

Vitalii Telvak

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X>

Viktorija Telvak

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X>

Bohdan Yanyshyn

Institute of the History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0386-2530>

Between cooperation and conflict: Mykhailo Hrushevskiy through the eyes of Polish intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries*

The unique personality of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy has inevitably attracted the attention of researchers of Eastern European historiography. Hrushevskiy is best known for developing the first coherent interpretation of Ukrainian history and conceptualizing the framework of the historical narrative, which ultimately gave rise to the national scientific tradition. In addition, Hrushevskiy is renowned for his immense influence on the social and political circles of his time and for his talents as a publicist who used his professional skillset and expertise to legitimize the Ukrainian independence movement. As both a “scientist” and a “public figure”, Hrushevskiy was often compared to leading Slavic thinkers such as Joachim Lelewel, František Palacký, and Tomáš Masaryk by his contem-

* Proof-reading services were co-financed by the Ministry of Education and Science pursuant to agreement No. RCN/SP/0265/2021/1 of 1 November 2022; value of the grant awarded as part of the „Development of scientific journals” program – PLN 80 000.

poraries. The fact that the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus* gained such widespread recognition in various countries could explain his considerable popularity not only among Ukrainian¹ but also among French², German³, Czech⁴, and Romanian⁵ intellectuals.

However, Hrushevskyi's work was most widely recognized by Ukraine's immediate neighbors – the Poles and the Russians. This interest was sparked mainly by his historiographic model which often clashed with Polish and Russian research traditions, as well as his social and political work that affirmed the Ukrainian people's right to be the masters of their ethnic lands. At the same time, in the pre-war period, Polish intellectuals had developed a notably emotional attitude towards the Ukrainian professor of Lviv University Hrushevskyi because they recognized the exceptional nature of Hrushevskyi's work. Numerous and diverse studies on Hrushevskyi authored by Polish scholars, of which little was known even in the professional community, have reached Ukraine⁶. This research is quite interesting considering that Hrushevskyi's work can be regarded as a makeshift mirror of all Polish-Ukrainian studies at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

A comprehensive analysis of all Polish studies on Hrushevskyi extends beyond the scope a single article, and this paper focuses on the most eventful period of Polish–Ukrainian historiographic discussion which covers the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A number of factors are responsible for the unique character of this discussion. Firstly, Hrushevskyi lived and worked prolifically in Lviv at that time, which, on the one hand, significantly intensifies the scientific polemic, and on the other hand, contributes to the popularity of the social and political issues addressed in his work. Secondly, the Ukrainian-Polish historiographic dialogue in Galicia during the examined period should be analyzed primarily as a national equivalent to Piedmont not only for the Ukrainians but also for the Poles. Thirdly, in the analyzed period, Polish and Ukrainian historiographies were experiencing institutional, theoretical and methodological modernization to initiate

¹ V. Telvak, *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia)*, Kyiv–Drohobych 2008; V. Telvak, M. Sabinskyi, 'Battles for Hrushevskyi': era of Ukrainian Revolution in diaspora intellectuals discussions of post-war twenty years, "Eminak" 2022, issue 1(37), pp. 100–109.

² V. Telvak, V. Telvak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the works of his french colleagues: problems of reception*, "Eminak" 2022, issue 4(40), pp. 120–138.

³ V. Telvak, B. Yanyshyn, V. Telvak, *Between history and politics: the image of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in German Slavic studies of the first third of the 20th century*, "Przegląd Nauk Historycznych" 2021, vol. XX, no. 2, pp. 103–125.

⁴ V. Telvak, V. Telvak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Czech historiography (the first third of the 20th century)*, "Codrul Cosminului" 2019, vol. XXV, issue 2, pp. 265–286.

⁵ V. Telvak, V. Ilnytskyi, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Nicolae Iorga: scholars' struggle over the national history*, "Codrul Cosminului" 2018, vol. XXIV, issue 1, pp. 53–64.

⁶ Ł. Adamski, *Nacjonalista postępowy. Mychajło Hruszewski i jego poglądy na Polskę i Polaków*, Warszawa 2011; T. Chynczewska-Hennel, *150 rocznica Mychajły Hruszewskiego. Kilka słów refleksji polskiego historyka*, "Studia Polsko-Ukraińskie" 2016, vol. 3, pp. 33–48.

an open discussion on a broader range of historical problems in the context of increasingly complex national and political movements across the European continent.

Upon his arrival in Lviv in 1894, Hrushevskiy was extremely warmly and optimistically welcomed by the Polish scientific community in Galicia. To a certain extent, this enthusiastic welcome was less influenced by the historian's scientific achievements, which at that time were not yet significant, but by the fact that an adherent of the Kyiv worldview came to Galicia as a supporter of positive Polish-Ukrainian relations and the associated policies referred to as the "New Era". Polish scientists' reaction to Hrushevskiy's inaugural lecture at Lviv University can be explained through similar terms. Anatol Levytskyi summarized the address in his review: "This is the truth behind this exciting performance. We congratulate the author on his rebirth as the new plowman in the field of our shared past; we know him from his previous works as a talented and hardworking researcher who has developed an exquisite historiographic method, and above all, as someone who is possessed by a sincere desire to understand the truth, whatever it may be. On behalf of the Jagiellonian University, we would also like to congratulate the author on acquiring a new position in our lands: God bless!"⁷.

Polish professors were initially very fond of Hrushevskiy, and some of them even chose to talk to him in Ukrainian. Invitations from Polish colleagues to various social gatherings can be found in the scientist's archive. Hrushevskiy was also quite friendly towards the Poles at that time. In a letter to his friends in Kyiv, he reported on the first months of his stay in Lviv: "I maintain relations with Poles and Ukrainians whose views span the entire political spectrum. At lunch, I am usually joined by Poles, professors, who are quite pleasant"⁸. On 2 May 1895, Hrushevskiy was elected a corresponding member of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Krakow⁹, which can be regarded as a particular token of appreciation for the young Ukrainian scientist from his Polish colleagues.

Having arrived in Lviv to support the "New Era" course, Hrushevskiy quickly broke off from the political supporters of the Polish-Ukrainian agreement. In his *Autobiography*, he wrote with regret that: "The hope for favorable circumstances for the Ukrainian cultural and, especially, scientific development, for commitment to the Ukrainian national idea on behalf of the government and the Poles with whom I arrived to Galicia, relied on the assurance of older Kyivans who claim to be better acquainted with Galician affairs, but base their opinions on false assurances from the Poles who want to suppress any opposing and freedom-oriented movements among the Galician Ruthenians through "agreements" that take the form of handouts of cultural and national variety. [...] On the

⁷ A. Lewicki, *Hruszewskij M. «Wstupnyj wyklad z dawnoji istoriji Rusy»*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny" 1895, vol. IX, pp. 565–567.

⁸ Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u m. Kyiv, f. 1235, 1, 273: 95–96.

⁹ *Sprawozdanie Sekretarza Generalnego z czynności Akademii od maja 1894 roku do maja 1895 roku*, "Rocznik Zarządu Akademii Umijętności w Krakowie" 1895, p. 59.

other hand, my relations with the Polish university board, which saw me as a submissive supporter of Polish imperialism, have soon deteriorated completely and caused a lot of regrets”¹⁰. These events turned a scientist into a dedicated opposition activist, an opposer of loyalist tactics which favored the carrot over the stick. As early as 1898, Hrushevskiy declared: “Now I consider the ‘New Era’ politics to be no less harmful to our people than Moscovphilia”¹¹.

The gradual stagnation of the Ukrainian-Polish dialogue in the late 19th century, coupled with the growing radicalization of social and political life in Galicia at the time, led to the intensification of not only political polemics but also of the historiographic debate involving a wide range of provocative questions about the genesis of the relationship between the two nations. This was also facilitated by changes in the theoretical underpinnings of Eastern European historical culture at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries that emerged due to the growing influence of Neo-romanticism which emphasized the need to revive the national statehood within the preset “historical” boundaries¹². As a result, historiography increasingly became hostage to political hubris. Thus, the research conducted by Polish historians turned towards the Jagiellonian idea and tradition advocating for a “familiar” perception of Ukrainians, which was facilitated by the frequent replacement of the “Ukraine” toponym with the term “Rus” and inevitably deepened the conflict with Ukrainian historians. Since then, the reviews of Hrushevskiy’s works and Ukrainian scientific literature in general took on a more caustic and critical tone. It is important to note that similar tendencies were also observed among Ukrainian scientists, as evidenced by the content of the *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, especially the review section.

Immediately upon his arrival in Lviv, Hrushevskiy focused on scientific and publishing work in the Shevchenko Scientific Society¹³, of which he was a chairman. He made special efforts to reform the *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, which quickly became the most authoritative scientific journal in Ukraine. The journal’s growing scientific expertise attracted respect among peers. Therefore, beginning in the late 19th century, critical reviews of the journal’s content began to appear in the Polish press. Despite the fact that Polish scholars were generally highly critical of the journal’s view on Eastern European history, mainly the views expressed by Hrushevskiy and his followers from the

¹⁰ M. S. Hrushevskiy, *Avtobiohrafia*, 1906, [in:] *Velykyi Ukrainets: Materialy z zhyttia ta diialnosti M. S. Hrushevskoho*, Kyiv 1992, p. 201.

¹¹ M. Hrushevskiy, *Yak mene sprovadzhenno do Lvova*, “Dilo” 1898, issue 137, p. 1.

¹² See examples: J. Maternicki, *Historiografia polska XX wieku. Część I. Lata 1900–1918*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1982, pp. 59–76.

¹³ V. Telvak, V. Telvak, *The first institutional encyclopaedia in Ukraine. Naukove tovarystvo imeni Shevchenka: Entsyklopediya [Shevchenko Scientific Society: encyclopaedia]*, “Studia Historiae Scientiarum” 2022, vol. 21, pp. 423–432.

Lviv school, they nonetheless paid tribute to the professionalism of the editorial staff by praising the journal's presentation¹⁴.

During his stay in Lviv, Hrushevskyyi also attempted to develop a holistic account of Ukrainian history. Polish scholars' interest in Hrushevskyyi's work increased substantially after the publication of the first volumes of *The history of Ukraine-Rus*. The work presented a detailed and multifaceted analysis of Ukrainian history from the birth of the Ukrainian nationhood, and it was the first publication to cover the entire historical territory of the Ukrainian people. This work affirmed the authenticity and individuality of Ukrainian culture and its difference from the spiritual practices of neighboring nations. *The history of Ukraine-Rus* became the scientific basis of the Ukrainian movement of that time, which provided the necessary theoretical argumentation and earned a contentious reception from Polish scientists.

Despite the fact that the first Ukrainian-language volume of *The history of Ukraine-Rus* was not widely accessible for Polish readers for linguistic reasons, the publication was prominently reviewed. For instance, a short review of Hrushevskyyi's book was written by Alexander Brückner, a well-known Polish researcher of Old Rus' literature, and published in the "Archiv für Slavische Filologie" journal in Berlin. Firstly, Brückner expressed his admiration for the breadth of the issues covered in the book and the range of sources and literature involved: "All modern, especially Russian, literature is presented here as carefully as possible, and the references are very detailed. The author spared no time and effort; he is extremely well-read, critically tactful, relies on the best scholarly and methodological practices, and presents us with a good, thorough and accessible book which has few equals, even in older Slavic literature". Brückner commented on certain aspects of Eastern European history that had been addressed in Hrushevskyyi's book. At the same time, he fiercely argued with Hrushevskyyi's anti-Norman position which was based on the conviction that the people of Kyivan Rus' had developed mature views on political identity and statehood. In the concluding remark, Brückner stated that "despite some objections, this respectable work is worthy of all recognition and will be useful in many ways"¹⁵.

Hrushevskyyi's anti-Norman views were also sharply criticized by Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński, the famous Polish publicist, ethnographer, and historian. Noting the renaissance of the anti-Norman theory, Rawita-Gawroński pointed out that V. Antonovych and

¹⁴ See examples: S. Zdziarski, *Zapysky naukowego Towarzystwa imeny Szewczenki*, t. 31–32, "Wisła. Miesięcznik Geograficzny i Etnograficzny" 1900, vol. XIV, pp. 794–797; Ek., *Zapysky Naukowego Towarzystwa imeny Szewczenka. Tom XCVIII. R. 1910*, "Świat Słowiański" 1911, vol. VII (August–September), pp. 175–178; J. Leszczyński, *Zapysky Naukowego Towarzystwa imeny Szewczenka. Tom CIII. R. 1911, zeszyt III, tom CIV, roku 1911, zeszyt IV*, "Świat Słowiański" 1912, vol. VIII (May), p. 394.

¹⁵ A. Brückner, *Publikationen der Szewczenko-Gesellschaft*, "Archiv für Slavische Filologie" 1900, no. 22, pp. 293–294; idem, *Neuere Arbeiten zur slavischen Volkskunde*, "Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde" 1902, vol. XII, pp. 228–237.

M. Hrushevskiy, his best student, defended the theory with staunch ardor. According to the critic, even in his monograph on the Prince and in his inaugural lecture, Hrushevskiy asserted that the Slavic state had existed long before the Varangian invasion, which contributed to a militaristic and vigilante depiction of the invasion in literary sources in later years. This hypothesis became the main point in Rawita-Gawroński's criticism who accused his Ukrainian colleague of speculation and hypothesizing, and attributed it to a desire to confirm the existence of a pre-Varangian Rus'¹⁶ by scientific means at all costs.

The conceptual premise of the first volume of *The history of Ukraine-Rus* was analyzed in much greater detail by Polish scholars after a German translation of the book had been published in 1904¹⁷. Brückner's lengthy critical review was published in the "Kwartalnik Historyczny" journal, and he expanded upon the prior polemic in his *Norman Dogma* study. Brückner referred to Hrushevskiy's anti-Norman concept as "the latest historical heresy". He started his review by expressing his general thoughts on Hrushevskiy's work and professional skillset: "The work of Mr. H[rushevskiy] gives eloquent testimony to the Ruthenian author's scholarship and universality. He has mastered the vast literature on the subject, including archaeological, historical, and philological studies, primarily Russian ones, that had previously been closed to Europe with seven seals; he simply surprises us with his eruditeness, a knowledge of the most obscure, underrated, and often forgotten Russian and German works. In addition to such indelible scholarship, he offers his speed of thought, originality of judgment, and perfect methodology – all this to an utterly unnatural extent"¹⁸. Brückner's main criticism was that Hrushevskiy relied on outdated ideas of Russian linguists, despite not being a linguist himself. Brückner concluded that: "Had the author been a philologist, he would have never been cornered into this anti-Norman pitfall".

Having expressed his criticism of Hrushevskiy's anti-Normanism, the reviewer also disagreed with the assertion that the Antes were the direct ancestors of Ukrainians, and attributed Hrushevskiy's stance solely to a desire "to make his Ukraine appear as early as possible" within the historical milieu. By relying on philological arguments, Brückner also criticized Hrushevskiy's theory about ethnic processes along the Ukrainian-Polish border in the 11th–13th centuries. Brückner considered Hrushevskiy's assertions about the Ukrainian origin of the Cherven Cities to be groundless, and he generally opposed Hrushevskiy's theory on the Poles' expansionist policy in relation to the Kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia. However, the Polish researcher praised the last chapters devoted to Slavic colonization and the material culture of East Slavic tribes, and Hrushevskiy's at-

¹⁶ F. Rawita-Gawroński, *Ustrój państwowo-społeczny Rusi w XI i XII w. w zarysie*, Lwów 1896, pp. 2–8.

¹⁷ V. Telvak, B. Yanyshyn, *Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) volkes' of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the discussions of the beginning of the XXth century*, "Studia Historica Nitriensia" 2021, vol. XXV, issue 1, pp. 71–90.

¹⁸ A. Brückner, *Dogmat normański*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny" 1906, vol. XX, p. 665.

tempts at reconstructing the origins of the Ancient Rus state. Brückner ended the review by emphasizing the scholarly value of the book and stating that he was “impressed with its size, erudition, and the comprehensiveness of the research”¹⁹.

Brückner’s controversial remarks have initiated a discussion between Polish and Ukrainian researchers on the significance of the Norman factor in the evolution of various forms of statehood in Kyivan Rus’. Hrushevskiy countered Brückner’s criticism of the philological arguments presented in the book by pointing to the inefficiency of the historiographic instruments used by the Polish philologist: “Prof. Brückner became bored with the company of philologists, and in recent years, he has turned his attention to the historians’ community, where he is an equally cantankerous and raucous guest. He turns everything inside out, flips tables, berates poor historians whenever he gets the chance – and then he goes home, leaving the hosts in uncertainty as to whether they should take everything seriously or consider it all a joke”²⁰.

Brückner’s criticism received support from Ludwik Kolankowski, Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński, Jan Kamiński and others. Hrushevskiy’s terminology, especially his popularization of the term “Ukraine-Rus”, became the main bone of contention. His early historical reconstructions and his views on the genesis of ethnic processes along the Ukrainian-Polish border²¹ were also cast into doubt.

The following volumes of *The history of Ukraine-Rus* sparked even more fervent discussion in Polish periodicals. Dedicated to the common past, they received a significant number of polemical comments from Polish researchers. The second series of *The history of Ukraine-Rus*, covering volumes fourth to six, was analyzed in a lengthy review by L. Kolankowski. In a fashion that was traditional at the time, the Polish historian paid tribute to Hrushevskiy’s “great, impressive erudition” which enabled the author to paint a comprehensive picture of economic, social, national and cultural relations in the Ukrainian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth²².

Kolankowski’s arguments centered on three scientific problems which, in his opinion, were central to the discussion, namely the nature of Casimir III the Great’s policy towards Rus’ and the significance of the Union of Lublin and the Union of Brest for the Ukrainian people. In criticism of Hrushevskiy, Kolankowski cited Casimir’s alleged

¹⁹ Ibidem, p. 679.

²⁰ M. Hrushevskiy, *Brückner A. Próbkki najnowszej krytyki historycznej (P.H., 1905, pp. 24–35)*, “Zapysky NTSh” 1907, vol. 77, p. 206.

²¹ L. Kolankowski, *Kilka uwag o Prof. M.Hruszewskiego Historii Ukrainy-Rusi*, Lwów 1913, p. 20; F. Rawita-Gawroński, *Profesor Hruszewskij i jego «Historia Ukrainy-Rusi»*, “Świat Słowiański” 1911, vol. VII (May), pp. 337–356; J. Kamiński, *Przyczynek do charakterystyki szkoły historycznej prof. Hruszewskiego*, Lwów 1910, pp. 1–10.

²² L. Kolankowski, *Hruszewski M. Istorija Ukrainy-Rusi, t. IV, V, VI*, “Kwartalnik Historyczny” 1913, vol. XXVII, p. 350.

patronage of Poland's Ukrainian population, especially the protection of Orthodoxy, and emphasized the benefits of the Union of Lublin and the Union of Brest for the Ukrainians. According to the reviewer, Hrushevskiy hyperbolized the influence of the Ukrainian factor on Poland at the time, which he considered to be particularly manifested by the author's use of the toponym "Ukraine" instead of "Rus", his efforts to portray the Cossacks as an element of national revival in the late 16th century, and his general belief that the Jagiellonian period witnessed the rapid decline of Rus'. Kolankowski attributed these misconceptions to Hrushevskiy's bias.

According to Kolankowski, the greatest flaw of *The History of Ukraine–Rus* stemmed from Hrushevskiy's attempts to exacerbate and accentuate the Ukrainian–Polish contention in all possible dimensions of social life. The reviewer argued that there were no valid reasons for such a deep ethnic conflict. Therefore, he opined that Hrushevskiy's conclusions were not only groundless, but also excessively biased and politicized due to tense relations between the two nations in the early 20th century. According to Kolankowski, these circumstances prompted the "astoundingly hardworking, tireless researcher (...) to go on extensive tangents that are only suitable for a dedicated sensationalist. Since Polish-Ukrainian hatred is a permanent theme in Hrushevskiy's work, one wonders whether it was the author's intention to make such sensationalist statements"²³.

Kolankowski continued to criticize Hrushevskiy's historical views in scientific journals, correctly surmising that the Ukrainian's scientific theories resulted from his social and political activism. In December 1907, Kolankowski gave a speech entitled "Ukrainian thoughts and odes of professor M. Hrushevskiy" in Krakow's Slavic Club²⁴. In his speech, Kolankowski emphasized the dangerous nature of Hrushevskiy's historical concepts, and he pointed out that the concept of a never-ending rivalry between Poles and Ukrainians, which was popularized by the press, could make the already tense atmosphere in Eastern Galicia even more explosive²⁵. In Kolankowski's opinion, Ukrainian patriotism should not be rooted in ghastly scenes of ethnic bloodshed. He suggested that both nations should unite in the fight against the common enemy – Russian imperialism, because "the road to a free Kyiv also leads to a free Warsaw"²⁶.

Polish historians were equally drawn to discussing the Cossack series of *The history of Ukraine-Rus*. This subject turned out to be even more emotionally provocative for Polish intellectuals who strongly emphasized the fatality of Cossack movements for the fate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Rawita-Gawroński was the most ardent critic of Hrushevskiy's Cossack studies. He devoted entire articles to a critique of Hru-

²³ Ibidem, p. 357.

²⁴ *Trzy posiedzenia Klubu Słowiańskiego*, "Świat Słowiański" 1908, vol. IV (January), pp. 42–43.

²⁵ L. Kolankowski, *Pomysły i idee ukraińskie prof. M. Hruszewskiego*, "Świat Słowiański" 1908, vol. IV (January), pp. 19–30.

²⁶ Ibidem, p. 29.

shkevskiy's scientific and journalistic works, and he published many essays in the general press in which he rightly asserted that Hrushevskiy was not only a bookworm academician, but also an ideologist of the Ukrainian national movement.

The Ukrainian scholar's main work was discussed in detail in Rawita-Gawroński's lengthy article entitled *Professor Hrushevskiy's «History of Ukraine-Rus»* which focused on the volumes dedicated to the Cossack period, with occasional references to other volumes whenever they benefited his agenda²⁷. Rawita-Gawroński presented Hrushevskiy's interpretation of the Cossacks' origins and early activities, as well as their role in the history of the Ukrainian people, in his typical ironic fashion. He praised Hrushevskiy for his diligence and erudition in the most general terms, and he also recognized the fact that the book was based on facts and the correct chronology of events. Rawita-Gawroński suggested that this "backbone" should be left intact, whereas the remaining parts of the book, namely the author's interpretation of Cossack history, should be rejected as biased, unscientific and excessively subjective due to the author's "nationalistic proclivities".

According to Rawita-Gawroński, by depicting the Cossacks' past in dark colors and emphasizing its exceptionally destructive influence on society in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (without distinguishing nationality and religion), Hrushevskiy "places current political opinion above historical logic in an attempt to transform ordinary ruffians into national and ideological heroes of the 20th century". Rawita-Gawroński observed that this interpretation of Cossack history in Hrushevskiy's work is "merely an act of protest against Poland", while "gangs of thugs" are portrayed as noble knights who devoted their lives to the protection of the Ukrainian population. Rawita-Gawroński argued that this historical confabulation stemmed from the author's "childish" methodology which is exemplified by a bias towards the arguments of his opponents and by the complete absence of logical connections between facts and conclusions, in an attempt to manipulate the facts using a premeditated structure. The reviewer was also critical of the language of the narrative, and he based his counterargument on the fact that Ukrainian was a "young" language and that the volatility of its conceptual apparatus contributed to the "cumbersome" style of *The history of Ukraine-Rus*.

Rawita-Gawroński's main criticism focused on the terminology used by Hrushevskiy. He considered the term "Ukraine-Rus" to be completely distasteful and especially inappropriate in the context of the early Medieval history of Eastern Europe. It is worth noting that in his attempts to determine the Ukrainian scholar's motivation for developing new historical terminology, Rawita-Gawroński focused on Hrushevskiy's political and "state-building" aspirations which logically involved "historical" and "territorial" gripes with Russia, Austria-Hungary and Poland in the 18th century. As a result, the

²⁷ F. Rawita-Gawroński, *Profesor Hruszewskij i jego «Historia Ukrainy-Rusi»*, "Świat Słowiański" 1911, vol. VII (May), pp. 337–356.

Polish researcher surmised that Hrushevskyy's reconstructed model of Ukrainian history was artificial.

Rawita-Gawroński put forward this hypothesis in numerous essays and articles, where he emphasized the weakness and underdevelopment of Ukrainian culture and national identity (he referred to Ukrainians exclusively as "Ruthenians"). In his opinion, Ukrainians were not yet ready for an active social and political life because they were unable to fully recognize their own needs²⁸. Adopting a highly condescending tone, Rawita-Gawroński claimed that "Their misfortune lies in the fact that Ruthenians want more than their mental, cultural and material abilities can muster, as their aspirations never correspond with reality, and they don't recognize their limits. Meanwhile, their restlessness is an integrally ethnic trait that brings more harm than anything that has ever been described by Hrushevskyy and his followers combined"²⁹. Rawita-Gawroński argued that due to these shortcomings, the political ideas of Ukrainians, in particular Hrushevskyy who was "a socialist by conviction", could not be critically acknowledged.

Rawita-Gawroński's views were upheld by other Polish reviewers of Ukrainian literature at the time³⁰. Hrushevskyy's interpretation of Cossack history was questioned by Tadeusz Korzon in *Dzieje wojen i wojskowości w Polsce*. Korzon referred to Hrushevskyy as "the creator of a new (Ukrainian, i.e. Cossack-Sich) theory" and argued that Hrushevskyy significantly updated the image of the Cossack *starshyna* and offered a different take on Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. The Polish researcher accused Hrushevskyy of nationalistic megalomania and claimed that source materials had been "killfully manipulated" by the "prolific scholar of Ukraine-Rus"³¹.

Polish historians were nearly unanimous in their criticism of Hrushevskyy's historical terminology, in particular the term "Ukraine-Rus" which was gradually making inroads into the mainstream due to the Ukrainian scholar's efforts. Stanisław Smolka accused Hrushevskyy of "forced implementation" of "artificial linguistic nomenclature". Smolka argued that such language hindered adequate interpretation of the Medieval history of Eastern Europe³².

A discussion with Hrushevskyy's followers in Lviv (who, at the time, were attempting to recontextualize Hrushevskyy's concepts based on his theoretical and methodological

²⁸ See examples: E. Koko, *Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930). Wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości. Studium archaizmu*, Gdańsk 2006.

²⁹ F. Rawita-Gawroński, *Kwestya ruska wobec Austrii i Rosyi*, "Świat Słowiański" 1912, vol. VIII (August–September), pp. 557–578; F.K., *Z prasy ruskiej*, "Świat Słowiański" 1907 vol. III (February), pp. 136–141.

³⁰ See examples: A. Szelański, *Kwestya ruska w świetle historii*, Warszawa 1911, pp. 19, 37; B. Barwiński, *Istorycznyj rozwij imeni ukraińsko-ruskoho narodu. U Lwowi 1909. Nakładem Redakcyi Ruslana, "Ruś"* 1911, vol. I, issue 3, pp. 339–340.

³¹ T. Korzon, *Dzieje wojen i wojskowości w Polsce*, vol. I, Kraków 1912, pp. 63–67, 91; idem, *Dzieje wojen i wojskowości w Polsce*, vol. II, Kraków 1912, pp. 302–303, 312, 354–355.

³² S. Smolka, *Przedmowa*, [in:] idem, *Aleksandr Jablonowski. Historia Rusi południowej do upadku Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Kraków 1912, pp. XI–XII.

guidelines) was initiated in the historiography of the early 20th century, thus replacing the debates surrounding Hrushevskiy himself³³. Polish historians claimed that Hrushevskiy's ideas constituted a "Ukrainian historiosophy" of sorts which had significantly influenced many young Galician historians who became his followers. The conceptual framework behind the historiographic manipulations of Hrushevskiy's followers in Lviv received the most scathing criticism in Jan Kamiński's article entitled *Reasons for the characterization of prof. Hrushevskiy's historical school*.

Hrushevskiy's relationship with Polish scholars deteriorated dramatically in the years directly preceding World War I. The Ukrainian scholar's image became increasingly radicalized in the Polish press, to the extent of becoming almost demonic. At that time, any issues between Poles and Ukrainians were attributed expressly to the harmful influence of the Chairman of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Ludwik Kulczycki's brochure dedicated to the problematic coexistence of neighboring nations can serve as a clear example in this respect. Kulczycki asserted that Hrushevskiy's arrival in Lviv in 1894 was a true milestone in the life of Ukrainian Galicians. He wrote: "Professor Hrushevskiy is undoubtedly a vibrant person with powerful connections in Russia, a hardworking and clever manager; at the same time, he possesses traits of character and intelligence that exerted a negative influence on Ruthenian people in Galicia"³⁴. Kulczycki briefly commented on Hrushevskiy's accomplishments in Galicia, his administrative abilities, and scientific work.

Kulczycki was far more diligent in identifying the negative aspects of Hrushevskiy's work and activities. Despite the fact that Kulczycki was quite familiar with the reasons for the conflict between Hrushevskiy and Galician nationalists, he addressed his criticism to the then-chairman of the Shevchenko Scientific Society under the false pretense of objectivity. Above all, Kulczycki accused the Ukrainian scholar of "despotism and volatility" which, in the author's opinion, had been inherited from Russian culture.

In addition to these "character defects", Kulczycki also identified other "equally relevant mental deficiencies" which were allegedly manifested in Hrushevskiy's scientific work as well as in his political activities. As regards the former, Kulczycki remained loyal to the criticism voiced by other Polish publicists and described Hrushevskiy's book in the following words: "His narrative, rich in new facts obtained from previously unknown sources, is occasionally marked with strange naivety in the assessment of phenomena, and it suffers from a lack of historical perspective and comparative sense"³⁵. According to Kulczycki, these flaws could be attributed to Hrushevskiy's flawed education and the use of "subpar Russian models" in historiography.

³³ V. Telvak, V. Pedych, V. Telvak, *Historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Lviv: formation, structure, personal contribution*, "Studia Historiae Scientiarum" 2021, vol. 20, pp. 239–261.

³⁴ L. Kulczycki, *Uгода polsko-ruska*, Lwów 1912, p. 39.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 40.

Kulczycki was convinced that Hrushevskyyi's deep understanding of Russian politics affected his equanimity as a politician. By identifying defects in his social activism, Kulczycki pointed to M. Hrushevskyyi's ill-founded criticism of Polish rule in the region, his skepticism regarding the possibility of Polish-Ukrainian coexistence, his radical demands for national equality, and his "pernicious" influence on youth. Kulczycki also described Hrushevskyyi's illogical tolerance of Russian despotism and his belief that Poles were more dangerous. The author's "objectivity" was evidenced by the statement that "Hrushevskyyi's influence prevented the celebration of the anniversary of Mazepa's departure from Russia in 1909"³⁶. This claim can be easily disproved by the well-documented festivities that had been initiated by Hrushevskyyi as well as a volume of the *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society* that was dedicated to Mazepa. Hrushevskyyi's social activism in Galicia received ever greater criticism from Benedykt Dybowski, his colleague at the Lviv University³⁷.

In summary, an analysis of Polish studies dedicated to Hrushevskyyi in the discussed period leads to several conclusions that essentially correspond with Polish historians' general attitude towards their Ukrainian counterparts. In the late 19th century, most reviews of Hrushevskyyi's work were objective – specific research problems were actualized, and attempts were made to find the most appropriate solutions to these issues. However, in the early 20th century, the radicalization of Ukrainian and Polish national movements led to the deterioration of inter-ethnic relations, and the nature of the historiographic discourse changed and turned towards overt politicization. Hrushevskyyi's historical concepts were increasingly interpreted from the perspective of growing national confrontation which served as a theoretical justification for the Ukrainian political movement. Once again, this observation proves that Polish scholars' interpretations of Hrushevskyyi's historiographic theories embodied the conceptual framework of the entire Ukrainian historiography. The politicization of the Ukrainian-Polish historiographic discourse in the early 20th century, which both sides were ultimately responsible for, reflected the general tension in the relations between the two nations on the eve of the Great War. A dialogue metamorphosed into a monologue with the sole purpose of accumulating national grievances and obstructing mutual understanding, as illustrated by the tragic events of our shared history in the first half of the 20th century.

References

Adamski Ł., *Nacjonalista postępowy. Mychajło Hruszewski i jego poglądy na Polskę i Polaków*, Warszawa 2011.

³⁶ Ibidem, p. 41.

³⁷ B. Dybowski, *Z powodu artykułu prof. Hruszewskiego*, "Słowo Polskie" 1906, issue 377, p. 3 and issue 379, pp. 3–4.

- Barwiński B., *Istorycznyj rozwyj imeni ukraińsko-ruskoho narodu. U Lwowi 1909. Nakładem Redakcyi Rusłana*, "Ruś" 1911, vol. I, issue 3.
- Brückner A., *Dogmat normański*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny" 1906, vol. XX.
- Brückner A., *Neuere Arbeiten zur slavischen Volkskunde*, "Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde" 1902, vol. XII.
- Brückner A., *Publikationen der Szewczenko-Gesellschaft*, "Archiv für Slavische Filologie" 1900, vol. XXII.
- Chynczewska-Hennel T., *150 rocznica Mychajły Hruszewskiego. Kilka słów refleksji polskiego historyka*, "Studia polsko-ukraińskie" 2016, vol. 3.
- Dybowski B., *Z powodu artykułu prof. Hruszewskiego*, "Słowo Polskie" 1906, issue 377 and issue 379.
- Ek., *Zapysky Naukowego Towarzystwa imeny Szewczenka. Tom XCVIII. R. 1910*, "Świat Słowiański" 1911, vol. VII (August–September).
- F.K., *Z prasy ruskiej*, "Świat Słowiański" 1907, vol. III (February).
- Hrushevskiy M.S., *Avtobiohrafiiia, 1906*, [in:] *Velykyi Ukrainets: Materialy z zhyttia ta diialnosti M.S. Hrushevskoho*, Kyiv 1992.
- Hrushevskiy M., *Brückner A. Próbkki najnowshej krytyki historycznej (P.H., 1905, S. 24–35)*, "Zapysky NTSh" 1907, vol. 77.
- Hrushevskiy M., *Yak mene sprovadzhenno do Lvova*, "Dilo" 1898, issue 137.
- Kamiński J., *Przyczynek do charakterystyki szkoły historycznej prof. Hruszewskiego*, Lwów 1910.
- Koko E., *Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930). Wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości. Studium archaizmu*, Gdańsk 2006.
- Kolankowski L., *Hruszewski M. Istorija Ukrainy-Rusi, vol. IV, V, VI*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny" 1913, vol. XXVII.
- Kolankowski L., *Kilka uwag o Prof. M.Hruszewskiego Historiji Ukrainy-Rusi*, Lwów 1913.
- Kolankowski L., *Pomysły i idee ukraińskie Prof. M. Hruszewskiego*, "Świat Słowiański" 1908, vol. IV (January).
- Korzon T., *Dzieje wojen i wojskowości w Polsce*, vol. I, Kraków 1912.
- Korzon T., *Dzieje wojen i wojskowości w Polsce*, vol. II, Kraków 1912.
- Kulczycki L., *Uгода polsko-ruska*, Lwów 1912.
- Leszczyński J., *Zapysky Naukowego Towarzystwa imeny Szewczenka. Tom CIII. R. 1911, zeszyt III, tom CIV, roku 1911, zeszyt IV*, "Świat Słowiański" 1912, vol. VIII (May).
- Lewicki A., *Hruszewskij M. «Wstupnyj wykład z dawnoji istorji Rusy»*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny" 1895, vol. IX.
- Maternicki J., *Historiografia polska XX wieku. Część I. Lata 1900–1918*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1982.
- Rawita-Gawroński F., *Kwestya ruska wobec Austrii i Rosyi*, "Świat Słowiański" 1912, vol. VIII (August–September).

- Rawita-Gawroński F., *Profesor Hruszewskij i jego Historia Ukrainy-Rusi*, "Świat Słowiański" 1911, vol. VII (May).
- Rawita-Gawroński F., *Ustrój państwowo-społeczny Rusi w XI i XII w. w zarysie*, Lwów 1896.
- Smolka S., *Przedmowa*, [in:] idem, *Aleksandr Jabłonowski. Historia Rusi południowej do upadku Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Kraków 1912.
- Sprawozdanie Sekretarza Generalnego z czynności Akademii od maja 1894 roku do maja 1895 roku*, "Rocznik Zarządu Akademii Umijętności w Krakowie" 1895.
- Szelągowski A., *Kwestya ruska w świetle historii*, Warszawa 1911.
- Telvak V., *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia)*, Kyiv–Drohobych 2008.
- Telvak V., Ilnytskyi V., *Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Nicolae Iorga: scholars' struggle over the national history*, "Codrul Cosminului" 2018, vol. XXIV, issue 1.
- Telvak V., Pedych V., Telvak V., *Historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Lviv: formation, structure, personal contribution*, "Studia Historiae Scientiarum" 2021, vol. 20.
- Telvak V., Sabinskyi M., *'Battles for Hrushevskiy': era of Ukrainian Revolution in diaspora intellectuals discussions of post-war twenty years*, *Eminak* 2022, issue 1(37).
- Telvak V., Telvak V., *Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Czech historiography (the first third of the 20th century)*, "Codrul Cosminului" 2019, vol. XXV, issue 2.
- Telvak V., Telvak V., *Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the works of his french colleagues: problems of reception*, "Eminak" 2022, issue 4(40).
- Telvak V., Telvak V., *The first institutional encyclopaedia in Ukraine. Naukove tovarystvo imeni Shevchenka: entsyklopediya [Shevchenko Scientific Society: encyclopaedia]*, "Studia Historiae Scientiarum" 2022, vol. 21.
- Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., *Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) volkes' of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the discussions of the beginning of the XXth century*, "Studia Historica Nitriensia" 2021, vol. XXV, issue 1.
- Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V., *Between history and politics: the image of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in German Slavic studies of the first third of the 20th century*, "Przegląd Nauk Historycznych" 2021, vol. XX, issue 2.
- Trzy posiedzenia Klubu Słowiańskiego*, "Świat Słowiański" 1908, vol. IV (January).
- Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u m. Kyiv, f. 1235, 1, 273.
- Zdziarski S., *Zapysky naukowego Towarystwa imeny Szewczenki, t. 31–32*, "Wisła. Miesięcznik Geograficzny i Etnograficzny" 1900, vol. XIV.

Between cooperation and conflict: Mykhailo Hrushevskyi through the eyes of Polish intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries

Summary: This article reconstructs Polish intellectuals' interpretations of M. Hrushevskyi's multifaceted activities in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The evolution of Polish scholars' attitudes towards Hrushevskyi's concepts was examined in two main periods. The first period (late 1890s) was predominantly scientific, and it centered primarily on finding the most acceptable solutions to the presented issues. The second period (early 20th century) brought a substantial radicalization of Ukrainian and Polish national movements and led to the deterioration of Polish-Ukrainian relations in Eastern Galicia and the politicization of the historiographic discourse. At the same time, Polish scholars began to associate Hrushevskyi's historiographic concepts with the conceptual framework of Ukrainian historical research during that period. The politicization of the Ukrainian-Polish historiographical discourse in the early 20th century reflected the general tension in the relations between the two neighboring nations on the eve of World War I. A dialogue metamorphosed into a monologue with the sole purpose of accumulating national grievances, which significantly obstructed the path to mutual understanding, as illustrated by the tragic events in our shared history in the first half of the 20th century.

Keywords: Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, Ukrainian and Polish historiography, review, journalism, international relations

Zwischen Kooperation und Konflikt: Mykhailo Hrushevsky in den Augen der polnischen Intellektuellen des späten 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts

Zusammenfassung: Der Artikel rekonstruiert die Art und Weise, wie die polnische Intelligenz des späten 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts M. Hruschewskis vielseitiges Wirken wahrgenommen hat. Es werden zwei Perioden der Rezeption unterschieden: Die erste (die zweite Hälfte der 1990er Jahre) ist eine wissenschaftliche Diskussion, die nach Lösungen für spezifische Forschungsprobleme sucht. Die zweite (Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts) brachte eine Verhärtung der polnisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen in Ostgalizien mit sich, was zu einer Politisierung der historiographischen Diskussionen führte. Gleichzeitig begannen die Ansichten von M. Hruschewski, wie sie von seinen polnischen Kollegen interpretiert wurden, mit der gesamten ukrainischen Geschichtswissenschaft jener Zeit identifiziert zu werden. Die Autoren stellen fest, dass die Politisierung des polnisch-ukrainischen Historiographiestreits zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts die allgemeinen Spannungen in den Beziehungen zwischen diesen Nationen am Vorabend des Ausbruchs des Ersten Weltkriegs widerspiegelt. Die Verfestigung der nationalen Positionen und das ständige Erinnern an das erlittene Unrecht ließen die Schwierigkeiten bei der Suche nach einer Einigung voraussehen.

Stichworte: Mykhailo Hrushevsky, ukrainische und polnische Historiographie, Rezension, Journalismus, internationale Beziehungen

Między współpracą a konfliktem: Mychajło Hruszewski w oczach polskich intelektualistów końca XIX i początku XX wieku

Streszczenie: Artykuł rekonstruuje sposoby postrzegania przez polską inteligencję przełomu XIX i XX w. wielopłaszczyznowej działalności M. Hruszewskiego. Wyróżniono dwa okresy recepcji. Pierwszy z nich (druga połowa lat 90.) to naukowa dyskusja poszukująca rozwiązań konkretnych problemów badawczych. Kolejny (początek XX w.) przyniósł zaostrzenie stosunków polsko-ukraińskich w Galicji Wschodniej, którego efektem było upolitycznienie dyskusji historiograficznych. Jednocześnie poglądy M. Hruszewskiego w interpretacjach jego polskich kolegów zaczęły być utożsamiane z całą ówczesną ukraińską historiografią. Autorzy zauważyli, iż upolitycznienie polsko-ukraińskiego sporu historiograficznego na początku XX w. odzwierciedlało ogólne napięcie w stosunkach między tymi narodami w przededniu wybuchu I wojny światowej. Okopanie się na pozycjach narodowych i rozpamiętywanie krzywd zwiastowały trudności w znalezieniu konsensusu.

Słowa kluczowe: Mychajło Hruszewski, historiografia ukraińska i polska, recenzja, dziennikarstwo, stosunki międzynarodowe