

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY IN CZECH HISTORIOGRAPHY (THE FIRST THIRD OF THE 20th CENTURY)

Vitalii TELVAK , Viktoria TELVAK 

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University (Ukraine)

E-mail: telvak1@yahoo.com; viktoriateltvak75@gmail.com

Abstract: *The article deals with the study of the reception of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scientific heritage in the Czech researches of the first third of the 20th century. It focuses on the peculiarities of the reception of the scholar's ideas at the beginning of the 20th century, during the First World War and the interwar period. It has been highlighted that the Czech scientists were generally objective and produced favourable reviews on Hrushevsky's works. Their positive reaction was related to the absence of mutual historical claims, the similarity of the imperial oppression experience, traditionally strong Czech-Ukrainian cultural ties, and Mykhailo Hrushevsky's friendly relations with many contemporary Czech scholars. The article summarises the variety of Czech-Slavic studies, dedicated to the analysis of Hrushevsky works.*

Keywords: *Hrushevsky, Czech Slavic studies, historiography, 20th century, perception, journalism.*

Rezumat: *Mihail Hrușevski în istoriografia cehă (prima treime a secolului XX).* Articolul este dedicat cercetării modalităților de receptare a operei științifice a lui Mihail Hrușevski în lucrările apărute în Cehia în prima treime a secolului al XX-lea. Sunt evidențiate particularitățile receptării ideilor cercetătorului ucrainean la începutul secolului al XX-lea, în anii Primului Război Mondial, precum și în perioada interbelică. Autorul demonstrează că abordările specialiștilor cehi privind creația științifică a lui Hrușevsky au fost, în linii generale, obiective și au rezultat în recenzii favorabile. Această reacție pozitivă s-a datorat absenței unor pretenții istorice reciproce, experiențelor similare acumulate sub opresiunea imperială, relațiilor culturale ucraineano-cehe tradițional puternice, relațiilor personale de prietenie ale lui Hrușevski cu mulți cercetători cehi contemporani. Articolul rezumă diversitatea studiilor slavo-cehe privitoare la opera lui Hrușevski.

Résumé : *Mykhailo Hrushevsky dans l'historiographie tchèque (le premier tiers du XX^e siècle).* On consacre l'article ci-joint à l'étude des manières d'apercevoir l'œuvre scientifique de M. Hrushevsky dans les ouvrages tchèques du premier tiers du XX^e siècle. On y met en évidence les particularités de la réception des idées du chercheur ukrainien au début

du XX^e siècle, pendant la Première Guerre mondiale, ainsi que pendant l'entre-deux-guerres. L'auteur y démontra que les abords des spécialistes tchèques concernant la création scientifique de Hrushevsky furent, en général, objectifs et favorables. L'absence de prétentions historiques mutuelles, les expériences similaires sous l'oppression impériale, les relations culturelles bilatérales entre l'Ukraine et la République Tchèque, traditionnellement fortes, les relations personnelles et amicales de M. Hrushevsky avec de nombreux contemporains tchèques ont favorisé cette réaction positive. L'article ci-joint résume la diversité des études slaves tchèques regardant l'œuvre de M. Hrushevsky.

INTRODUCTION

1894 was, to some extent, a significant year in the history of Galician Ukrainians under the Austro-Hungarian empire rule. That year, another successful attempt was made to sign the Polish-Ukrainian agreement, called "New Era", which brought numerous important results for the Ukrainian community. The most important one was opening of the first in the history of Ukrainian science Ukrainian History Department. After several years of negotiations, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, a young talented student from Kyiv Documentary School, was appointed to this responsible post (1866-1934). This decision was purely political. The applicant had not even obtained his Master's degree at that moment of being appointed by the Emperor's rescript. However, the given position turned out to be extremely successful, despite Hrushevsky's young age. Not only was he Volodymyr Antonovych's, the leader of Kyiv Ukrainianophiles, ambitious student but also, he an unprecedentedly active participant of Ukrainian cultural-scientific and socio-political life.

The results of his activity became soon visible. He was an initiator and the main force of many initiatives, for instance: the transformation of the narrow-specialized party institution of T. Shevchenko Scientific Society into the actual Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the writing of the first scientific synthetic work the "History of Ukraine-Rus", the creation of Lviv Historical School, political apparatus reforms in Galicia, etc. These remarkable joint efforts of M. Hrushevsky, his colleagues and students caused the rapid modernisation of all aspects of the Dniester Ukrainians, who fell significantly behind the Dnieper compatriots' and other Slavic peoples of the Danube monarchy.

Such rich and diverse work drew the attention of the Ukrainian life observers, first of all, the Ukrainian Slavic neighbours, who lived in the Habsburg and the Romanov monarchies. At the same time, the Russian and Polish intellec-

tuals regarded M. Hrushevsky's activity as a threat for their prolonged domination in the Ukrainian ethnic territories. The majority of them, with few exceptions, formed the opposition to his cultural and public activity. On the background of the united Polish-Russian opposition, the activity of the leader of the Ukrainian movement attracted a rather interesting and objective (with the willingness to understand the essence of the processes) reception in the circle of the Czech intellectuals.

While the Polish and Russian Hrushevsky studies have repeatedly been the subject of independent historiographical analysis,¹ the research of the perception of the Ukrainian scientist's activity by his Czech counterparts lacks a more profound analysis and is not equal to the heuristic potential of the problem. Moreover, a stereotyped view of "the lack of links between the Ukrainian and Czech scholars during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" in contemporary literature is still widespread.² As the first step of the reconsideration of such a statement, we suggest a comprehensive analysis of the numerous sources to reconstruct the reception of M. Hrushevsky's diverse activity by his Czech contemporaries. We will concentrate on the period of the end of the nineteenth – the first third of the twentieth century, that period which M. Hrushevsky witnessed and actively participated.

TWENTY YEARS IN LVIV

M. Hrushevsky was first mentioned in the last years of the nineteenth century on the pages of the Czech scientific periodicals. At that time, diversified activities aimed at modernising of the Ukrainian cultural and public space of Galicia

¹ More precisely in Віталій Тельвак, *Наукові погляди Михайла Грушевського в історіографічних дискусіях у Російській імперії кінця XIX - початку XX ст.* [Scientific views of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in historiographical discussions in Russian empire at the end of XIX – beginning of XX centuries], in "Студії з архівної справи та документознавства" [Studies from Archive field and documentology], Київ, 2008, № 16, с. 42-57; Віталій Тельвак, *Польська грушевськіана кінця XIX – початку XX ст.: постати та ідеї* [Polish Hrushevsky studies at the end of XIX – beginning of XX centuries: personalities and ideas], in "Studia polsko-ukraińskie" [Polish-Ukrainian studies], Warszawa, 2016, № 3, s. 49-68.

² Тарас Романюк, *Любор Нідерле і розвиток чеської славістики та археології у контексті українського національного поступу* [Lyubor Niederle and the development of the Czech Slavic studies in the context of Ukrainian national development], in "Матеріали і дослідження з археології Прикарпаття і Волині" [Materials and research on archaeology of Transcarpathian and Volhynian regions], Львів, 2017, № 21, с. 50.

gave first results. The Czech scholars were approvingly commenting on the scientific level of the periodicals, headed by Lviv professor of Shevchenko Scientific Society, the articles of “The Notes of the SSS” in particular. As an example, a respected periodical in the Slavic circles “Český Časopis Historický” described unfavourable conditions for the development of the Ukrainian science in its native language within the Russian Empire and pointed out that despite all the obstacles, the task of the Ukrainian culture development was greatly accomplished by Lviv scientists, united by M. Hrushevsky at the SSS. An employee of Prague journal, a philologist and folklorist Jiří Polívka stated that even having less than modest finances, the journal thoroughly implemented its scientific program that justly deserved to be awarded the title of the Academy of Sciences. He emphasised on the importance of scientific publications of the SSS in promotion of the Ukrainian culture and scientific achievements.³

Following the development of “The Notes of the SSS”, the Czech observers of the Ukrainian cultural life repeatedly noted that the periodical had exemplary bibliographical and scientific chronicle sections. The Czech colleagues wrote about that in their reviews⁴ as well as in the letters to the chief editor. For example, after receiving “The Notes of the SSS” as a present, the director of the Czech Ethnographic Museum, Lyubor Niederle, wrote to M. Hrushevsky: “I consider it to be my duty to express my genuine admiration for the excellent and rich scientific chronicles and bibliography in the “The Notes...”. Nothing like this would appear in any magazine in the nearest future”.⁵ The Polish, German and Russian reviewers, like their Czech colleagues, also appreciated the high quality of the periodicals

³ J. P. [Jiří Polívka], *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XI, Praha, 1905, s. 468–469.

⁴ For further details, see *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko. Sv. XIII* [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Vol. XIII], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook III, Praha, 1897, s. 122; František Pastrnek, [Review] *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko* [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society], in “Listy filologické” [Filological sheets], Yearbook XXVII, Praha, 1900, s. 308–310; J. P. [Jiří Polívka], *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XI, Praha, 1905, s. 468–469; *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko. Roč. XV, Lvov 1906* [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Yearbook XV, Lvov 1906], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XIV, Praha, 1908, s. 120; Ml. [Jan Máchal], [Review] *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko. Roč. XXII, 1913* [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Yearbook XXII, 1913], in “Časopis českého museum” [The Journal of the Czech Museum], Yearbook LXXXVIII, Praha, 1914, s. 358–359.

⁵ Всеволод Наулко, *Листи Любора Нідерле до Михайла Грушевського* [Letters of

edited by M. Hrushevsky.⁶

The scientific works of M. Hrushevsky were mentioned by the representatives of the Czech scientific world after the publication of the first volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" in 1898. The magazine "Český časopis Historický" emphasised that M. Hrushevsky's book was written on a truly professional level and that it was the first thorough study of the early period of Ukrainian history.⁷ Even more exalted were the assessments of the Czech humanitarians expressed in the letters to the author. For example, while expressing gratitude for the gift, L. Niederle described the book as an "excellent"⁸ one.

Founded by L. Niederle, the Prague magazine "Věstnik Slovanských Starožytosti", informed its readers about the appearance of the first volume of "History", written by M. Hrushevsky, and promised to publish a detailed review of the book.⁹ Interestingly, the editor of "Věstnik" contacted the author himself with a request to choose a possible reviewer from the circle of his acquaintances.¹⁰ Following the advice of M. Hrushevsky, L. Niederle turned to the young student of the Lviv professor Myron Korduba. To please the author, L. Niederle agreed to publish a comprehensive review, written by M. Korduba in the Ukrainian language,¹¹ on the pages of his journal. M. Hrushevsky noticed this friendly gesture of the editorial board and in his review in the Prague journal, he pointed out "the progress that the editorial staff made, finally placed the Ukrainian language equally among

Lyubor Niederle to Mykhailo Hrushevsky], in "Український археографічний щорічник. Нова серія" [Ukrainian archeographic yearbook. New series], Київ, 2006, № 10/11, с. 632.

⁶ Віталій Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)* [Creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in assessments of his contemporaries (the end of 19th century – 30's of 20th century)], Київ–Дрогобич, 2008, с. 44-52.

⁷ *Zpráva* [News], in "Český časopis Historický" [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook V, Praha, 1899, s. 392.

⁸ Всеволод Наулко, *op. cit.*, p. 635.

⁹ *Грушевський Мих. Історія України-Руси. Т. 1. У Львові, 1898* [Hrushevsky Mykh., History of Ukraine-Rus. Vol. I. Lviv, 1898], in "Věstnik Slovanských Starožytosti" [The Slavonic Antiquities Journal], Yearbook II, Praha, 1899, s. 54. The review was submitted without mentioning authorship.

¹⁰ See: Всеволод Наулко, *op. cit.*, p. 634–635.

¹¹ Мирон Кордуба, [Review] *Грушевський Михайло. Історія України-Руси. Т. 1. У Львові, 1898* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky, History of Ukraine-Rus, Vol. 1. Lviv, 1898], in "Věstnik Slovanských Starožytosti" [The Slavonic Antiquities Journal], Yearbook II, Praha, 1899, s. 63-67.

other Slavic languages”.¹²

In Western European and the Czech scientific circle, the real interest in the Lviv professor’s work emerged with the first publication in German, called “History of the Ukrainian people”, which was written by M. Hrushevsky. This work was, in fact, an authorised translation of the second Ukrainian edition of the first volume of “History of Ukraine-Rus”. The Czech historians responded to the publication of this book with concise bibliographic notes.¹³ as well as with two informative reviews.

K. Kadlec, the professor at Karl University, wrote a profound, critical review on “The History of the Ukrainian People” for the Prague magazine “Sborník Věd Právních a Státních”. In his review, K. Kadlec conducted a thorough analysis of the content of the work, demonstrating his profound knowledge of the subject. At the beginning of his review, the Czech researcher introduces the author to the readers. He stated that M. Hrushevsky remained an unknown scholar for the Czechs: “although he belongs to the most interesting and the most distinguished Slavic authors”.¹⁴ Idealising to a certain extent the personality of M. Hrushevsky, the reviewer compared M. Hrushevsky’s contribution to the development of the Ukrainian culture with the importance of František Palacký’s contribution to the Czech culture. As K. Kadlec claims, M. Hrushevsky “...raised awareness among his people with the help of his scientific and journalistic activity. M. Hrushevsky proved that the Ukrainians have the right to be recognised as an independent nation, distinct from the Great Russians (the Velykorosy – the people, who inhabited the ethnic Russian lands in the Russian Empire)”. It should be noted that since that review of K. Kadlec, such comparison of František Palacký and M. Hrushevsky, as well as their influence on their people, gained popularity in the Czech Hrushevsky studies.

¹² М. Г. [Михайло Грушевський], [Review] *Věstník slovanských starožitnosti...* [Věstník slovanských starožitnosti...], in “Записки НТШ” [Notes of the SSS], Yearbook XLII, Львів, 1901, с. 1-2.

¹³ Čeněk Zibrť, [Review] *Hruševikj Michael. Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) Volkes. 1906* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people. 1906], in “Časopis Musea Kràlovstvi Českého” [The Journal of the Czech Kingdom Museum], Yearbook LXXX, Praha, 1906, s. 483-484.

¹⁴ Karel Kadlec, [Review] *Hruševskýj Mychajlo, Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy* (6. svazek, Lvov, 1907) a *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes* (I sv. Lipsko, 1906) [Mykhailo Hrushevsky, History of Ukraine-Rus (6. vol, Lviv, 1907) and History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people (I vol., Lipsk, 1906)], s. 298.

K. Kadlec notes that “The History of the Ukrainian People” was essentially a significant contribution to the national revival. The Czech researcher paid particular attention to the introduction of the first volume, which outlines the conceptual foundations of the entire “History of Ukraine-Rus”. The reviewer fully agrees with the basic theoretical foundations of the Ukrainian scientist, calling them “heretical”; as compared to those, who were generally accepted by the Slavic studies of that time. K. Kadlec considers the author’s emphasis on the history of culture and socio-economic life to be an appropriate accent, which suggests the continuity of the historical process of the Ukrainian people that caused its independent political life only in the earliest period of its existence. According to K. Kadlec, M. Hrushevsky’s statement about the heredity and continuity of the Ukrainian state tradition from the times of Kyiv Rus and the emphasis on the importance of the Old Rus heritage in the formation of Eastern European culture was especially courageous. Highly appreciating the scientific level of the work, the reviewer did not overlook its debatable points. For example, he observed the insufficient arguments of M. Hrushevsky’s hypothesis on the Antes as direct ancestors of the Ukrainians, as well as the excessive confidence in its defence, which was rather dissonant given the general scarcity of the available historical sources to back it up.

The thorough review of the historian and publicist Jan Slavik in “*Český Časopis Historický*” was noticeably more critical towards the “History of the Ukrainian people”. The reviewer begins with his credo concerning the very essence of the Ukrainian – or in the reviewer’s terms – the “Little Russian” question. J. Slavik claims that he does not support those scholars who, “in the Great and Little Russians discussions, take an extremely negative position, most clearly manifested in Petro Valuev’s (the Russian Minister during the 1860s) words: “there was no Ukrainian nation, there is no and there cannot be”. Next, the reviewer admitted that “this part of the dispute, when the very existence of the Little Russians as a separate ethnographic unit was seriously questioned, is already left in the past. The Little Russian people exist and will always exist”.¹⁵

At the same time, the Czech scholar raised the question of whether the nation had existed for a long time or was distinguished at the beginning of Slavic

¹⁵ Jan Slavik, [Review] *Hruševskýj Michael, Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906. I Band* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky, History of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) people. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906. I vol.], in “*Český Časopis Historický*” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XIV, Praha, 1908, s. 214.

history. Jan Slavik doubted Mr Hrushevsky's positive answers to these questions. The Ukrainian scientist's theses, as Jan Slavik emphasised, "are significantly different from our generally accepted view". Making clear the generally accepted view, the reviewer said: "for us, the Ukrainians [...] are the part of the Russian (ruského) tribe, the product of a secondary, special development, which the Russian (ruský) people made during the historic period mainly".¹⁶

Jan Slavik criticised M. Hrushevsky's Anti-Normanist theory, which was substantiated in a special appendix to the first volume. The reviewer himself called this appendix "a good review on the history of controversy", though J. Slavik admired the author's exhaustive analysis of the literature. At the same time, he said: "M. Hrushevsky's intention to undermine the Norman theory failed as well the efforts of his predecessors to undermine it. And the «Slavic» hypothesis about the origin of the Kyiv principality obviously lacks objectivity".¹⁷ It should be noted that the remarks mentioned above of the Czech historians on the first volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" were generally typical of Western-European criticism on that book: The Polish, German and Romanian reviewers were almost unanimous in their assessments of M. Hrushevsky's historiographical approach.¹⁸

The debate around the first volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" in German and the increasingly active work of Shevchenko Scientific Society brought respect and popularity to M. Hrushevsky among the Czech colleagues. They became more and more interested in his works written in Ukrainian. Most of the Czech researches were excited by volumes of the so-called "Cossack cycle" of "History of Ukraine-Rus". A review of the seventh volume, devoted to the study of an important issue of the genesis of the Ukrainian Cossacks, was written by J. Slavik, whom we mentioned above. He considered his critical response to be a continuation of the discussion initiated by the German review of the first work made by his Ukrainian colleague. In the introduction, the Czech scientist pointed out that M. Hrushevsky traced back the origins of the Ukrainian people to the beginnings

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, s. 217.

¹⁸ Віталій Тельвак, *Перший том "Історії України-Руси" Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників* [The first volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" in assessments of his contemporaries], in "Історіографічні дослідження в Україні" [Historiographical research in Ukraine], Вип. 17, Київ, 2007, с. 16-38; Vitalii Telvak, *Vasyl Ilnytskyi, Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Nicolae Iorga: scholars' struggle over the national history*, in "Codrul Cosminului", Vol. XXIV, 2018, no. 1, p. 53-64.

of the ancient Rus state. The ethnonym “the Ukrainians”, as in reviews as mentioned earlier, was usually written in quotation marks. J. Slavik admitted that the peer-reviewed volume is better than the previous one in a range of aspects. “The research gets rid of prejudices”, the reviewer emphasised, “and it is not biased anymore. The presentations about the origin of the Cossacks are based on, I believe, convincing sources and, perhaps, I will not be mistaken if I say in advance that here we have for a long time the product of the main ...”.¹⁹

More accomplished and comprehensive reviews on the Cossack volume of “History of Ukraine-Rus” were published in two parts in Russian translation under the title “The History of the Ukrainian Cossacks”, in the magazine “Sbornik Věd Právních a Státních” by K. Kadlec. Having received these books as a gift from the author, the Czech scientist expressed his admiration for the scientific prolificacy of his Ukrainian counterpart: “I am your great debtor. My review of your «Kyiv Rus» has not come out yet, and I have already received the work of greater value”.²⁰

In the reviews on the Cossack volumes of “History of Ukraine-Rus”, which K. Kadlec called “the work of the whole life of Prof. Hrushevsky”, special attention was devoted to acquainting the Czech reader with the content richness of the research. The reviewer pointed at the diligence of the sources and literature by his Ukrainian colleague, and also emphasised his critical approach towards common myths and stereotypes. K. Kadlec noted a daring historiographical construction of the past of the Ukrainian Cossacks, the entirely original hypotheses concerning the origin and evolution of this social strata.²¹ A similar logic was marked by an overview of the second part of “The History of the Ukrainian Cossacks”: K. Kadlec

¹⁹ Jan Slavik, [Review] *Hruševskij Michajlo, Istorija ukrainskoj Kozaččini. T. I. do roku 1625. Kijev–Lvov, 1909* [Hrushevsky Mykhailo, The History of Ukrainian Cossack Era. Vol. I until 1625. Kyiv-Lviv, 1909], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XVI, Praha, 1910, s. 335.

²⁰ Центральний державний історичний архів України у Києві [Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Kyiv] (**hereinafter ЦДІАУК**), Collection 1235, Entry 1, Case 508, Sheet 35.

²¹ K. K. [Karel Kadlec], [Review] *Грушевский М., Исторія українського козацества до єдинення с Московским государством. Том I. до начала XVII века...* [Hrushevsky M. The History of Ukrainian Cossacks until the merging with Moscow state. Vol. I. Until the beginning of XVII ct...], in “Sbornik Věd Právních a Státních” [The Journal of legal and public sciences], Yearbook XIII, Praha, 1913, s. 442.

dedicated the majority of his text to an overview of the work.²² It should be noted that K. Kadlec's words of praise were similar to the Russian assessments of Hrushevsky's works on the Cossack's studies.²³ However, the Polish researchers of the Ukrainian Cossack studies were much more critical towards them.²⁴

The publications, dedicated to the commemoration of the decade of Hrushevsky's migration to Galicia (1904), were a peculiar achievement of the Czech Hrushevsky studies at the beginning of the 20th century. This event was the first commemoration on behalf of his contemporaries and became a turning point in the Ukrainian journalism as well as in the life of the Galician Ukrainians. In numerous publications, the professor was unanimously recognised as the leader in scientific and public life.

The Czech observers also shared such assessments of the importance of M. Hrushevsky's cultural work for the Galician Ukrainians. For example, in 1904 Rudolf Broz in his essay *The Awakening of Little Russian People* sincerely admired vitality and diversity of the national service of Lviv Professor: "The return to scientific work marked Rusyn revival in recent years. The breakthrough in Rus-Ukrainian thought led to the creation of the «Shevchenko Scientific Society» in Lviv, headed by M. Hrushevsky, the professor of history at Lviv University, who is a person of great knowledge, energy and endurance. M. Hrushevsky united all the Rusyns, who wanted to work for the revival of their people. With a pedagogical courtesy, he led young people to scientific work, and this group achieved great results, clearly under his leadership".²⁵

The students and friends of M. Hrushevsky presented to him the magnificently published volume of the scientific works.²⁶ This great gift to M. Hrushevsky once again attracted the attention of the Czech observers to the figure of the

²² К. К. [Karel Kadlec], [Review] *Грушевский М., История украинского козачества до соединения с Московским государством. Том II* [Hrushevsky M. The History of Ukrainian Cossacks until the merging with Moscow state. Vol. II], in "Sborník Věd Právních a Státních" [The Journal of legal and public sciences], Yearbook XV, Praha, 1915, s. 60.

²³ Віталій Тельвак, *Наукові погляди Михайла Грушевського...*, с. 42-52.

²⁴ Віталій Тельвак, *Польська грушевськіана...*, с. 52-53.

²⁵ Rudolf Brož, *Probuzení maloruského národa* [Awakened by the little-Russian nation], in "Slovansky Přehled" [Slavic review], Praha, 1904. Yearbook VI. S. 397.

²⁶ *Науковий Збірник присвячений професорови Михайлови Грушевському учениками і прихильниками з нагоди Його десятилітньої наукової праці в Галичині (1894-1904)* [Scientific Collection dedicated to professor Mykhailo Hrushevsky by his students and admirers to commemorate the anniversary of his scientific activity in Galicia (1894-1904)], Львів, 1906.

Ukrainian scientific life leader. Recognising the emergence of the “Scientific Collection”, the Czech observers noted that the output of such a magnificent book indicated that: “M. Hrushevsky has a respectful academic school around him”.²⁷

The anniversary mentioned above and the publication of the “Scientific Collection” gave impact to the presentation of M. Hrushevsky to the Czech audience in the Prague journal “Slovansky Přehled”. K. Kadlec was the one to represent the versatile personality of M. Hrushevsky on the journal’s pages.²⁸ According to the Czech scholar, his Ukrainian colleague: “...belongs to the most prolific and most profound Slavic scholars”.

In 1911 M. Hrushevsky was elected a member of the Czech Academy of Sciences. This fact of being elected was the recognition of M. Hrushevsky's achievements in the study of the history and culture of the Slavic peoples by the Czech academic community. K. Kadlec firstly reported the event.²⁹ The author of “The History of Ukraine-Rus”, and both his relatives and colleagues treated this news with a significant upsurge as evidence of the recognition of many years of the scientific work and considerable efforts to popularise the achievements of modern Ukrainianity. However, the joy turned out to be premature, as the political intrigues intervened: due to the imperial status of the Academy, the approval of this appointment had to be made by the Emperor. But it was delayed. In the last pre-war years, the opposition to the Ukrainian movement, the Polish journalism, consistently created the image of M. Hrushevsky as a separatist, which made the choice of the Czech academic community completely vetoed.

As a compensation for this refusal, the Czech intellectuals elected M. Hrushevsky a member of the oldest scientific institution – the Czech Scientific Society, which did not need any governmental approval for its choices. The initiator of this election, L. Niederle, informed the Ukrainian scientist in his letter of January 8, 1914: “I have the honour to inform you that the Czech Scientific Society (Česká královská společnost nauk) elected you yesterday as a foreign member, taking into account your enormous and outstanding activity in the

²⁷ *Na oslavu desítiletého působení ... Michala Hruševského ve Lvově* [Lvové Commemoration of 10 years' anniversary ... of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Lviv], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XIV, Praha, 1906, s. 503–504; *Rozhledy a správy* [Perspectives and news], in “Slovansky Přehled” [Slavic review], Yearbook VIII, Praha, 1906, s. 338–339.

²⁸ Karel Kadlec, *Mychajlo Hruševskýj* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky], in “Slovansky Přehled” [Slavic review], Yearbook XI, Praha, 1909, s. 163–167.

²⁹ *ЦДІАУК*, Collection 1235, Entry 1, Case 508, Sheet 32.

Slavic science”.³⁰ Later, M. Hrushevsky received an official announcement signed by Joseph Zubatý, in which he said: “The Royal Scientific Society of the Czech Republic, recognising your merits to science, has decided to elect you as our current member”.³¹

AMID WAR AND UPRISING

The rapid events of World War I and the Ukrainian Uprising complicated the scientific communication to a great extent, and the decline in the intensity of the scientific work by M. Hrushevsky, his exile to the Russian hinterland, and subsequently an active immersion in the creation of the state as the chairman of the Central Rada influenced the reception of his works in all national historical schools, including the Czech one. However, the individual works of the Ukrainian scientist, which appeared in the Czech book collections, certainly became the subject of discussion. Thus, on the pages of the magazine “Český Časopis Historický”, the popular science publications of M. Hrushevsky were noted, despite the complicated scientific communication.³²

It should be noted that during the war some popular essays by M. Hrushevsky were translated into Czech, some of them were treated with curiosity by critics. In 1918 in Prague, the Czech translation of “Ukraine and the Ukrainians” was published³³. The following year in the series “Discover Ukraine” there was published the collection of historical and journalistic articles “Ukraine and Russia”³⁴. Traditionally, the Czech observers have been upholding the scientific and literary features of the reprinted books, emphasising that new editions, exempted from the censorship, had a larger number of carefully collected and talentedly interpreted materials about the Ukrainian national movement from the middle of the nineteenth century to the times of the Central Rada.³⁵

³⁰ Всеволод Наулко, *Листи Любора Нідерле до Михайла Грушевського* [Letters of Lyubor Niederle to Mykhailo Hrushevsky], с. 638.

³¹ ЦДІАУК, Collection 1235, Entry 1, Case 29, Sheet 46.

³² *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XXV, Praha, 1919, s. 156.

³³ Mychajlo Hruševskýj, *Ukrajina a Ukrajinci* [Ukraine and Ukrainians], Praha, 1918.

³⁴ Mychajlo Hruševskýj, *Ukrajina a Rusko* [Ukraine and Russia], Praha, 1919.

³⁵ For further details, please refer to: V. Brtník, [Review] *M. Hruševskýj, Ukrajina a Ukrajinci. Praha, 1918* [M. Hrushevsky, Ukraine and Ukrainians. Prag, 1918], in “Lipa” [Linden], Praha, 1917/1918, № 1, s. 799–800.

Being the head of the Central Rada, M. Hrushevsky had an opportunity to get closer to Tomas Masaryk, who, from May 1917 to March 1918, was in a revolutionary Russia, and, in particular, for more than four months in Ukraine, in Kyiv. Along with the formation of the Czech-Slovak Legion from the captivated soldiers and officers, T. Masaryk conducted active social and political activities, cooperated with the activists of the Ukrainian Central Rada and the Ukrainian Republic: M. Hrushevsky, V. Vynnychenko, S. Petliura, O. Shulgin, actively spoke on the political goals. There was signed an agreement between the Central Rada and the National Council of Czechoslovakia on the legalisation of the Czechoslovak regiment placement on the territory of Ukraine – the status of the legion was defined as extraterritorial, and the Ukrainian government granted it weapons.

However, the leaders of the Ukrainian and Czech liberation movements had different points of view on the foreign policy guidelines: M. Hrushevsky sought for assistance from Germany against the Bolshevik forces; Instead, T. Masaryk advocated for a strong united Russia, in which the Ukrainians would only have broad autonomy. In the end, these differences did not influence the good relationship between the two intellectuals in subsequent years, which was important for the fate of many exiled Ukrainians during the interwar period.

EMIGRATION

After the defeat of the Central Rada, M. Hrushevsky was forced to leave Ukraine in April 1919. Together with his family, he travelled to Prague. In the Czech capital, M. Hrushevsky met with T. Masaryk several times, as well as with Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs Stepanko and a well-known English publicist Seton-Watson. Nowadays the content of these talks is known from the records of the Czech President.³⁶ According to these notes, the Ukrainian colleague raised the question of supporting the idea of an independent Ukraine on behalf of the victorious states. However, the interlocutors unanimously pointed at the complete desperateness of such hopes. The records state that T. Masaryk, understanding the complexity of M. Hrushevsky's migration between countries of Western Europe with documents of the non-existent state (the Ukrainian Repub-

³⁶ *Інститут Рукопису Національної бібліотеки України імені Володимира Вернадського* [Volodymyr Vernadsky Institute of the Manuscript of the National Library of Ukraine], Collection 357, № 64, Sheet 1.

lic), informed the Ukrainian colleague about the decision to grant him, if necessary, a diplomatic passport.³⁷

M. Hrushevsky made a trip to other countries of Western Europe, hoping, in vain, to find support for his political projects. Considering such a desperate situation, the scientist soon abandoned political activity and began to look for opportunities to resume systematic scientific work. He connected his scientific plans with the establishment of the Ukrainian Sociological Institute (hereinafter – USI), which was relocated to Prague from Geneva in April 1920. While building the structure of the USI, its founder paid a lot of attention to the establishment of its own publishing house. Later the Institute achieved the greatest success, particularly in publishing. The publication of M. Hrushevsky’s works in European languages, within the framework of the USSR publishing activity, revived the discussion of his creative ideas in the environment of Western European and Czech intellectuals. Also, after Czechoslovakia won the state independence, the Czech colleagues of M. Hrushevsky restored the Ukrainian scientist’s membership in the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts at the end of 1919.

Among the published books of USI, there were a few works of M. Hrushevsky, and the Czech Slavic periodicals noted their publication. The observers pointed at the importance of Institute in promotion of the achievements of the Ukrainian culture and science in European languages. This fact was a significant recognition, taking into account the decay of the Ukrainian cultural life in Soviet Ukraine and the difficulty in restoring its normal rhythm in Galicia. For example, K. Kadlec wrote a review on the French-language essay of Ukrainian history by M. Hrushevsky.³⁸

J. Bidlo noted the appearance of the next Ukrainian reprint of “Illustrated History of Ukraine” on the pages of “Český Časopis Historický”. Paying attention to the content value of the study, the reviewer pointed out that the new edition differed from the previous one. M. Hrushevsky, as an active participant of the mentioned events, presented the unknown history of the Ukrainian Uprising in the last section of the book. As J. Bidlo wrote: “The book of Hrushevsky is among

³⁷ *Листування Михайла Грушевського* [The correspondence of Mykhaylo Hrushevsky], т. 1, Київ – Нью-Йорк – Париж – Львів – Торонто, 1997, с. 257.

³⁸ K. K. [Karel Kadlec], [Review] *Hrushevsky, Abrègè de L’histoire de L’Ukraine. Paris, Genève, Prague 1920* [Hrushevsky, An essay on Ukrainian history. Paris, Genève, Prague 1920], in “Sborník Věd Právních a Státních” [The Journal of legal and public sciences], Yearbook XX, Praha, 1920, s. 296-297.

the best works in the aspect of the professional research”.³⁹ It is interesting to note, that the Ukrainian reviewers of the book mentioned above, written by M. Hrushevsky, were much more critical than their Czech colleagues, claiming that M. Hrushevsky highlighted the events of the Ukrainian Uprising from his political party point of view⁴⁰.

THE LAST DECADE

M. Hrushevsky faced numerous difficulties of an economic and personal character in the organisation of the scientific work in emigration. Those difficulties made him think of the idea of returning to Ukraine, where the Soviet government had already firmly established its authority. Thus, when the Kyiv Communists, aiming at splitting the Ukrainian emigration in Western Europe, offered M. Hrushevsky the title of the academician and provided guarantees of personal security, he decided to return to Ukraine in March 1924.

Those were the significant results in the scientific and organisational work of a newly elected academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (hereinafter – UAS) that attracted the attention of the Czech researchers one more time. In particular, the Czech colleagues were impressed by how “Nestor of Ukrainian history”, as he was referred to by one of the Czech observers, established a wide publishing activity, which quickly brought visible results⁴¹.

The Czech observers were contented with the restoration of M. Hrushevsky’s magazine “Ukraine” – according to their unanimous assessment – the most outstanding publication of the Ukrainian studies. For example, in reviewing the

³⁹ J. B. [Jaroslav Bidlo], *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XXV, Praha, 1919, s. 156.

⁴⁰ Віталій Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського...*, с. 215.

⁴¹ For further details, see A. F., [Review] *Науковий збірник за рік 1925. Том XX під редакцією голови історичної секції Всеукраїнської Академії Наук Михайла Грушевського* [Scientific collection for 1925. Volume XX edited by the head of historical section of All-Ukrainian Academy of Science of Mykhailo Hrushevsky], in “Slovanský Přehled” [Slavic review], Yearbook XVIII, Praha, 1926, s. 643; *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XXXIII, Praha, 1927, s. 677; *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XXXV, Praha, 1929, s. 224; V. Charvat, [Review] *За сто літ. Матеріали з громадського і літературного життя України XIX і початків XX століття, за редакцією академіка Михайла Грушевського. Р. 1928* [In one hundred years. Materials from civic and literary life of Ukraine. 1928], in “Slovanský Přehled” [Slavic review], Yearbook XXI, Praha, 1929, s. 142–143.

first issues of the revived “Ukraine”, J. Bidlo drew attention to the difficult conditions in which the Ukrainian scientist had to realise his creative plans in the Soviet state. Therefore, the peer-reviewed publication is believed by the Czech observer to be a clear testimony to M. Hrushevsky’s thorough organisational talent.⁴² The Ukrainian reviewers in emigration had similar assessments, while Marxist reviewers in the Soviet state sternly criticised the publishing work of M. Hrushevsky.⁴³

Particular attention was paid to the contributions of M. Hrushevsky to the investigations of the Czech-Ukrainian cultural relations. The scholar’s “Influences of the Czech national movement of the 15th century on the Ukrainian life and culture, as a problem of experimentation. A few notes”, which were prepared by the author during the work on the fifth volume of “History of Ukrainian Literature”, were especially warmly welcomed by the Czech critics.⁴⁴ Its content was introduced to readers of the magazine “Slovanský Přehled” by a well-known journalist and politician Vincent Charvat. First of all, he emphasised the importance of the appearance of “this short but extremely interesting studio of the most prominent Ukrainian historian, since M. Hrushevsky’s more voluminous work is inaccessible to wider circles of the Ukrainian and Slavic public”.⁴⁵ The Ukrainian researcher provided a significant amount of the material about the Czech influence in Ukraine and Belarus in the 14th and 15th centuries, as well as systematised views of the Polish, Russian and Ukrainian scholars on this issue and “clearly, briefly described the penetration of the Czech culture to the Eastern Europe in the late 14th and

⁴² Jaroslav Bidlo, [Review] *Ukraina, naukovyj tr'õchmisjačnyk ukraïnoznavstva za rok 1924* [Ukraine, scientific three month review of Ukrainian studies for 1924], in “Časopis národního musea” [The Journal of the National Museum], Yearbook XCIX, Praha, 1925, s. 83-87.

⁴³ Віталій Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського...*, с. 251.

⁴⁴ Михайло Грушевський, *Впливи чеського національного руху XIV–XV вв. в українськiм життiю i творчостi, як проблема дослiду. Кiлька замiток i дезидерат* [Influences of Czech national movement in 14th – 15th centuries in Ukrainian life and art as a problem of experience. Some notes and desiderata], in “Записки НТШ” [Notes of the SSS], Т. CLI-CLIII, Львiв, 1925, с. 1-13.

⁴⁵ V. Charvat, [Review] *Михайло Грушевський: Впливи чеського національного руху XIV–XV вв. в українськiм життiю i творчостi, як проблема дослiду. Кiлька замiток i дезидерат* [Influences of Czech national movement in 14th – 15th centuries in Ukrainian life and art as a problem of experience. Some notes and desiderata], in “Slovanský Přehled” [Slavic review], Yearbook XIX, Praha, 1927, s. 546.

early 15th century where it was significantly spread in the Polish administrative and church circles”.

The Czech critics met the continuation of M. Hrushevsky's work on “The History of Ukraine-Rus” with numerous reviews. On the pages of the Prague “Časopis národního musea”, the two parts of the ninth volume were immediately reviewed by J. Bidlo, an old friend of the Ukrainian Scientist. Describing M. Hrushevsky as “the indefatigable and fruitful creator of modern historiography (and to a large extent, the uprising history) of Ukraine or, better, of the Ukrainian people”, the reviewer emphasised the importance of continuing the immense scientific activity after returning from the emigration.⁴⁶

Quoting excerpts from the work of M. Hrushevsky, the observer drew attention to the conceptual aspects of the work in question, fully agreeing with the author. J. Bidlo provided numerous examples that illustrated the originality of the author's approach in solving many scientific problems, demonstrated his unbridled erudition and professional skills in the analysis of different sources and significant historiographical literature. The reviewer also noted the stylistic skills of the author, arguing that the artistic value of “History of Ukraine-Rus” is steadily increasing so much that: “in the latter one can see the skills of a virtuoso writer”.

Alongside with the review of J. Bidlo, the newspaper “Prager Presse”, an informal speaker of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, also responded with the review of the “The Rise and Decline of Ukraine”. The ninth volume was called a new brick, which M. Hrushevsky put into the structure of a holistic synthesis of the Ukrainian history that he had been building for decades. The reviewer emphasised the significance of the events described in the new work not only from a historical point of view, since the last years of Khmelnytsky were marked by a powerful upsurge of the Ukrainian struggle for independence, but also given their social resonance – the resemblance with the recent Ukrainian Independence Uprising of one of the largest Slavic peoples. Considering the solid historiographic tradition of the Cossack era in the writings of the Ukrainian, the Polish and the Russian researchers, M. Hrushevsky managed to express his significant and original concept not only in the source-related aspect (involving a huge

⁴⁶ Jaroslav Bidlo, [Review] *Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj, Istorija Ukraïny–Rusy. Tomu devjatoho perša polovyna (Chmelnyččyny roky 1650–1653)... – Tomu devjatoho druha polovyna (Chmelnyččyny roky 1654–1657)...* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky. History of Ukraine-Rus. The first half of the ninth volume (years of Khmelnytsky Era 1654 – 1657) ... – The second half of the ninth volume (years of Khmelnytsky Era 1654 – 1657)], in “Časopis národního musea” [The Journal of the National Museum], Yearbook CV, Praha, 1931, s. 130–131.

number of newly discovered documents) but also in an attempt to reconsider largely mythologised historical facts and personalities by the previous tradition.⁴⁷ The Polish historians in their reviews supported the views of their Czech colleagues on the ninth volume, which was the evidence of normalisation of the Polish-Ukrainian historiographical dialogue. However, the Soviet reviewers presented nothing but ungrounded criticism.⁴⁸

In the second half of the 1920-is another multivolume studio of M. Hrushevsky "The History of Ukrainian Literature" was in the public eye of the Czech observers. This work, although special reviews did not mark it, was repeatedly mentioned on the pages of the Czech scientific journals when reviewing the novelties of the Ukrainian science. In these reviews, "The History of Ukrainian Literature" was unanimously attested to as a fundamental synthetic work – the organic addition to "History of Ukraine-Rus".⁴⁹

A peculiar result in the perception of M. Hrushevsky by his contemporaries was the widespread celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of his birthday and the fortieth anniversary of the scientific and organisational activity in 1926. Among many letters addressed to Hrushevsky, there were also the congratulations from his Czech counterparts. M. Hrushevsky received the congratulations from the President of the Czech Academy of Sciences J. Zubaty⁵⁰, and from the Czech Scientific Society, signed by J. Polivka and J. Yanko. Also, on behalf of the Historical Society in Prague Vaclav Novotny congratulated the famous historian and a leader of the fraternal people. In its turn, under the signature of Matviy Murko, the editorial office of the philological magazine "Slavia" congratulated the "Honoured historian of Ukraine" prof. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who enriched the Slavic philology with his cultural-historical and literary-historical works".⁵¹

Responding to the celebration of M. Hrushevsky's anniversary, his Czech friends also informed the country about it. The pages of the "Prager Presse" presented a letter, written by J. Bidlo, printed with a portrait of M. Hrushevsky. In this

⁴⁷ М. Н., *Der Ukraine Glanz und Niedergang (M.Hruševs'kyj: Geschichte der Ukraine)* [Rise and Fall of Ukraine (M. Hrushevsky; The History of Ukraine)], in "Prager Presse" [Prager Presse], Praha, 1931, № 99, s. 8.

⁴⁸ Віталій Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського...*, с. 322-325; 337-341.

⁴⁹ For further details, see *Zprávy* [News], in "Český časopis Historický" [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XXXIII, Praha, 1927, s. 677.

⁵⁰ *Ювілей академіка М.С.Грушевського. 1866–1926. I. Ювілейні засідання. II. Привітання* [The Anniversary of M. Hrushevsky. 1866 – 1926. I Anniversary sessions. II. Greeting], Київ, 1927, с. 138.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

essay, for the first time in the Czech literature, the rich scientific, literary and political activities of the scientist were thoroughly characterised. Turning to the public activity of M. Hrushevsky for his people, J. Bidlo pointed at the immutability of his progressive aspirations, which allowed the author to notice the similarity of M. Hrushevsky with another prominent Czech, T. Masaryk.

The Czech Slavic magazine "Slovanský Přehled" also responded with an informative article on the anniversary of M. Hrushevsky. The author of the essay, a philosopher-ukrainist František Tichý, accurately stated that after the death of Lesia Ukrainka and Ivan Franko, it was M. Hrushevsky, who became "an indisputable spiritual mentor of a cultural Ukraine". Briefly depicting the life and a creative path of the scientist, he called him "one of the most outstanding and the most prominent representatives of the modern Slavs", the Czech researcher investigated the Lviv period in detail, as at that time the scientist launched a "worthwhile surprise of diverse activities".⁵² F. Tichý described the "History of Ukraine-Rus" as an epoch-making work, which, together with a productive scientific and organisational work, gave M. Hrushevsky an honoured place in the pantheon of European science.

The relationship between M. Hrushevsky and his Czech counterparts were violently interrupted by Stalin's repressions against the Ukrainian science and one of its leaders, which unfolded at the turn of the 1920-es and 1930-es. From 1931, the scientist was in an "honourable" exile in Moscow. In autumn of 1934, he and his family left for vacation to Kislovodsk, where he fell ill with carbuncles and died, during the unsuccessful surgical operation, on November 24.

HONOURING MEMORY

The premature death of M. Hrushevsky was perceived by the scientific community with great concern, in particular, by his Czech counterparts and became the reason for "an outburst" of the publications about the scientist. The first information about the tragic news from Kislovodsk was sent to the Czech audience by the Prague Radio on November 26, 1934, and the evening newspapers circulated this news. The next day, obituaries appeared in the authoritative Prague newspaper "Lidové noviny"⁵³ and other editions. In these writings, M. Hrushevsky was

⁵² František Tichý, *Michajlo Hruševskýj* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky], in "Slovanský Přehled" [Slavic review], Yearbook XVIII, Praha, 1926, s. 643.

⁵³ Dr. V. V., *Michajlo Hrušovskýj zemřel* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky was dead], in "Lidové noviny" [People's News], Praha, 1934, 27 listopada, s. 4.

portrayed as a true patriarch of the Ukrainian culture and science; he was compared with František Palacký, a great Czech personality.

In Czechoslovakia, during the interwar period, there lived the largest Ukrainian cultural emigration among the countries of Western Europe, whose representatives responded to the death of M. Hrushevsky by numerous memorials. Occasionally, the Czech officials and scientists also took part in them. Thus, at the commemoration of M. Hrushevsky, Professor Janko, who arranged an international committee in the Czechoslovak Republic on December 29, 1934, in Prague at the Gusovy Dom, delivered a speech on behalf of the Czech Academy of Sciences together with the leaders of the Ukrainian institutions.⁵⁴ Apart from this, on January 20, 1935, the Czechoslovak Ukrainian Association organised the commemoration event in the concert hall of the Masaryk Studio House in Brno, which was attended by the city officials, the rectors of the Masaryk University and the Forest Academy, the representatives of the Czechoslovak-Russian and Czechoslovak-Bulgarian unions.⁵⁵ On January 27, 1935, the Ukrainian Academic Committee organised the commemoration event at Karl University, where J. Bidlo complemented the speeches of the Ukrainian representatives with his memories of the deceased.

Along with the daily press, the academic journals also reacted to the death of M. Hrushevsky with the memorial notes. In the obituary on the pages of the Prague “Český Časopis Historický” Z. Hájek called M. Hrushevsky the most prominent Ukrainian scholar and a public figure, whose influence reached far beyond the borders of his Motherland: “His works had a tremendous pivotal significance, as well as the Ukrainian national movement was largely under his influence”.⁵⁶

J. Slavik responded to the death of M. Hrushevsky with a brief obituary note on the pages of the “Slovanský Přehled” magazine. By referring an interested reader to the previous reports about the Ukrainian scientist that appeared in the journal during the past decades, the Czech scientist summarised the achievements of the Soviet decade of the Kyiv academician’s life. Speaking about the persecution of M. Hrushevsky by the communist authorities, J. Slavik accurately noted: “The

⁵⁴ М.-н., *Поминки по Михайлі Грушевськiм у Празі* [The Wake of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Prague], in “Діло” [Business], Львів, 1935, № 7, с. 3-4.

⁵⁵ *Свято в пам’ять акад. Михайла Грушевського у Брні* [The memorial event to commemorate Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Brno], in “Діло” [Business], Львів, 1935, № 7, с. 4-5.

⁵⁶ Z. H. [Z. Hájek], *Zprávy* [News], in “Český Časopis Historický” [The Czech Historical Review], Yearbook XL, Praha, 1934, s. 671.

fate of M. Hrushevsky during the World War, when he became a victim of the tsarist government, repeated in the worst form".⁵⁷

Another vast obituary on the death of M. Hrushevsky was written on the pages of the Prague "Slavische Rundschau" by an old friend of the deceased J. Bidlo. In the beginning, the Czech scholar noted with dismay that instead of the anniversary article about the seventy years' jubilee of M. Hrushevsky, he was forced to write an obituary on M. Hrushevsky's premature death, which became "an irreparable loss to the whole historical science". Schematically outlining the main facts of the biography of a Ukrainian colleague, the author focuses on the characterisation of his creative heritage, calling it a fundamental one.

J. Bidlo was the first among the non-Ukrainian authors, who also wrote a general work, devoted to the life and activity of M. Hrushevsky, which was published by a separate booklet in Prague in 1935. The Czech scientist, having reacted with plenty reviews on the main works of the scholar, was well acquainted with the circumstances of the activity of his Ukrainian colleague during different periods of his life, and the long-standing correspondence with M. Hrushevsky made him aware of numerous unknown facts of his biography.⁵⁸

The Ukrainian, the Polish, the German and the French reviewers fully shared the evaluations of the Czech intellectuals.⁵⁹ Instead, the Soviet historians were forced to silence this tragic event by the party leadership.

CONCLUSIONS

Summing up the Czech Hrushevsky studies of the first third of the twentieth century, we draw attention to a certain symbolism of the favoured by Czech intellectuals' comparison of Mykhailo Hrushevsky to František Palacký. They pointed out that both scholars played a similar role in the development of their nations. It was Hrushevsky who, through his numerous works, in which he skilfully united the love for his people and positivist objectivity, introduced Ukraine and the Ukrainians to the world.

In comparison with the emotionality of the reports of the Polish and the Russian observers of the Ukrainian scientist activities, the Czech assessments of the various M. Hrushevsky's works were in an overall objective and, in general, quite favourable. The absence of mutual historical conflicts, the similarity

⁵⁷ Jan Slavik, *Michajlo Hruševskýj* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky], in "Slovanský Přehled" [Slavic review], Yearbook XXVI, Praha, 1934, s. 311.

⁵⁸ Jaroslav Bidlo, *Michal Hruševs'kyj* [Mykhailo Hrushevsky], Praha, 1935.

⁵⁹ Віталій Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського...*, с. 356-405.

of the experience of a foreign oppression, the traditionally strong Czech-Ukrainian cultural relations, the personal friendships between the scientist and the foremost representatives of the scientific world of Bohemia created a favourable atmosphere for building a fully-fledged international historiographical dialogue, not burdened with the imperial heritage or mutual claims, as in case with Russia or Poland. In this dialogue, M. Hrushevsky played a leading role on the Ukrainian side.

Finally, we would like to state the richness of the reconstructed Czech Hrushevsky studies. The research could be continued in various chronological and thematic aspects, e.g. the clarification of the features of M. Hrushevsky's reception in the Czech Slavic studies (the second half of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century), integration of the Czech-Ukrainian intellectual relationships and visions, etc.