

Igor Hyrych

(Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies
named after Mykhailo Hrushevskyy in Kyiv, Ukraine)
ORCID: 0000-0002-9999-5620

**The Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskyy. Vol. 7:
Mykhailo Hrushevskyy's correspondence with Oleksandr
Barvinskyi / Edited by V. Telvak, M. Diadiuk. – Lviv; Kyiv;
New York; Ostroh, 2019.– 208 p.**

The “Epistolary Fountainhead of Hrushevskyy Studies” series was founded by the Hrushevskyy Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies and the Ukrainian Historical Society in USA (headed by Professor Liubomyr Vynar) in the late 20th century. The first volume was published in 1997. The peer-reviewed volume was published only in 2019. Over the past 23 years, seven volumes of Mykhailo Hrushevskyy's epistolary legacy have been published. The volumes “Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskyy” are a supplement to the 50-volume “Works of Mykhailo Hrushevskyy” series, which has been published by the “Svit” publishing house in Lviv since 2002. Today, there are 25 volumes, some of which are split into several books. Initially, we have considered publishing the correspondence separately from the 50-volume series.

Thus, the epistolary legacy of M. Hrushevskyy began to see light of day even earlier than the many volumes of his scientific, artistic, literary and journalistic output. According to the founders of this project, the epistolary heritage of Hrushevskyy should be separated from his other works, which is exactly how the publishing and numbering of this section of his bibliography has been approached, as the separate volumes are being prepared. The system developed previously by scholars of the past, wherein Hrushevskyy's letters are presented in either alphabetical or chronological order, has not been applied here. Instead, a combined approach has been taken: the publishing of separate letter collections according to their place of storage, or according to quantitative and qualitative indicators of the addressees and correspondents.

Archaeologists, archivists, historians and literary critics from a number of scientific, educational institutions, museums and libraries of Ukraine have joined forces to work on the publication of Hrushevskyy's epistolary legacy, which, according to preliminary estimates can amount to thirty volumes. In the 1960s, certain sets of epistolary sources began to be published in the "Ukrainian Historian" journal, edited by Prof. Vynar. V. Miiakovskyy, M. Antonovych and other venerable members of the Ukrainian diaspora were also involved, in addition to the editor-in-chief.

In the late 1980s and the early 1990s, separate editions of M. Hrushevskyy's outgoing and incoming letters were also being published in Ukraine. Mainly in the "Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society", the "Ukrainian Archaeographic Yearbook" journals and the "Ukrainian Historical Journal". Over the last thirty years, hundreds of such publications have been accumulated. Not all of them meet professional archeographic quality standards. Preparing book editions of M. Hrushevskyy's epistolary legacy was a matter of coordinating efforts. The "Epistolary Fountainhead of Hrushevskyy Studies" series of books has been founded based on this principle. The editors of each volume are humanities specialists wielding considerable experience in processing epistolary documents. In accordance with the concept of the series, not only the letters written and sent by M. Hrushevskyy are being published, but the ones addressed to him, too. In some cases, only the letters of M. Hrushevskyy's correspondents have survived. A vast array of M. Hrushevskyy's letters is stored in the archives of Kyiv, Lviv, Odesa, Chernihiv. They are also available in foreign archives: in Ottawa, Moscow, St. Petersburg, etc. The largest collection of letters of the great historian is located in the personal fund of M. Hrushevskyy (№ 1235) in the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv.

The editors of this series of volumes are: I. Hyrych, R. Maiboroda, V. Naulko, V. Starkov, I. Starovoitenko, O. Todiichuk (Hrushevskyy Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies of NASU), H. Burlaka, N. Lysenko, A. Shatska (Shevchenko Institute of Literature of NASU), Professors V. Telvak, V. Pryshliak, A. Atamanenko (from the universities of Drohobych, Volyn and Ostroh, respectively), M. Diadiuk (Manuscript Department of the Stefanyk National Library), S. Pankova (Hrushevskyy Historical and Memorial Museum in Kyiv) and O. Melnyk (Mystetskyi Arsenal National Art and Culture Museum Complex). Two books of correspondence were published outside the series in Lviv: the volumes of M. Hrushevskyy's correspondence with K. Studynskyy (edited by H. Svarnyk) and M. Korduba (edited by O. Kupchynskyy).

The first volume consists of M. Hrushevskyy's letters to Ukrainian writers, which are kept in the Manuscript Department of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature, the second – of the correspondence with F. Vovk, M. Biliashivskyy, V. Doroshenko and V. Lypynskyy; the third – of the letters of Ukrainian writers

to M. Hrushevskyy (also in the Manuscript Department of the T. Shevchenko Institute of Literature), volumes 4–6 each consist of only one correspondent to M. Hrushevskyy (Ye. Chykalenko (outstanding patron of culture), I. Dzhydzhora (favorite student), Yu. Siryi (Tyshchenko) (the largest publisher and bookseller, an employee of the historian). And finally, after a seven-year break, a volume of letters by O. Barvinskyi to M. Hrushevskyy, edited by Vitalii Telvak and Myroslava Diadiuk is coming out.

The first approaches to the publication of correspondence between M. Hrushevskyy and O. Barvinskyi (attempts to print individual letters and present the history of their relationship) were made twice in the 1990s. Oleh Kupchynskyy and Leonid Zashkilniak, well-known researchers from Lviv were responsible for the publication of these letters.

But in full, all the known letters between two people, accountable for the transformation of the Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society from a literary institution to a scientific association of scientists, were being published for the first time. The book contains 128 complete, uncensored letters known to the scientific communities of today. The letters of Oleksandr Barvinskyi are stored in the Kyiv archive of M. Hrushevskyy (№ 1235). M. Hrushevskyy's letters to O. Barvinskyi were deposited in the personal fund of the famous deputy of the Galician Diet and the Austrian Parliament in the Manuscript Department of the Stefanyk National Library. The letters in the publication are placed in chronological order. Not all postal items, both of O. Barvinskyi and M. Hrushevskyy, have survived. Some of the topics touched upon in the letters do not find their conclusion. But this arrangement of documents allows the reader to follow the twists and turns of the relationship in the order of days and months, year after year. The “original letter – response” principle has been used.

The most thoroughly highlighted period is the friendliest spell in the relationships between scientists and public figures: 1894 to 1896. The time of M. Hrushevskyy's turn to professorship and the first years of his management of the History and Philosophy Department of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. These three years account for more than 90% of all the letters. The years 1898, 1902, 1903 and 1926 are represented by only up to a dozen letters each. With the worsening of relationships after 1896, the letters were becoming only formal in nature and mostly concerned official matters.

The preface to the “Correspondence” volume, written by V. Telvak deserves a special mention. Despite its small size of only about 30 pages – it is written densely and is based on a large pool of source material. Contains more than a hundred references to literature and archival documents. The source material on this subject matter remains very diverse and extensive. It consists, among other things, of the reflections of O. Barvinskyi from his famous diary, which has also been partially published for about twenty years by the Shevchenko

Institute of Literature of NASU, but hasn't been published in full yet. V. Telvak studied it in great detail from the point of view of the relationship between M. Hrushevskiy and O. Barvinskyi, highlighting all of the crucial points. Both previously published and unpublished correspondences of O. Barvinskyi with O. Konyskyi, V. Antonovych, K. Studynskiy, A. Vakhnianyn, H. Berlo, etc. have been included. A handful of letters from M. Hrushevskiy to his teachers V. Antonovych and O. Konyskyi have also been used. The author of the foreword has managed to avoid being biased and was as objective as possible in assessing the history of relationships. Which is a feat that's not often possible for historians studying biographies of their heroes on the basis of available sources. V. Telvak showed a great understanding of the context of the conflict between M. Hrushevskiy and O. Barvinskyi. He tried to understand and multilaterally interpret the behavior of both O. Barvinskyi and M. Hrushevskiy during this time.

The volume of correspondence between M. Hrushevskiy and O. Barvinskyi is interesting to us primarily because of the well-known conflict between the two, which unfolded in full force during the fourth year of M. Hrushevskiy's stay in Lviv. O. Barvinskyi was behind this key event in modern Ukrainian history. He directly negotiated with Austrian and Polish politicians to establish a department of Ukrainian history at the Lviv University and to invite Professor Mykhailo Hrushevskiy as a representative of Greater Ukraine. He was obliged to implement the policy of the New Era (in agreement with the masters of the land – the Polish) – to establish a cultural and scientific outpost – the Shevchenko Scientific Society, to nurture distinct Ukrainian culture for the inhabitants of Galicia and the Upper Dnieper region, which was to become the basis of Ukrainian struggle for political independence.

The conflict, which had a personal component, due to both figures being profoundly charismatic and rivalling each other's ambition to become the leading figure in Ukrainian politics, still had a larger political background. While O. Barvinskyi was mainly concerned with the well-being of only the people of Western Ukraine, M. Hrushevskiy saw himself responsible for the nation as a whole. But Oleksandr Barvinskyi could hardly agree with such a position because of his character and level of public standing in Galicia. The latter was a member of the government circles of the Austrian establishment, conducting behind-the-scenes negotiations with the Polish representatives. He did not believe in the victory of the Ukrainian project through the means of a violent incursion of Ukrainian radical ideas into the Polish political circle in Galicia, but instead put his trust into the subtler vein of mutual agreements, ensuring lasting political cooperation with the Polish political forces. O. Barvinskyi saw M. Hrushevskiy as a junior comrade who had no right to act at his own discretion, and instead had to veto his actions with the lieutenants and leaders of the New Age – O. Konyskyi and V. Antonovych. To Barvinskyi, the historian's bet on

radicals from within the ranks of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and his persistence on publicising the Polish-Ukrainian relations to the larger public were not just mistakes, but a betrayal of discreet agreements and mutual trust between the two; he saw it as dishonest behavior. M. Hrushevskyyi did not acknowledge his obligatory subordination to O. Barvinskyyi, O. Konyskyyi and V. Antonovych. He believed that as the leading figure of Ukrainian politics he had the right to act at his own volition.

Their annoyance with each other was so great that both parties started to act unreasonably towards one another. In the “Ruslan” newspaper, O. Barvinskyyi scrutinized every decision made by M. Hrushevskyyi, even ones that had undeniable merit. For example, O. Barvinskyyi argued against the establishment of Ukrainian private gymnasiums in Galicia. In return, M. Hrushevskyyi refused to consult Barvinskyyi’s son, Bohdan – a prominent Galician historian in his own right. But the most publicized controversy at the time was the dismissal of O. Barvinskyyi from the Shevchenko Scientific Society, caused largely by M. Hrushevskyyi in 1905–1908. Despite the fact that Barvinskyyi himself has founded the Society in the early 1890s.

Vitalii Telvak tries to objectively evaluate the behaviors of both M. Hrushevskyyi and O. Barvinskyyi. In my opinion, he comes to the logical conclusion that both of them had the right to their own interpretation of the situation surrounding the Shevchenko Scientific Society. When M. Hrushevskyyi was elected Chairman of the Society in 1897, O. Barvinskyyi became his biggest critic, chastising Hrushevskyyi for more than twenty years for radicalism and unwillingness to negotiate with the Polish politicians. From Barvinskyyi’s point of view, it was easier for the nobles – high ranking Ukrainians and Poles – to negotiate among themselves, and decide on what’s right for the nations they represent. In his view, “commoners” would only bring disarray and disrepute into the relationship between the two nations.

M. Hrushevskyyi could also do no wrong, by bringing I. Franko and V. Hnatiuk into cooperation with the Society – two powerful public figures. Hrushevskyyi did not exclusively rely on the clerical-conservative forces of the right wing. He urged not to trust any agreements or treaties, but to exert constant pressure on the owners of the region in order to achieve a Ukrainian-Polish status quo in Galicia. The author of the preface rightly notes that there was no apoliticalness in the actions of either O. Barvinskyyi or M. Hrushevskyyi. The latter was no less “politicized” in his decisions, although he justified the removal of O. Barvinskyyi from the Shevchenko Scientific Society on the grounds of the Society’s transformation from a political institution into a scientific one.

Due to the specifics of the development of Ukrainian science, the Shevchenko Scientific Society was not only a scientific organization, but also inherently a socio-political one. Some of its actions were very uncharacteristic for those of a sci-

entific organization: publishing a political journal, owning a publishing house for popular literature, communicating with political parties and periodicals, taking the floor at political rallies (for instance, refusing to participate in the Prague Slavic Congress in honor of František Palacký – the “Father of the Czech Nation”). O. Barvynskyi has also criticized M. Hrushevskyi for this. Even though M. Hrushevskyi was very much in the right here. It’s unwise to participate in the celebrations of Slavic unity alongside national organizations which do not recognize the right of the Ukrainian people to exist (Russian Slavophiles, in this instance).

The style of commentary in the book deserves a special mention. It is almost equal in volume to the amount of text in the letters themselves. The commentary is not too formal either. V. Telvak and M. Diadiuk have taken many archival sources into consideration. For example, detailed commentary has been provided on the future pro-Russian professor V. Milkovych from Chernivtsi. The found documents allowed to submit a detailed biography of a man who was a long-time opponent of M. Hrushevskyi. During the First Russian Revolution, he wrote a negative review of M. Hrushevskyi’s “History of Ukraine-Rus”. During his writing process, V. Telvak found a number of materials in the State Archives of the Lviv Region (DALO) – Hrushevskyi’s manuscripts of internal nature, which were unknown to scholars studying his work and were not included in the 50-volume “Works of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi” series.

Despite the well-known conflict between O. Barvynskyi and M. Hrushevskyi, which has been long-publicized for almost thirty years, the very topic of the conflict is scarcely mentioned in the letters themselves. Thus, to fit one of the most interesting arrays of correspondence of M. Hrushevskyi into historical context, it was necessary to devote much space to the unraveling of various details, including biographies of little-known professors, analysis of the epistolary heritage of other Galician and Upper Dnieper region figures, etc. And both editors did a fantastic job at it.

Was the relationship between M. Hrushevskyi and O. Barvynskyi primarily personal in nature? It was not – in the opinion of the editors, which is an opinion we can agree with. Despite his deliberation on the topic of “how M. Hrushevskyi was banished to Lviv” in 1897 and 1926, O. Barvynskyi still paid tribute to the work of the historian in Galicia in his later days. He signed the congratulatory letter to Hrushevskyi on his sixtieth birthday during his Kyiv anniversary in 1926. In turn, M. Hrushevskyi politely thanked O. Barvynskyi and praised his contribution to the Ukrainian cause. V. Telvak has emphasized this in his preface.

We hope that the “Epistolary Fountainhead of Hrushevskyi Studies” series will not end with its seventh volume, and that soon we will see new books, subtitled “The Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi”.