

UDC 94 (477) "XIX"

doi: 10.15330/jpnu.7.2.32-41

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI AND HALYCHYNA (1885–1894)

IHOR RAIKIVSKYI

Abstract. The article discusses M. Hrushevskyi's interest in Halychyna and his early association with the *narodovtsi* in 1885–1894 prior to his relocation to Lviv, where, in consequence of the "New Era" policy, he was invited to chair the newly created History of Ukraine Department at Lviv University. The author focuses on the young historian's connections with the Halychian *narodovtsi* from the beginning of his association with the region and the publication of his first article in *Dilo (The Deed)*, a Lviv-based newspaper, till his relocation to the capital of Halychyna.

Keywords: Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, association, Halychyna, "New Era", Shevchenko Scientific Society.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the topical issues in modern Ukrainian historiography concerns the relationships between the activists from Dnieper Ukraine under tsarist Russia and those from Austria-ruled Halychyna, which contributed to forging a sense of all-Ukrainian national unity (*sobornist*). Between the mid-to-late 19th and the early 20th centuries, one of the greatest upholders of the unification of Dnieper Ukraine with Halychyna was M. Hrushevskyi, an outstanding historian and cultural and political activist, who played a particularly significant role in fostering a sense of Ukrainian nationhood in the Halychian Ruthenians and promoting their unity with the Ukrainians in Russia. According to I. Franko, the development of Ukrainophilia in Halychyna is associated with "representatives of three different generations", whose influence "spread mostly among the intelligentsia and also partially among the peasantry: in the 60s of the 19th century Kulish had the most dominant influence; in the 70s and 80s, Drahomanov; and in the 90s, Hrushevskyi". I. Franko described the first trend as "formally national"; the second one, as "radically social"; and the third one, as "nationally radical" [32, p. 189].

The figure of M. Hrushevskyi has long attracted the interest of Ukrainian and international researchers; there has even emerged a separate research area – studies of Hrushevskyi. However, owing to unfavorable political circumstances in Ukraine, which lasted till the end of the 20th century, as well as the limited accessibility of original sources created by Western and diasporic historiographers who studied the biography, oeuvre and impact of the historian and public figure, many issues have hitherto remained untouched or little-known. One of them is the relationships between M. Hrushevskyi and the Halychian *narodovtsi* between the mid-to-late 1880s and the mid 1890s, that is from the beginning of his association with Halychyna till his relocation to Lviv (1894). This research area has attracted the attention of Ukrainian historians such as L. Zashkilniak, R. Pyrih, V. Telvak, I. Chornovil, Yu. Shapoval, among others; of international and diasporic historiographers such as L. Vynar, D. Maciak, and others [1; 5–7; 18–20; 26; 28; 33–35]; however, it has not lost its

scientific and socio-political topicality. Written in the spirit of “intellectual history”, this article explores the impact of the relations between the Ukrainian activists living on both sides of the Austrian-Russian frontier on modern Ukrainian nationhood.

2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

M. Hrushevskyy became associated with Halychyna long before his arrival in Lviv in 1894. When a gymnasium student in Tyflis, he began to educate himself. In mid 1882, as per L. Zashkilniak, he became interested in Ukrainian activism, thus making it an objective “to commit himself to studying Russian-Ukrainian history”. In the fall of 1883, the 17-year-old Mykhailo Hrushevskyy began to keep a diary, where on October 15 he made a note about the death of one of the leaders of the Halychian *narodovtsi*, V. Barvynskyy, who promoted the originality of the 17-million nation living beyond the Zbruch River: “... * We are an independent people, and we differ from both *katsapy*** and other Slovenian peoples” [19, p. 18]. He continued his discovery of the region through literary art. With the assistance of I. Nechui-Levytskyi, a writer from Dnieper Ukraine (he gave a warm feedback on M. Hrushevskyy’s first steps in writing; his association with the Halychian *narodovtsi* began as back as the late 1860s), the editorial board of the pro-*narodovtsi* periodical *Dilo* (*The Deed*) accepted the belles-lettres of the gymnasium student. His first publication – the story *Bekh-al-Dzhuhur* written under the pseudonym of M. Zavolok [3] – appeared in the Lviv-based *Dilo* in 1885. However, the editor of *Dilo*, I. Belei, did not publish M. Hrushevskyy’s other early works, for instance *Svoi i chuzhi* (*Insiders and Outsiders*), submitted by I. Nechui-Levytskyi in 1885 because they were immature, as the author himself admitted self-critically later [18, p. 141, 142, 143]. Perhaps, the young M. Hrushevskyy was also the author of the two poems written under the pseudonym of *Neznakomets* (*The Stranger*) and published in the section *Z Ukrainy* (*From Ukraine*) of the Lviv-based journal *Zoria* (*The Morning Star*) in October 1885, which can be inferred from their subject matter, content, and style [18, p. 143].

While at Kyiv University (1886–1894), M. Hrushevskyy, being a student of the History and Philology Department, got involved in the *Stara Hromada* (*The Old Community*). In terms of research interests, the young man was the most influenced by Professor V. Antonovych. In terms of social and political activism, he was inspired by O. Konyskyi, who, of all the activists from Dnieper Ukraine, had by far the closest connections with the Halychians in the 1880s: almost every year he visited Lviv, where he was much published (the bibliographer I. Levytskyi counted a total of as many as 10 cryptonyms and 21 pseudonyms in his Halychian publications before 1886) [17, p. 16]. “As regards the length, continuity and intensity of his participation in Halychian life,” M. Hrushevskyy wrote, “Konyskyi is comparable only to Drahomanov, though, needless to say, his impact was not nearly as profound and strong ...” [13, p. 232]. V. Antonovych visited Halychyna for the first time in 1880; and O. Konyskyi, in late 1865; both activists turned their attention to Austria-ruled Halychyna, where there were possibilities of organizing a legal pro-Ukrainian movement to counteract anti-Ukrainian bans such as the *Valuev Circular* of 1863 and the *Ems Ukaz* of 1876 imposed by the Russian Empire. M. Hrushevskyy acknowledged that I. Nechui-Levytskyi had an important role in shaping his worldview because he was “not only his favorite writer but also ideological guide and teacher [...]” [15, p. 124]. In the mid-to-late 1880s, the famous activists of the *Stara Hromada*, V. Antonovych and O. Konyskyi, together with the *narodovtsi* from Lviv led by O. Barvynskyy, made a tremendous effort to turn Halychyna into Ukraine’s Piedmont, a center for all-Ukrainian national movement. In the course of the struggle against Russophilia, the *Hromada* members in Dnieper Ukraine, the Halychian *narodovtsi* and the Polish political groups in the region gradually generated the idea of a compromise, which was supported by the Austrian government under conditions of a looming diplomatic conflict with the Russian Empire. The ideological foundation for the Polish-Ukrainian compromise, known in history as the “New Era”, was to be prepared by the all-Ukrainian Lviv-based journal *Pravda* (founded in 1867,

* Henceforth the translation does not create the textual effect of the source language; its only aim being to render the semantic content of the original.

** Transl. note: *katsapy* is a transliteration of the Ukrainian derogatory term for Russians.

published with interruption, and relaunched in the fall of 1888). As per L. Zashkilniak, “the soul and engine” of the publication plans was O. Konyskyi, who normally acted through O. Barvinskyi [18, p. 144, 145]. The *Pravda* journal provided a platform not only for the authors from Halychyna but also from Dnieper Ukraine. “In Dnieper Ukraine the relaunch of the *Pravda* was welcomed with enthusiasm,” O. Barvinskyi recounted his memories, “and quite many remarkable writers began to aid this publication by their works” [2, p. 65].

M. Hrushevskyi was among the activists from Dnieper Ukraine who participated in the publication of the Lviv-based *Pravda* in the late 1880s. In the first volumes of the newly launched journal, he published several insightful reviews of issues in Slavic studies, the history of the colonization of Ukrainian lands and the evolution of the local *shliakhta** between the 16th and 18th centuries [5, p. 188]. One of his reviews published in the *Pravda* in the December of 1888 was co-authored with I. Franko [8]. However, the young M. Hrushevskyi achieved his first recognition for the research publications in Dnieper Ukraine, for instance *Ocherki istorii Kievskoi zemli ot smerti Yaroslava do kontsa XIV stoletia* (*Sketches of the History of the Kyivan Land from the Death of Yaroslav to the End of the 14th Century*), a monograph of over 500 pages about the interprincely relations in Kyiv Rus', which was printed in Kyiv in 1891. Prior to his arrival in Halychyna, M. Hrushevskyi had quite remarkable research accomplishments: two monographs, two fundamental volumes of published documents (charters of the Bar Starostvo), dozens of articles and reviews, belles-lettres, poems [5, p. 189].

At Kyiv University, M. Hrushevskyi became interested in Halychyna while focusing on his master's paper. His works were published regularly in the Halychian press, with which he established ties in as early as the mid 1880s through the activists of the Kyivan *Stara Hromada*. Thus in the spring of 1891 at the suggestion of O. Konyskyi he wrote an article (under the pseudonym of M. Serhienko), which opened the first volume of *Zapysky NTSh (Proceedings of the SSS)* launched in 1892 as the bulletin of the *Naukove Tovarystvo imeni Shevchenka (Shevchenko Scientific Society)*, henceforth – *NTSh (SSS)*, created on the basis of the eponymous literary society [29]. While exploring the history of the Bar Starostvo, he published the critical article *Nova krytyka neoslovianofilstva (New Criticism of Neo-Slavophilia)* in the Lviv-based *Pravda* in 1893 [25]. In the article, M. Hrushevskyi described the evolution of Russian Slavophilia into neo-Slavism (“from the humane, though indistinct, views of former Slavophiles to modern Muscovite nation-eaters”), whose essence lay in substantiating the exceptional role of Russia among other Slavic peoples in preserving tsarism as a counterweight to “depraved” Western liberalism. The author wrote about “the modern orgy of Muscovite nationalism, chauvinist, impudent, gluttonous” and castigated “Russia's centralizing and Russifying policy” [25, p. 564, 567, 568].

Austria-ruled Halychyna received several mentions in M. Hrushevskyi's diary. He is known to have made his first note about the social life of the region in the October of 1883 in response to the death of O. Barvinskyi. According to the diary, M. Hrushevskyi was informed about the contacts of O. Konyskyi and V. Antonovych with the Halychians; however, exercising caution for obvious reasons, he was quite stingy with information about the social life in Halychyna [18, p. 149]. In his diary, the young historian made the following laconic note for May 5, 1891: “Yesterday it was said that Barvinskyi was imploring for help. I visited the Vovks; they behaved very well [...]” [16, p. 111]. What it meant was obviously the need to provide money for the publication of the Lviv-based *Pravda*. M. Hrushevskyi noted on February 25, 1892 that the day before he had had a conversation with M. Ohloblyn; they had been “chatting about Halychyna, the relationships of Ukraine with the Muscovite state...” [16, p. 155]. It is easy to guess that this must have referred to the massive persecution of Ukrainophiles in Russia and the important role of Halychyna as a shelter for Ukrainian national movement.

M. Hrushevskyi was an upholder of the “New Era”, which was declared at the Galician Diet in the fall of 1890 and was much discussed; however, it gained no popularity among either the Ukrainians or the Poles. From the beginning, the Halychian Moscowphiles and the Radicals actively opposed the “New Era” policy; soon its opponents also appeared among the *narodovtsi* who were dissatisfied with the minor concessions made by the Polish administration. The Kyivan *Stara Hromada* advocated the

* Transl. note: *shliakhta* is the Ukrainian equivalent of the Polish term for the nobility (*szlachta*).

“New Era” considering its contribution to the common national cause of cultural development. After the leader of the Halychian *narodovtsi*, Yu. Romanchuk, criticized the idea of the compromise in late 1892, in 1893 the members of the Kyivan *Stara Hromada* responded with a letter handwritten by M. Hrushevskyy [18, p. 153]. The letter addressed Yu. Romanchuk as “a guide of the Ukrainian *Narodovtsi* Party in Halychyna” and argued that opposing the Austrian government was erroneous after the compromise “yielded some positive results”. “Any alliance between the *narodovtsi* and the Moscowphiles was regarded as “an absolutely harmful thing, compromising for the Ukrainian *Narodovtsi* Party ...”. Compromises of this sort contributed to “the prolongation of the existence of the Moscowphile Party”, “a sore on the Ukrainian-Ruthenian land, in which the community sees no grounds (because what grounds can there be for a nation to negate its existence?) ...” [24, sheet 1].

O. Konytskyi wrote in the letter to O. Barvynskyy on April 12 (24), 1894 that M. Hrushevskyy had been among over 30 people, including V. Antonovych (Pasichnyk), K. Mykhalchuk (Pyvovar), M. Lysenko (Boian), I. Nechui-Levytskyi (Nechui), and others who had written this letter [23, sheet 45 rev.]. However, having familiarized himself with the political situation in Halychyna, M. Hrushevskyy changed his attitude to the “New Era” since the Polish had made only minor concessions. After relocating to Lviv in 1894, M. Hrushevskyy wrote the following: “... soon came the understanding that my Kyivan associates were deeply mistaken in their sympathy for the compromise and its adherents, that the Polish are reluctant to make any concessions to their domination and can regard their relationships with the Ruthenians as nothing other than those of a dominating nation with a subordinated one” [11, p. 10]. The individual advantages gained from the compromise were expected to form an actual lever of power to put an end to Moscowphilia, which was of major importance for the victory of Ukrainian nationhood in Halychyna. One of the biggest achievements of the “New Era” was the establishment of a department traditionally referred to in the literature as the History of Ukraine Department, but its word-for word name was “the Department of World History with a Special Emphasis on the History of Eastern Europe”. The Austrian Ministry of Education made up this name in order to avoid the term “Ruthenian history” [10, p. 77].

In the fall of 1890, the *narodovtsi* submitted a proposal to establish the department for the consideration of the viceroy of Halychyna, and V. Antonovych, an outstanding historian from Dnieper Ukraine, was expected to become its chair. However, his affiliation with the Orthodox Church was a serious obstacle (in the eyes of the Austrian and Polish politicians Orthodox Christianity was associated with Russian imperialism); moreover, his conscious conversion from the Catholic to the Orthodox faith argued against him [33, p. 133, 134]. In the March of 1892, the Austrian Kaiser granted permission to open the department; but instead of assuming the new post, V. Antonovych was taking his time. Having learnt about plans to open the department from V. Antonovych in early 1891, M. Hrushevskyy, as he recounts his memories in the autobiography, perceived the idea “with enthusiasm considering the importance attached to the Halychian movement by the Kyivan Ukrainian circles ...” [11, p. 7]. From the very beginning, V. Antonovych considered M. Hrushevskyy for the post as he was a talented, promising scholar; but the Halychian *narodovtsi* did not abandon the hope of seeing an authoritative, world-renowned professor in Lviv [18, p. 152].

According to L. Zashkilniak, V. Antonovych had the first conversation with M. Hrushevskyy about the department on February 23, 1891, shortly after his return from Europe when he was in Lviv en route and met with the Halychians. In his diary M. Hrushevskyy wrote on February 24, 1891: “I visited Volodymyr Bonifatiyovych: he gave me a friendly welcome; we chatted for an hour or so [...], about the new department, [...] ‘putting aside the shyness of a young lad, I’ll tell that I also thought this over’ and I was surprised when he said he wasn’t to work long and stuff like that – this wasn’t good” [16, p. 94]. It is difficult to determine exactly, considering the conspiratorial style of the letter, whether the question of M. Hrushevskyy’s professorship was brought up at all; but on October 1 of the same year at a meeting of the *Hromada* members in K. Melnyk’s apartment (she was V. Antonovych’s second wife), there was a straightforward conversation about inviting the young historian to chair the newly created department. M. Hrushevskyy’s diary contains a laconic note for October 2: “... My professorship was

considered very resolutely; even I felt bad about it, [...] that it had not been thought over in good time. I want to chat with Volodymyr Bonifatiiovych about it today" [16, p. 131].

On the next day, October 3, M. Hrushevskyi wrote that "yesterday I saw Volodymyr Bonifatiiovych twice", but I did not get to talk [...]. The desired conversation with V. Antonovych about this "offer", as seen from the entry for the Sunday of October 6, happened twice (on Friday and Saturday); both activists "came out absolutely solidary", but there was a fear of some "insinuation", libel, because of which "I would be left *nach Vaterland* (in the fatherland. – I.R.) – this is unpleasant!" [16, p. 131, 132]. Dnieper Ukrainians were not convinced that the authorities would permit the relocation of M. Hrushevskyi to Halychyna: in as early as 1891 he supported the idea of his professorship at Lviv University for reasons of patriotism. "In the world, I do not have any other bigger interest than the well-being of my people," M. Hrushevskyi wrote in an undated letter to O.Barvinskyi in late October–early November 1894, "from that matter I abstract my personal sympathies or antipathies, let alone any ambitions ..." [26, p. 82]. In fact, the offer boosted the young historian's ambitions; the department received several mentions in the diary entries for January 24 and 25, 1892: "all that is creeping into my head" [16, p. 241]. Due to maintaining close connections with O. Konyskyi and V. Antonovych, M. Hrushevskyi stayed informed about the political situation in Halychyna in the early 1890s [18, p. 153]. The situation with the department culminated in 1893, when I. Belei, the editor of *Dilo*, and O.Barvinskyi, one of the initiators of the "New Era", came to Kyiv to hold negotiations. I. Belei described the results of the trip in a detailed report after returning from Kyiv to Lviv on March 19, 1893. As can be seen from the letter, the situation with the department was uncertain; the Halychians had conversations about that with O. Konyskyi, V. Antonovych and M. Hrushevskyi in his apartment. The latter had two main conditions for his arrival in Halychyna ("I would never abandon my faith"; I would agree to occupy "only the position of an extraordinary professor") [22, sheet 38, 41]. At the end of the letter, I. Belei wrote that "the matter, as you can see, is quite intricate", and expressed concern that the intrigues might make a Moscowphile (*katsap*) or a Pole chair of the department; to prevent this, he suggested that O.Barvinskyi apply urgent measures [22, sheet 42, 43]. There were several candidates for the position of department chair: V. Milkovych, the son-in-law of I. Sharanevych; Yu. Tselevych, the first head of the NTSh; A. Levytskyi, a professor from Krakow University; and others. The intrigues about the new department in Lviv, which were going on behind the scenes, produced an unpleasant impression on Dnieper Ukrainians [33, p. 135, 136].

In late 1893, after receiving a letter from O. Konyskyi on November 13 (25), O.Barvinskyi personally arrived in Kyiv, where, as he tells later, "I found professors Antonovych and Hrushevskyi, who I already knew personally from my past stay in Kyiv. [...] I explained the purpose of my arrival and on behalf of both our community and the government expressed a burning desire" that the department be chaired by V. Antonovych. However, during a conversation with O.Barvinskyi, the latter stressed that owing to his respected age and long years of "callousing toil, he did not feel strong enough to perform such an important and difficult task" [1, p. 12, 13]. The reasons for V. Antonovych's refusal concerned his old age (in 1894 he turned 60 years old), his reluctance to personally delve into the complicated political circumstances in the region, the critical perception of the "New Era" by the Halychian society [33, p. 135, 136]. Following the recommendation of V. Antonovych, his "best student", the 27-year-old M. Hrushevskyi, arrived in Halychyna in the fall of 1894, shortly after being conferred a master's degree in history by Kyiv University in the May of the same year [34, p. 41, 43]; and the professors from Lviv University approved of his arrival because he was a young, promising scholar [7, p. 7].

M. Hrushevskyi began to prepare to move to Halychyna in as early as 1891; with that end in view, he tried to familiarize himself with the circumstances in Halychyna. Thus while visiting O. Konyskyi, the young historian reread the Halychian periodicals published in Kyiv; during his business trip to Moscow in the February–March of 1892, he visited its libraries to find literature about Halychyna. M. Hrushevskyi described his impressions of some of the books in his diary. To illustrate, the work of V. Kelsiev *Halichina i Moldaviia. Putevye pisma (Halychyna and Moldavia. Travel Letters)*, published in Petersburg in 1868, presents the Russian writer's impressions of the region from the perspective of the unity of "Ruthenian" people; regarding this, Mykhailo wrote the following conclusion in his diary on

February 15, 1892: the work is “interesting though the perspective is just foul; the Ruthenian movement and enthusiasm of the 60s are portrayed pretty well” [16, p. 152]. V. Kelsiev identified two trends in the Halychian national movement – Ukrainophiles (*narodootsi*), whom he criticized, and Russophiles, adherents of pan-Ruthenian unity; he expressed the sincere regret that in Halychian schools they did not teach “the all-Russian literary language”. At the same time, he noted that “for some, the question has not been resolved yet: are Eastern Ruthenians and Great Ruthenians one nation or two” [9, p. 94, 95]. Unlike the Russian society of that time, M. Hrushevskyyi did not have any sympathy with the Halychian Russophile (Moscowphile).

Halychians warmly welcomed M. Hrushevskyyi’s arrival in Lviv. Congratulating him on assuming the professorship of the department at Lviv University in the April of 1894, the *Dilo* newspaper wrote that it “will become a connector of research interests between Austrian and Russian Ukraine-Rus’ ...” [31, p. 1]. On September 30 (October 12), 1894, M. Hrushevskyyi gave an introductory lecture on the ancient history of Rus’ [12], which created a public stir. “One of the university’s biggest assembly halls,” the Lviv-based *Pravda* wrote, “could hardly accommodate the huge audience made up of almost exclusively Ruthenian members”, who perceived the arrival of the young professor from Kyiv as an indication of national and cultural unity and the common objectives of Ukraine-Rus’ ” [30, p. 711]. During the introductory lecture, M. Hrushevskyyi drew the attention of the students and the Halychian Ukrainian public to the main thesis of his historiosophic conception: the leading idea of the historical process is a people, the masses. O. Lototskyi (a Ukrainian public and political activist and scholar of the late 19th – early 20th centuries) expressed the opinion that “if the “New Era” had limited itself to this achievement only, professor M. Hrushevskyyi’s impact on Halychyna alone would have fully justified the political move whose creators were Antonovych, Konyskyi, Barvinskyi” [21, p. 173, 174].

As regards Ukrainian studies, the most considerable were the findings of researchers from Dnieper Ukraine, but “they had to be synthesized on the Halychian ground considering the conditions in which Ukrainians existed in Russia” [14, p. 42]. Having relocated to Lviv, M. Hrushevskyyi launched active research and cultural and political activity, which served as a weighty tool for constructing the historical memory of the Ukrainians and extended in the following three directions: 1) Development of the *NTSh*: in 1894 he supervised the historical and philosophical section of the society and in 1897 became head of the *NTSh*. 2) Organization of rigorous publishing activity in the Ukrainian language (at the turn of the 20th century, there were approximately 20 titles of periodicals and series): *Zapysky NTSh* (*The proceedings of the SSS*), *Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk* (*The Ethnographic Collection*), *Zherela do istorii Ukrainy-Rusy* (*Sources on the History of Ukraine-Rus’*), and so on. 3) Training new experts in Ukrainian history, who created the school of M. Hrushevskyyi (I. Krypiakievych, S. Tomashivskyyi, M. Korduba, and others) [27, p. 183]. Under M. Hrushevskyyi’s leadership, the *NTSh* (SSS) became akin to the Academy of Sciences. According to I. Krypiakievych, his term of office was “the brightest age in the development of the society” [6, p. 5]. The “New Era” facilitated the development of Ukrainian historiography, which provided scientific arguments for the national liberation movement; this would have been impossible without M. Hrushevskyyi’s contribution [20, p. 11, 12].

3. CONCLUSIONS

The association of the historian from Dnieper Ukraine with Halychyna was an embodiment of the idea of Ukraine’s national unity, *sobornist*. *Zapysky NTSh* edited by M. Hrushevskyyi (from 1895) provided a truly all-Ukrainian forum. During the Austrian period, 37 out of 105 authors whose works were published in the journal (except for short articles) were from Dnieper Ukraine. Overall, the authors from Dnieper Ukraine accounted for at least a third, or at times even more, of all contributors to the *NTSh* editions [4, p. 328]. At the same time, the relations between the inhabitants from Dnieper Ukraine, or between M. Hrushevskyyi, on the one hand and the Halychians on the other hand were associated with problems caused by differences in their worldviews, which was clearly reflected on the historian’s further stay in Halychyna. He had to resign from the position of the *NTSh* head after a conflict, which occurred in 1913 and escalated into discussions about the relationships of Ukrainian

activists from Halychyna with those from Dnieper Ukraine. Eventually, M. Hrushevskiy left Halychyna; in 1914, he began launching research programs in Kyiv [34, p. 125, 126]. However, to his last days he continued to be concerned with Halychyna and remained committed to the idea of *sobornist*. Therefore, in his young years M. Hrushevskiy became interested in Ukrainian issues, so he turned his attention to Austria-ruled Halychyna, which he regarded as a potential center for all-Ukrainian national movement in the context of the *Ems Ukaz*. Inspired by the ideas of V. Antonovych, O. Konyskyi, and I. Nechui-Levytskyi, assisted by the activists from the Kyivan *Stara Hromada* in the mid 1880s, he got involved in the Halychian *narodovtsi* (O. Barvinskyi, I. Belei and others), contributed to the local periodicals such as *Diolo*, *Pravda*, *Zapysky NTSh*, and so on. M. Hrushevskiy supported the policy of the “New Era”, which allowed for the possibility of his relocation to Halychyna, where in the fall of 1894 he was appointed chair of the newly created History of Ukraine Department at Lviv University. This was the beginning of a new, Halychian, period in M. Hrushevskiy’s life and work, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Барвінський А. Заснування катедри історії України в Львівському університеті. В: Барвінський А. *Записки НТШ. Відбитка*, Т. CXLI–CXLIII. Львів, 1925.
[Barvinskyi A. Zasnovannia katedry istorii Ukrainy v Lvivskomu universyteti. V: Barvinskyi A. *Zapysky NTSh. Vidbytka*, Т. CXLI–CXLIII. Lviv, 1925.]
- [2] Барвінський О. *Спомини з мого життя*, Т. II. Ч. III–IV. Стилос, К.; Нью-Йорк, 2009.
[Barvinskyi O. *Sportyny z toho zhyttia*, Т. II. Ch. III–IV. Stylos, K.; Niu-York, 2009.]
- [3] Бехъ-аль-Джугуръ. Фантазія Михайла Заволоки. *Дьло*, 66-68 (1885), 1-2.
[Bekh-al-Dzhuhur. Fantaziia Mykhaila Zavoloky. *Dilo*, 66-68 (1885), 1-2.]
- [4] Бурдуланюк В. Наукове товариство імені Шевченка – всеукраїнський науковий центр кінця XIX – початку XX століть. *Українознавчі студії*, 8-9 (2007–2008), 323–330.
[Burdulaniuk V. Naukove tovarystvo imeni Shevchenka – vseukrainskyi naukovyi tsentr kintsia XIX – rochatku XX stolit. *Ukrainoznavchi studii*, 8-9 (2007–2008), 323–330.]
- [5] Валіон О. Внесок М. Грушевського у національно-культурне відродження українського народу в кінці XIX – на початку XX ст. *Україна–Європа–Світ. Міжнародний збірник наукових праць. Серія: Історія, міжнародні відносини*, 5 (2010), 187–199.
[Valion O. Vnesok M. Hrushevskoho u natsionalno-kulturne vidrozhennia ukrainskoho narodu v kintsia XIX – na rochatku XX st. *Ukraina–Yevropa–Svit. Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Serii: Istoriia, mizhnarodni vidnosyny*, 5 (2010), 187–199.]
- [6] Винар Л. *Михайло Грушевський і Наукове товариство ім. Тараса Шевченка, 1892–1930*. Мюнхен, 1970.
[Vynar L. *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i Naukove tovarystvo im. Tarasa Shevchenka, 1892–1930*. Miunkhen, 1970.]
- [7] Винар Л. Галицька доба життя і діяльності Михайла Грушевського. *Український історик*, 1-2 (1967), 5–22.
[Vynar L. Halytska doba zhyttia i diialnosti Mykhaila Hrushevskoho. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1-2 (1967), 5-22.]
- [8] Грушевський М., Франко І. Бібліографічні звістки. Урсинь. Очерки изъ психології славянскаго племени. Славянофилы. *Правда*, III (1888), 203–208.
[Hrushevskiy M., Franko I. Bibliografichni zvistky. Ursin. Ocherky yz psykhologiy slavianskago plemeny. Slavianofily. *Pravda*, III (1888), 203–208.]
- [9] Кельсієв В. *Галичина и Молдавія: подорожні листи*. СПб., 1868.
[Kelsiiev V. *Halychyna y Moldaviia: podorozhni lysty*. SPb., 1868.]
- [10] Грицак Я. *Нарис історії України. Формування модерної української нації XIX–XX століття*. К., 1996.
[Hrytsak Ya. *Narys istorii Ukrainy. Formivannia modernoi ukrainskoi natsii XIX–XX stolittia*. K., 1996.]
- [11] Грушевський М. *Автобіографія: друкується як рукопис*. К., 1926.
[Hrushevskiy M. *Avtobiohrafia: drukuietsia yak rukopys*. K., 1926.]

- [12] Грушевський М. *Вступний виклад з давньої історії Русі, виголошений у Львівському університеті 30 вересня 1894 р.* Світ, Львів, 2002.
[Hrushevskyy M. *Vstupnyi vyklad z davnoi istorii Rusi, vyholosheny u Lvivskim universyteti 30 veresnia 1894 r.* Svit, Lviv, 2002.]
- [13] Грушевський М. Олександр Кониський. М. *Грушевський. Твори: У 50-ти т.* Т. 1: Серія “Суспільно-політичні твори (1894–1907)”. Львів, 2002.
[Hrushevskyy M. Oleksandr Konyskyi. M. *Hrushevskyyi. Tvory: U 50-ty t.* Т. 1: Seriiia “Suspilno-politychni tvory (1894–1907)”. Lviv, 2002.]
- [14] Грушевський М. Розвиток українських досліджень у ХІХ столітті і вияви в них основних питань українознавства. *Український історик*, 1-4 (1990), 28–44.
[Hrushevskyy M. Rozvytok ukrainskykh doslidzhen u XIX stolitti i vyiavy v nykh osnovnykh pytan ukraïnoznavstva. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, 1-4 (1990), 28–44.]
- [15] Грушевський М. Спомини. *Щомісячний літературно-художній та громадсько-політичний журнал Спілки письменників України та Київської письменницької організації*, 12 (1988), 116–139.
[Hrushevskyy M. Spomyny. *Shchomisiachnyi literaturno-khudozhnii ta hromadsko-politychnyi zhurnal Spilky pysmennykiv Ukrainy ta Kyivskoi pysmennytskoi orhanizatsii*, 12 (1988), 116–139.]
- [16] Грушевський М.С. *Щоденник (1888–1894 рр.)*. К., 1997.
[Hrushevskyy M.S. *Shchodennyk (1888–1894 rr.)*. K., 1997.]
- [17] Дяченко О.В. Олександр Якович Кониський і процес українського націотворення другої половини ХІХ століття : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук: спец. 07.00.01 “Історія України”. Дніпропетровськ, 2008.
[Diachenko O.V. Oleksandr Yakovych Konyskyi i protses ukrainskoho natsiotvorennia druhoi polovyny XIX stolittia : avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. ist. nauk: spets. 07.00.01 “Istoriia Ukrainy”. Dnipropetrovsk, 2008.]
- [18] Зашкільняк Л. Михайло Грушевський і Галичина (до приїзду до Львова 1894 р.). В: Грицак Я., Дашкевича Я. (ред.) Михайло Грушевський і українська історична наука: матеріали конференцій. Львів, 24–25 жовтня 1994 р.; Харків, 25 серпня 1996 р.; Львів, 29 вересня 1996 р. Львів, 1999, 141–156.
[Zashkilniak L. Mykhailo Hrushevskyy i Halychyna (do pryizdu do Lvova 1894 r.). V: Hrytsak Ya., Dashkevycha Ya. (red.) Mykhailo Hrushevskyy i ukrainska istorychna nauka: materialy konferentsii. Lviv, 24–25 zhovtnia 1994 r.; Kharkiv, 25 serpnia 1996 r.; Lviv, 29 veresnia 1996 r. Lviv, 1999, 141–156.]
- [19] Зашкільняк Л. Початки зв'язків М. С. Грушевського з Галичиною (1885–1894 рр.). В: Михайло Грушевський і Західна Україна. Доповіді й повідомлення наукової конференції (м. Львів, 26–28 жовтня 1994 р.). Львів, 1995, 18–20.
[Zashkilniak L. Pochatky zviazkiv M. S. Hrushevskoho z Halychynoiu (1885–1894 rr.). V: Mykhailo Hrushevskyy i Zakhidna Ukraina. Dopovidi i povidomlennia naukovoi konferentsii (m. Lviv, 26–28 zhovtnia 1994 r.). Lviv, 1995, 18–20.]
- [20] Зашкільняк Л. Українська історіографія початку ХХ століття і міфологізація національної свідомості українців. В: Polasik-Wrzosek K., Wrzoska W., Zashkilniaka L. (Red.) *Historia – mentalność – tożsamość. Studia z historii, historii historiografii i metodologii historii*. Poznań, 2010.
[Zashkilniak L. Ukrainska istoriografiiia pochatku XX stolittia i mifolohizatsiia natsionalnoi svidomosti ukrainsiv. In: Polasik-Wrzosek K., Wrzoska W., Zashkilniaka L. (Red.) *Historia – mentalność – tożsamość. Studia z historii, historii historiografii i metodologii historii*. Poznań, 2010.]
- [21] Лотоцький О. *Сторінки минулого*, Ч. 1. Варшава, 1932.
[Lototskyi O. *Storinky mynuloho*, Ch. 1. Varshava, 1932.]
- [22] Львівська національна наукова бібліотека ім. В. Стефаника НАН України (далі – ЛННБ ім. В. Стефаника НАН України), відділ рукописів, ф. 11, од. зб. 596 (Белей І. Листи до Барвінського О. Відень, Львів, 1883–1886, 1892–1893 рр.), 45 арк.
[Lvivska natsionalna naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy (dali – LNNB im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy), viddil rukopysiv, f. 11, od. zb. 596 (Belei I. Lysty do Barvinskoho O. Viden, Lviv, 1883–1886, 1892–1893 rr.), 45 ark.]
- [23] ЛННБ ім. В. Стефаника НАН України, відділ рукописів, ф. 11, од. зб. 1437 (Кониський О. Листи до Барвінського О. Київ, 1892–1895 рр.), 70 арк.

- [LNNB im. V.Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, viddil rukopysiv, f. 11, od. zb. 1437 (Konyskyi O. Lysty do Barvinskoho O. Kyiv, 1892–1895 rr.), 70 ark.]
- [24] ЛННБ ім. В.Стефаніка НАН України, відділ рукописів, ф. 11, од. зб. 3501 (Грушевський М. Копія листа до Ю.Романчука, переслана Олександрю Барвінському. Б. м. 1893 р.), 1 арк.
[LNNB im. V.Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, viddil rukopysiv, f. 11, od. zb. 3501 (Hrushevskiy M. Kopiiia lysta do Yu.Romanchuka, pereslana Oleksandru Barvinskomu. B. m. 1893 r.), 1 ark.]
- [25] Хлопець (Грушевський М.) Нова критика неославнофільства. *Правда*, LVI (XIX) (1893), 564–568.
[Khlopets (Hrushevskiy M.) Nova krytyka neoslavianofilstva. *Pravda*, LVI (XIX) (1893), 564–568.]
- [26] Зашкільняк Л. “Не маю іншого інтереса більшого, як добро свого народу”. Листи М. С. Грушевського до О. Г. Барвінського. *Пам’ять століть*, 2 (1996), 71–87.
[Zashkilniak L. “Ne maiu inshoho interesa bilshoho, yak dobro svoho narodu”. Lysty M. S. Hrushevskoho do O. H. Barvinskoho. *Pamiat stolit*, 2 (1996), 71–87.]
- [27] Педич В. Культурно-просвітницька діяльність Наукового товариства імені Шевченка початку ХХ ст. як чинник конструювання історичної пам’яті. В: Зашкільняк Л., Пісулінська Й., Серженга П. (Ред.) *Історія – ментальність – ідентичність. Вип. IV: Історична пам’ять українців і поляків у період формування національної свідомості в ХІХ – першій половині ХХ століття*. Львів, 2011, 181–190.
[Pedych V. Kulturno-prosvitnytska diialnist Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka pochatku XX st. yak chynnyk konstruiuvannya istorychnoi pamiaty. V: Zashkilniak L., Pisulinska Y., Sierzhenha P. (Red.) *Istoriia – mentalnist – identychnist. Vyp. IV: Istorychna pamiat ukraintsiv i poliakiv u period formivannia natsionalnoi svidomosti v XIX – pershii polovyni XX stolittia*. Lviv, 2011, 181–190.]
- [28] Пиріг Р.Я., Тельвак В.В. *Михайло Грушевський: біографічний нарис*. К., 2016.
[Pyrih R.Ya., Telvak V.V. *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy: biohrafichnyi narys*. K., 2016.]
- [29] Сергієнко М. Громадський рух на Україні-Руси в ХІІІ віці. В: *Записки Товариства імені Шевченка. Видавництво, присвячене науці і письменству українсько-руського народу*, Ч. І. Львів, 1892, 1–28.
[Serhiienko M. Hromadskiy rukh na Ukraini-Rusy v XIII vitsi. V: *Zapysky Tovarystva imeny Shevchenka. Vydavnytstvo, prysviachene nauksi i pysmenstvu ukrainsko-ruskoho narodu*, Ch. I. Lviv, 1892, 1–28.]
- [30] Сучасна хроніка. *Правда. Місячник політики, науки і письменства*, LXVIII (1894), 711.
[Suchasna khronika. *Pravda. Misiachnyk polityky, nauky i pysmenstva*, LXVIII (1894), 711.]
- [31] У Львовѣ... *Дѣло*, 84 (1894), 1.
[U Lvovi... *Dilo*, 84 (1894), 1.]
- [32] Франко І. Українці. В: Франко І. *Зібр. творів у 50-ти т.*, Т. 41. К., 1984, 162–193.
[Franko I. Ukraintsi. V: Franko I. *Zibr. tvoriv u 50-ty t.*, Т. 41. К., 1984, 162–193.]
- [33] Чорновол І. *Польсько-українська угода 1890–1894 рр.* Львів, 2000.
[Chornovol I. *Polsko-ukrainska uhoda 1890–1894 rr.* Lviv, 2000.]
- [34] Шаповал Ю., Верба І. *Михайло Грушевський*. К., 2005.
[Shapoval Yu., Verba I. *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy*. K., 2005.]
- [35] Maciak D. *Próba porozumienia polsko-ukraińskiego w Galicji w latach 1888–1895*. Warszawa, 2006.

Address: Ihor Raikivskyi, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

E-mail: igor.raikivskyi@pnu.edu.ua

Received: May 29, 2020; **revised:** August 28, 2020.

У статті розглянуто інтерес М. Грушевського до Галичини та його перші взаємини з народовськими діячами в 1885–1894 рр. М. Грушевський зацікавився українською діяльністю ще в юності, вважав австрійську Галичину, з її конституційними можливостями, потенційним центром національного руху в умовах чинності Емського указу 1876 р., репресій проти українства в Росії. У щоденнику, який молодий Михайло вів з 1883 р., він регулярно записував свої враження від знайомства з подіями в Галичині. Під ідеологічним впливом В. Антоновича, О. Кониського та І. Нечуя-Левицького за посередництва діячів київської “Старої громади” М. Грушевський у середині 1880-х рр. налагодив стосунки з галицькими народовцями О. Барвінським, І. Белеєм та ін., друкувався в місцевій пресі. Перша публікація М. Грушевського у львівській газеті “Діло” з’явилася при підтримці І. Нечуя-Левицького в червні 1885 р. Він неодноразово друкував свої матеріали у львівському журналі “Правда” (з 1888 р.), а стаття під псевдонімом М. Сергієнко в першому томі “Записок НТШ” 1892 р. поклала початок його багатолітній співпраці з науковими виданнями Галичини.

М. Грушевський підтримав політику “нової ери” – польсько-українського порозуміння (1890–1894 рр.), що була ініційована українськими діячами в Росії з метою створення кращих умов для розвитку національного руху в Галичині. З 1891 р. обговорювалося питання переїзду М. Грушевського в Галичину, за рекомендацією професора В. Антоновича. Галицькі діячі наполягали на кандидатурі В. Антоновича, І. Белей та О. Барвінський у 1893 р. навіть здійснили візити до Києва, щоб переконати його погодитися на переїзд до Львова, але безрезультатно. Восени 1894 р. М. Грушевський з патріотичних міркувань переїхав до Галичини, де очолив новостворену кафедру історії України у Львівському університеті, що започаткувало новий, галицький період у його житті та творчості (до 1913 р.). Тепло прийнятий галичанами, він розгорнув багатогранну діяльність, що була вагомим інструментом конструювання історичної пам’яті українців: сприяв розбудові Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка, організації широкої видавничої діяльності українською мовою та ін.

Ключові слова: Михайло Грушевський, взаємини, Галичина, “нова ера”, Наукове товариство ім. Шевченка.