právních a státních* 13, 1912–1913, pp 196, and the Russian version of *The History of the Ukrainian Cossacks*, *ibid* 13, 1912–1913, pp 437–442, and 15, 1914–1915, pp 57–60.

³⁴¹ See a contemporary study by Zina GENYK – BEREZOVSÁ, *Ivan Franko and the Czech literature*, *Slavia* 55, 1986, pp 295–302.

³⁴² Hruševsky's membership in The Czech Academy of Science was dealt with by Alena Šlechtová and Josef Levora in *členové ČAVU 1890–1952*, Prague 1989, pp 510. See also *Věstník ČAVU* 20, 1911. pp 470.

stayed unresolved for the next eight years.³⁴² Probably as a reaction to this situation, Hruševsky was presented with membership by another Czech scholar society – *The Czech Royal Society of Science* (KČSN). Six existing members of KČSN, mostly linguists and historians, suggested Hruševsky to become a foreign member of KČSN. Among the petitioners we can find names such as L. Niederle, J. Zubatý, J. Goll, F. Pastrnek, and J. Kalousek, i.e. two historians from the older generation. The recommendation paper portrayed Hruševsky as “the most influential Ukrainian historian, representing the literary and scientific aspirations of Ukraine in Galicia as well as Kiev”, who is “the leading figure of the Ukrainian nation”.³⁴³ At the General Assembly of KČSN on 7th January 1914 Hruševsky was finally proclaimed the member.³⁴⁴

It would be wrong to assume that this double-acknowledgement paid to Hruševsky by the Czech scholar societies was to prove the unconditional reception of his scientific thesis on the sovereignty of Ukraine and its history. One year before Hruševsky, in 1913, a Russian professor from Kiev university, Timofej Florinskij was elected a foreign member of KČSN despite the fact that he opposed the Ukrainian separatism as well as Hruševsky’s thesis, and was considered a thorough Ukrainophobe.

It is not a coincidence that at the same time when Hruševsky’s work started to draw attention of the Czech scholars, representatives of the Russophile oriented Kramář line among journalists and politicians followed Hruševsky’s activities with disbelief and criticism.³⁴⁵ This criticism towards Hruševsky’s activities was later shared by a number of Czechs living in Ukraine.

Already before the outbreak of the World War I. which had a different impact and consequences, on both the Czech and Ukrainian

³⁴³ This recommendation paper is kept in the Archive of the Czech Academy of Science, fount KČSN, file 17 (personal files of members).

³⁴⁴ The election of Hruševsky as well as his profile was included in the *Výroční zpráva KČSN* for the year 1913, Prague 1914, pp 9–10. Historian’s letter of gratitude written in Lvov in Ukrainian on 26th January 1914 is filed in the Archive of the Czech Academy of Science, fount KČSN, in Hruševsky’s personal file.

³⁴⁵ See the article *Profěssor Gruševský /sic!/* in *Národní listy* 48, 1908, nr. 143, (24.5.), pp 1.

nations respectively, the formal spectrum of Hruševsky's relations to the Czech environment was closing up in quite a distinct way. At the same time Hruševsky tried to find a platform in the Ukrainian periodicals for already existing Czech-Ukrainian relations in the field of social sciences. The scholar revue *Ukrajina* that started to appear in the beginning of 1914 under Hruševsky's supervision was to fill up the gap. A few foreign historians were asked for cooperation. Besides the above mentioned Karel Kadlec, who did contribute to the periodical³⁴⁶, another young Czech literary historian, Josef Volf was invited. Hruševsky's letter to Volf from June 1914 hints at the vast spectrum of problems to be dealt with in the periodical with the help of Czech historians.³⁴⁷ The war bringing about persecution of the Ukrainian press by the czarist regime though disabled this cooperation for at least ten years.

Hruševsky, who returned to Eastern Ukraine, was shortly seized by the Czarist authorities and expelled somewhere to central Russia. Historian's contacts to Bohemia were thus interrupted, and his fate could hardly draw much attention in the rapidly evolving war events. The same can be said about the period after the March revolution in Russia in 1917 when Hruševsky became the leading figure of the Ukrainian political movement and its Central Council. In Bohemia he was mostly perceived for his state-forming ambitions. At the time however, Czechs were absorbed with their own national and state aspirations. In 1918 Czech policy was to a growing extent relying on the Western Allied powers, while the Ukrainian hopes were – from the lack of other possibilities - directed the other way. This fact was hindering positive reception of Hruševsky's state-forming attempts,

³⁴⁶ Kadlec published his review on Ž. Perič's study on the problem of the old-time household (*zádruha*) in Serbia in the first issue of the periodical on pages 142–143. Kadlec's name was listed on the cover page among the external contributors of the published issues of the periodical.

³⁴⁷ Hruševsky's letter from 19th June 1914 written on the original *Ukrajina* periodical letter-paper is preserved in Josef Volf's personal heritage in the Literary Archive attached to *Památník národního písemnictví* (Memorial of National Literature).

and often led to wrong conclusions depicting Hruševsky as a “traitor”, “Austrian agent”, etc.³⁴⁸

It was this inconvenient period, however, that enabled Hruševsky to play a much more important role, than anytime before. A tiny literary collection called “Ukraine and Ukrainians” dedicated to a mass reader caused the change.³⁴⁹ The book was prepared by a national-socialistic journalist and poet, not well known František S. Frabša. If the book were compiled by a historian, it would have likely given more lasting and realistic picture of Ukraine in the years of revolutionary changes within the old world.

Due to the way the book was worked up, only few reviews on the book appeared in the Czech periodicals and literary papers before it disappeared again.³⁵⁰ It was soon surpassed by events of much bigger importance for the Czech national interests. Later on, nevertheless, calls for a complete and better presentation of Hruševsky’s work prevailed. By the end of March 1919, O. Bočkovsky, a significant Ukrainian journalist living in Bohemia, suggested historian Jaroslav Bidlo – Marie Nosková to be the translator of Hruševsky’s illustrated history of Ukraine.³⁵¹ By a coincidence, there were good conditions for Hruševsky to fasten his ties to the Czech lands due to the adverse development in the independent Ukrainian state. Such ideal conditions were never to be repeated again.

³⁴⁸ Critical views are represented by Josef DŮRICH, *V českých službách*, Klášter nad Jizerou 1921, pp 76, 79, and 84–85, See also Fedor DOUBRAVA’s *Tragedie Slovanstva a Francie*, Prague 1921, pp 4,6.

³⁴⁹ M. HRUSEVSKY, *Ukrajina a Ukrajinci*, Prague 1918. František Švejda’s publishing house that published the book was so far only focused on publishing of theatre plays.

³⁵⁰ A daily *Národní politika* nr. 36, 1918, nr. 126 (2. 6.), *Nedělní zábavná a poučná příloha* pp 2; the magazine *Česká svoboda* nr. 1, 1918, nr. 2 (31. 5), pp 9; *Lípa* nr. 1 1917–1918, pp 799–800; *Naše doba* periodical 29, 1918–1919, pp 466; *Zlatá Praha* nr. 35, 1917–1918, pp 491; *Sborník české společnosti zeměvědné*, nr. 24, 1918, pp 66; and with a delay also *Česká revue* 19, 1919–1920, pp 402. This survey of reflections on the book may not be complete.

³⁵¹ Bočkovsky’s letter to Bidlo from 15th March 1919 is preserved in the heritage of Jaroslav Bidlo in the Archive of the Czech Academy of Sciences.

The immigration office for Czech soldiers returning from the front aligned to the Ministry of Defence operating in Stanislav confirmed Hruševsky's departure for abroad on 14th april 1919. The historian is surprisingly listed as a representative member of the Ukrainian Direktorium. The following day Hruševsky has crossed the Ukrainian border and started his five years long stay out of Ukraine. The exact chronology of his travel is not known but with the help of different sources it is worth trying to discover.³⁵² Hruševsky's itinerary from the years 1919-1920 shows incredible flexibility within the realm of mid-western Europe marked by Paris, Geneve, Berlin, Vienna, and Prague. The Czech metropolis belonged to places of higher priorities to Hruševsky's program abroad. That's why he spent quite a lot of time in Bohemia between 1919–1920.

On 18th April 1919 Hruševsky came to Prague, and stayed till mid June. In the time to come he set off for Paris and Luzern, and then back again to Prague in mid August. In the end of September he set off for Vienna and Berlin. He returned to Prague for a short time, and shortly continued to Geneve by the end of October. He stays in Geneve, Bern, and Paris till mid January 1920. According to the information available Hruševsky stayed in Prague partly in February and most of the summer, as well as in November. He stayed in Prague in January the next year as well. Then the most intensive period of Hruševsky's encounters with Prague was closing up.

The former highest situated representative of the Ukrainian state was pushed out to the margins of Ukrainian political life. Despite this he used to present himself in Europe not as a historian, but rather as a politician and journalist. This was due the fact that he was the major negotiator of The Ukrainian Social Revolutionary Party (SRP) in Europe, a role that was laid upon him before leaving Galician Ukraine in April 1919. Hruševsky and other representatives of the

³⁵² The main source of information for the period till February 1920 may be Hruševsky's essay *V peršij delegaciji Ukrajinškoji partiji socialistiv-revoljucioneriv* (kviteň 1919 r. – ljutyj 1920 r.). *Boritesja - poborete*, nr. 3 (November 1920), pp 47–60, nr. 7 (February–March 1921), pp 28–54.

party opposed the current political situation in Ukraine represented by the Direktorium, headed by Symon Petljura and the coalition parties, that have been sharing the power on the Ukraine political scene between 1919 – 1920. Hruševsky was aware of the necessity to compromise with the Soviet Russia to preserve the Ukrainian statehood were the SRP would have its place.

Until the occupation of the remaining Ukraine territory by the Bolshevik army in November 1920, Hruševsky didn't succeed, however, in pushing this concept through. It was not acceptable for the Bolshevik representatives, and the Soviet part of Ukraine either. Putting the Eser strategy across within the Ukrainian exile though must have complicated achieving another conception represented by Symon Petljura who proclaimed hostility to the Soviet Russia relying on foreign allies. It turned out that only the newly formed Poland following its own political interests would qualify as an ally at that time. Hruševsky criticized Petljura's orientation on Poland heavily in mid June 1920. His ideas were published in the Czech social-democrat daily *Právo lidu*.³⁵³

Even in Czech settings Hruševsky seemed rather a politician, journalist, and organizer than a historian. Hruševsky was devoted to his organizational activities so much, that he was not even able to maintain the Czech-Ukrainian scholar relations. He only tried to win over several Czech professionals from *L'Europe Orientale* magazine he was engaged with as a co-author from September 1919 to January 1920 in Paris. The Czech historians however were too preoccupied with problems of their own country to even react to Hruševsky's insistence.³⁵⁴ There was no way how to amplify Hruševsky's contacts with the Czech professionals. Karel Kadlec was no longer showing his interest in his Ukraine college's work. He was later replaced by historian prof. Jaroslav Bidlo who paid some attention to the Ukraine

³⁵³ Mich. HRUŠEVSKY /sic!/, *Ukrajina, Rusko, a Polsko*, *Právo lidu* 31, 1920, nr. 139 (15.6.), pp 2–3.

³⁵⁴ A summary only was published in the issue Nr. 7 from 1st December 1919 by Jaromír NEČAS, *Les Polonais en Galicie*, pp 219–221.

question after 1918.³⁵⁵ At that time, Bidlo edited the social-scientific part of the *Časopis Národního muzea* where the Ukraine question was given large publicity. He did interest himself in Hruševsky's work till it closed up.

During his stays in Czechoslovakia, Hruševsky used to live in the flat of Oleksandr Žukovsky, his close political colleague. Žukovsky lived with his wife at corner of Dobrovského and Ověnecká streets not far from the Letná Park from January 1920 to May 1921. The flat was used as the Foreign Mission of the in Prague Headquarters. Part of the would-be *Ukraine Sociological Institute* library was moved here as well. Hruševsky combined his Prague stays with moments of peace in the Czech countryside. Not even here did he put his work aside. Up to the day, there are only records on his stays in Sedmihorky, Vysoká u Mělníka and Karlovy Vary.³⁵⁶

It is not easy to characterize Hruševsky's activities in Czechoslovakia. He was involved in coordinating of the party policy, he took part in several negotiations and conferences, he wrote some articles, answered letters (there are records on open letters written by Hruševsky to various addressees), and organized purchases for the above mentioned library.

All the mentioned activities were topped up by occasional meetings with the Czech political representatives. There are, however, no reliable information on the frequency and range of those meetings. We can assume a closer political cooperation with Social democracy representatives. Among documents hinting at such cooperation is not only Hruševsky's article in *Pravo lidu* daily, but also the fact that Hruševsky's informational booklets in French were

³⁵⁵ For the first time Bidlo showed his significant interest by his rapport on the 3rd edition of the *Illustrated History of Ukraine* published in the *Český časopis historický* 25, 1919, pp 156.

³⁵⁶ Hruševsky stayed in Karlovy Vary after 20th August 1919 where he met with the Ukrainian Interior Minister Temnycky, and then again at the same time next year. In June and July 1920 he stayed in Harasov (near Kokořín) and Sedmihorky as it is proved by the date of publishing of the article on the tasks of Ukraine members of the SRP, see *Boritesja – poborete*, nr. 1 (September 1920), pp 51.

gradually published in Social Democracy's printing house.³⁵⁷ On the other side, there are no such hints to be found in the case of the Czechoslovak National-Socialist Party despite its warm, though short-termed relation to the Ukrainian question.

What was most significant were the meetings with Czechoslovak president, T. G. Masaryk having taken place at least twice (20. 8. 1919 and 21. 9. 1920).³⁵⁸ The meetings must have been useful for both sides. The president was briefed on the current situation in Ukraine and Hruševsky, the former political representative could share his ideas about the future prospects of Ukraine. On the other side, Hruševsky could seize the opportunity to make Masaryk aware of the needs of Ukrainians, and discuss the problems of the Ukrainian military and civilian refugees to Czechoslovakia in 1920.

Hruševsky was not only trying to defend his own position but he was talking in the name of the arising Ukrainian emigration that he, in fact, represented despite the already existing non-official diplomatic Ukrainian mission headed by Maksym Slavinsky. The new edition of Hruševsky's work *On the "Latest Ukrainian-Russian Relations"* published in the Czech translation in August 1919 originated from this environment.³⁵⁹ This was the second and last Hruševsky's work published in the Czech translation as a separate book.

Despite the odds, the Czech scholars still regarded Hruševsky mostly as their colleague of a different nationality in 1919. It was publicly confirmed at the Czech Academy of Science (ČAVU) general assembly on 2nd July 1919 and the regular monthly meeting of ČAVU on 15th November 1919 where the historian was proclaimed the member.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁷ Mychajlo HRUŠEVSKYJ, *Ukrajina a Rusko*, Prague 1919. The booklet was published as the 10th – 11th volume of the series *Explore Ukraine*.

³⁵⁸ Hruševsky mentions his meetings with Masaryk and journalist Scot Viator in *V peršij delagaciji*, p. 51. For the audience with the president see the Archive of the Presidential Office, label D 7290/25.

³⁵⁹ *La lutte sociale et politique en Ukraine* (1917, 1918, 1919), pp 1 (Prague) 1920 is the work concerned.

³⁶⁰ *Věstník ČAVU* 28–29, 1919–1920, Prague 1920, pp 129. The enrolment documents were signed by Karel Kadlec, the then secretary in chief of the particular branch of ČAVU.

Hruševsky was briefed on his membership in a letter from 9th December to Geneva. In his response from 20th December he thanked the assembly and took this honour “as if it were given through him to the whole Ukrainian nation”.³⁶¹

Hruševsky's activities in Bohemia culminated in 1920. Right after he realized that he can not meet his political targets with the help of the Czechoslovak authorities, the necessary condition of his permanent settlement in Prague. While in some cases, Hruševsky met with understanding (formalities concerning his passport for example), in other cases it was not considered necessary, or needful to help him achieve his targets. Due to the current lack of flats in Prague, all attempts to find him a flat failed as well as an adequate space for the Ukrainian Sociological Institute and the library. These facts led Hruševsky to permanently resettle to Austria in autumn 1920. Austria then became quite a stable base for him till the beginning of 1924.

There was a new chance for Hruševsky to move back to Czechoslovakia. From 1923 the *Ukrainian Industrial Academy* in Poděbrady representatives negotiated with Hruševsky, in September Hruševsky was contacted by the *Ukrainian Higher Pedagogical Institute* in Prague representatives. Both institutes were interested in Hruševsky as a teacher. It's right so to assume that Hruševsky would have had the best presumptions to devote himself fully to scholar and teaching activities, if he had moved back to Bohemia, since he was no longer engaged in politics at that time. This circumstance might have also intensified his contacts with the Czech scholar community. This construct had, however, never come true which made him move back to the Soviet Ukraine. He returned back to Kiev in the beginning of 1924.³⁶²

³⁶¹ The Archive of the Czech Academy of Science, fount ČAVU, file 211, label nr. 259.

³⁶² Olha ZUBKO, *Ukrajinski vysoki školy v Čecho-Slovaččyni ta M. Hruševskyj - vtračeni možlyvosti včenoho ta emibraciji (1920–1924)*, manuscript of so far not published work comprising of 11 pp. I'd like to thank the author who let me become familiar with her work.

After re-emigration, Hruševsky was allowed, from his position of the leading member of the *Ukrainian Academy of Science*, to accomplish his ideas on the development of the Ukrainian national, politically neutral historical science before Stalin's machinery started to mercilessly tighten the screw. Hruševsky tried to upkeep his relations with his Czech colleges, especially J. Bidlo and Jiří Polívka, and he came into touch with the *Prager Presse* editorial board.³⁶³ At that time he started to show interest in the Czech religious and literary influences on Ukrainian spiritual life in the 15th Century. He consulted this topic with Jiří Polívka in his correspondence before publishing the "History of the Ukrainian Literature".³⁶⁴

His letters reveals his attempts to intensify cooperation between the Czech and Ukrainian Academies of Science. That was why several Czech scholars were given membership in the Ukrainian Academy of Science. Hruševsky also tried to gain larger publicity for the achievements of the Ukrainian science in Czech periodicals. Due to the political situation such attempts were not welcome, and so the real output of Hruševsky's effort didn't live up to his expectations. Hruševsky failed to maintain permanent cooperation between the Czech scholars and the *Ukrajina*, the newly reborn scholar periodical. The most significant, though rather symbolical tribute to the Ukrainian scientist, were the articles by Czech scientists published in the Special Jubilee Edition devoted to Hruševsky's 60 years anniversary in 1926.³⁶⁵

There are no records of correspondence between Hruševsky and Czech historians after 1928. We do not know why these contacts

³⁶³ Hruševsky's correspondence with his Czech colleges was not published yet, although it deserves to be analysed more closely.

³⁶⁴ M. HRUŠEVSKY, *Vplyvy českoho nacionalneho ruchu XIV-XV vikiv v ukrajinskim zyt't'u i tvorčosty, jak problema doslidu (Kilka zamitok i deziderat)*, *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, tom 141-143, Lviv 1925, pp 1-13, was reprinted in Hruševsky's *Istorija ukrajiskoji literatury*, tom 5, Kyjiv 1926, pp 53-73 in the *Vidhomony českoho religijno-nacionalneho ruchu* chapter.

³⁶⁵ Czech scholars J. Bidlo, L. Niederle, and J. Polívka contributed to the *Special Jubilee Edition* published in Kiev in 1928.

didn't continue while the correspondence between Hruševsky and some of his Ukrainian colleges abroad went on till the beginning of 1931. Hruševsky followed new Czech historical studies after 1928 and reviewed some of them, mainly Slavistic works, in the *Ukrajina* periodical.³⁶⁶ Even this channel of contacts disappeared after Hruševsky was removed from Ukraine in early 1931. Since then the historian's name only appeared in the Czech periodicals at the turn of 1934, 1935 when he died.³⁶⁷ The best-informed voice came from Jaroslav Bidlo, Hruševsky's peer, who could devote him, thanks to his membership in ČAVU, an official obituary in the form of a separately published booklet.³⁶⁸

In years that followed after 1945 it was only possible for a short period of time to evaluate Hruševsky from the position of a scholar, rather than politician's.³⁶⁹ The critical approach to Hruševsky created in the USSR shortly became the norm in Czechoslovakia as well, and there was no way to discuss it after February 1948.³⁷⁰ Obscuring facts and misinterpreting the Ukrainian history became notorious, and

³⁶⁶ In 1929 Hruševsky informed about Bidlo's book *Dějiny Slovanů*, a new collection of essays, tribute to the same author, and Frank WOLLMANN's book *Slovesnost Slovanů*. In 1930 another collection of essays seized attention of Hruševsky, Václav Novotny's miscellany (a book dedicated to him by his students) on Slav geographical images, statistics, the constitutional establishment and philosophy, and the book by Josef JIRASEK *Russia and Us*.

³⁶⁷ In the very end of Hruševsky's life an entry on Hruševsky appeared in *Ottův slovník naučný* encyclopedia, volume 2, part 2, Prague 1933, pp 1261. A few obituaries from the press appeared in the bibliography: *One Hundred Fifty Years of Czech-Ukrainian Literary Encounters (1814–1964)*, Prague 1968, pp 237 and in a book that followed: *Ukrainian Literature in the Czech Context in the Years 1965–1994*, Prague 1999, pp 271.

³⁶⁸ Jaroslav Bidlo, Michal Hruševskyj, Prague 1935. It later became a source of information for Volodymyr MOTORNYJ – Mychajlo HNAŤUK, *Dijalnist' M. Hruševskoho v ocinci českoji akademičnoji hromadskosti*, in: *Mychajlo Hruševskyj i Zachidna Ukrajina*, Lviv 1995, pp 61–65. The evolution of Bidlo's approach to Hruševsky's work needs more informational sources, i.e. Bidlo's article Mychajlo Hruševsky, *Prager Presse* 6, 1926, nr. 267 (29. 11.), pp 3.

³⁶⁹ Josef MACŮREK, *Dějepisectví evropského východu*, Prague 1946, pp 226–228.

³⁷⁰ The renewed fight against Hruševsky's conception of the Ukrainian history was summed up by Vincenc CHARVÁT, *Odsudek dějinné koncepce M. Hruševského a jeho školy*, *Slovanský přehled* 33, 1947, pp 98–99.

Hruševsky was considered a condemnable representative of s.c. “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” even in Czechoslovakia. Only the effort of Vladimír Hostička has rehabilitated the image of Mychajlo Hruševsky among the Czech scholar community after long years of distortion.³⁷¹

Summary

The author collected basic information on the leading Ukrainian historian Mychajlo Hruševsky's relationship to the Czech historiography and Bohemia. The first part of the essay deals with reviews, annotations, and materials of various kind devoted to Hruševsky's work published in Czech periodicals from 1896 and then in larger extent after 1908. Most of them were related to Hruševsky's multi-volume History of Ukraine. The first information available on this work was provided by juristic-historian Karel Kadlec (till 1918), and Slav nations historian Jaroslav Bidlo (after 1919). Further on, two minor works by Hruševsky published in the Czech translation in 1918 and 1919 are dealt with in the essay. They aimed at introducing Ukraine to the Czech reader and providing information on the Ukrainian-Russian relations. Hruševsky's stays in Prague and other parts of Bohemia are surveyed in the part dealing with Hruševsky's five years long lasting emigration. Finally, Prague didn't become Hruševsky's place of permanent residence, it played an important role, however, in the period from May 1919 to the beginning of 1921. During this time the Ukrainian historian and the former leader of the Ukrainian parliament repeatedly met with the Czechoslovak president T. G. Masaryk. Several informational booklets in French by Hruševsky

³⁷¹ Vladimír Hostička, M. S. Hruševskij a jeho pojetí dějin východních Slovanů, in: Střední a východní Evropa v krizi XX. století, Prague 1998, pp 151–160. It is an adjusted form of the paper delivered in September 1996.

were published in Prague in order to arise the European consciousness about various aspects of Ukraine. This proves the fact that, for a short period of time, Hruševsky became the leading representative of the Ukraininan emigration in Czechoslovakia in the early stage of its existence.

Translation: Mariana Nachtigallová