

UDC 94(477)(092)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/95-2-6>

**Mykhailo SABINSKYI,**  
*orcid.org/0000-0001-6059-4646*  
PhD (History),  
Security Service of Ukraine  
(Kyiv, Ukraine) [mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com](mailto:mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com)

**Svitlana BILA,**  
*orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789*  
Candidate of Historical Sciences,  
Associate Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines  
Drohobych State Pedagogical University of Ivan Franko  
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) [bilasvitlana24@gmail.com](mailto:bilasvitlana24@gmail.com)

**Olga VLADYGA,**  
*orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164*  
Candidate of Historical Sciences,  
History Teacher  
Lviv Professional College of Computer Technologies and Building  
(Lviv, Ukraine) [olhavladyha@gmail.com](mailto:olhavladyha@gmail.com)

## THE SCHOLARLY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE UKRAINIAN DIASPORA

*This study aims to reconstruct the process by which historians of the Ukrainian diaspora investigated Mykhailo Hrushevsky's activity as an organiser of scholarly life. The research methodology involves the use of the principles of historicism and objectivity, as well as general scientific and special-historical methods of historiographical research. The scholarly novelty of the article lies in its comprehensive examination of the problem of historiographical interpretations of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's academic and organisational activity by Ukrainian intellectuals abroad during the 1960s–1980s. Conclusions. A distinctive feature of the historiographical discourse of diaspora Ukrainian studies – focused on a broad range of issues concerning Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational activity – was its progressive specialisation. This tendency manifested itself in the rapid expansion of the range of topics brought into scholarly circulation regarding the author of the History of Ukraine-Rus' as a scientific manager, made possible by new source discoveries and the application of Western methodological approaches. In this way, innovative historiographical studies emerged, some of which to this day have not only retained their scholarly significance but also have not been reinterpreted within contemporary social sciences and the humanities (for example, research on the period of Hrushevsky's presidency of the Shevchenko Scientific Society). At the same time, the inability – due to objective circumstances – to conduct in-depth work in archives on the mainland resulted in the thematic and problem-oriented fragmentation of diaspora Hrushevsky studies. Thus, during the 1960s–1980s, no comprehensive study appeared addressing the issues of Hrushevsky's organisation of scholarly work within the framework of the Ukrainian Scientific Society or the Ukrainian Sociological Institute. In turn, this made it impossible to offer a panoramic analysis of the eminent scholar's scholarly-organisational legacy. Nevertheless, it was precisely the historiographical work of diaspora intellectuals that provided the impetus for the rapid development of modern, Ukraine-based Hrushevsky studies.*

**Key words:** *M. Hrushevsky, Ukrainian foreign historiography, scientific and organizational activity, L. Vynar, reception.*

**Михайло САБІНСЬКИЙ,***orcid.org/0000-0001-6059-4646*

кандидат історичних наук

Служби безпеки України

(Київ, Україна) *mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com***Світлана БІЛА,***orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789*

кандидатка історичних наук,

доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін

Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка

(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) *bilasvitlana24@gmail.com***Ольга ВЛАДИГА,***orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164*

кандидат історичних наук,

викладач історії

Львівського вищого професійного училища комп'ютерних технологій та будівництва

(Львів, Україна) *olhavladyha@gmail.com*

## НАУКОВО-ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ДІАСПОРИ

Метою розвідки є реконструкція процесу дослідження українськими діаспорними істориками діяльності М. Грушевського як організатора науки. Методологія дослідження передбачає поєднання традиційних для історіографічних праць принципів об'єктивності, (історизму, холізму і системності, а також ціннісного підходу до об'єкту вивчення) та загальнонаукових (узагальнення, порівняння, аналіз і синтез) і спеціально-історичних (історико-порівняльний, історико-генетичний, історико-психологічний та історико-типологічний) методів наукової праці. Наукова новизна статті полягає у всебічному опрацюванні проблеми історіографічного осмислення науково-організаційної діяльності М. Грушевського українськими закордонними інтелектуалами протягом 1960-1980-х рр. Висновки. Особливістю історіографічного дискурсу діаспорного українознавства, сфокусованого на широкий спектр проблематики науково-організаційної діяльності М. Грушевського, була його прогресуюча спеціалізація. Її проявом стало стрімке зростання кола актуалізованих сюжетів спадщини автора «Історії України-Руси» як наукового менеджера, уможливлене новими джерельними знахідками і застосуванням західних методологічних технік. Таким чином постали новаторські історіографічні розвідки, деякі з яких і по сьогодні не лише не втратили наукової вагомості, але й не отримали переосмислення в новітній соціогуманітаристиці (приміром, дослідження періоду головування М. Грушевського в Науковому товаристві імені Шевченка). Разом із тим, неможливість з об'єктивних причин зануритися у материкові архіви спричинила проблемно-тематичну фрагментарність діаспорного грушевськознавчого дискурсу. Приміром, протягом 1960-1980-х років не з'явилось жодного цілісного опрацювання проблем організації М. Грушевським наукової праці на форумі Українського наукового товариства чи Українського соціологічного інституту. В свою чергу, це унеможливило панорамний аналіз науково-організаційної спадщини визначного вченого. Незважаючи на це, саме історіографічні студії діаспорних інтелектуалів дали поштовх стрімкому поступу новітніх материкових грушевськознавчих студій.

**Ключові слова:** М. Грушевський, українська закордонна історіографія, науково-організаційна діяльність, Л. Винар, рецензія.

**Problem statement.** The widely celebrated centennial anniversary of Mykhailo Hrushevsky, commemorated by the Ukrainian émigré community in 1966, significantly intensified attention to his multifaceted legacy. As a result, publications of various genres emerged, particularly numerous during subsequent anniversary commemorations (1976 and 1986) or memorial dates (1984) honouring the distinguished scholar. For the most part, these historiographical texts were popular-scientific in nature and fulfilled an important mission: disseminating among broad audiences an appreciation of the many dimensions of

Hrushevsky's national service. Through this process, numerous myths and prejudices that had taken shape during the era of the Ukrainian Revolution were gradually diminished. Alongside this popular-scientific «Hrushevskiana,» studies of a strictly scholarly character also appeared, focused on the comprehensive interpretation of particular aspects of the intellectual heritage of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. These works rested upon an ever-expanding body of sources and the application of modern methodological tools. It is precisely this research-oriented «Hrushevskiana,» concentrated on elucidating the spe-

cific features of the eminent historian's scholarly and organisational activity, that will constitute the main focus of the present study.

**This study aims** to reconstruct the process by which historians of the Ukrainian diaspora investigated Mykhailo Hrushevsky's activity as an organiser of scholarly life.

**Analysis of recent investigations and publications.** To date, Ukrainian diaspora Hrushevsky studies have produced a substantial body of literature. To some extent, its authors have also reflected on the contribution made by diaspora historians in 1968–1989 to the study of the phenomenon of Mykhailo Hrushevsky as an organiser of Ukrainian scholarship. Thus, Alla Atamanenko briefly addressed this issue in her monograph on the Ukrainian Historical Society (Atamanenko, 2010: 503–527). In turn, Vitalii Telvak examined the diaspora discourse of the theoretical «Hrushevskiyana» in a number of works devoted to the methodological views of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'* (Telvak, 2010; Тельвак 2012; Тельвак 2013; Telvak & Sabinskyi, 2022; Тельвак, Тельвак, 2021). How diaspora intellectuals interpreted Hrushevsky's scholarly practices was explored by V. Telvak and V. Pedych (Telvak, 2000; Тельвак, 2000a; Тельвак, 2000b; Тельвак 2007; Telvak & Pedych, 2016). However, in these and other studies, the scholarly and organisational «Hrushevskiana» of 1968–1989 has not been reconstructed in a comprehensive manner. This circumstance determines the relevance of the topic addressed in the present research.

**Presenting the main materials.** The study of the scholarly and organisational work of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'* constituted the most comprehensive component of the diaspora Hrushevsky-studies discourse. Intellectuals representing various political camps unanimously emphasised Mykhailo Hrushevsky's unparalleled organisational talent – the greatest among Ukrainians – since the majority of the scholarly institutions of his era were either founded or headed by the distinguished historian. Within the Lviv period of his scholarly and organisational activity, the multifaceted issue of his cooperation with the Shevchenko Scientific Society received the most extensive scholarly attention. The founder of scholarly Hrushevsky studies, L. Vynar, undertook the task of addressing this issue, highly relevant to Ukrainian scholarship. His substantial study initially appeared in several issues of *Ukrainskyi Istoryk* and later – after revision – was published in book form (Vynar, 1970). The structure adopted by the author envisaged a consistent presentation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's activity within the Shevchenko Scientific Society across

three chronological segments. Notably, the researcher dispensed with such traditional monographic components as an introduction and conclusions, which indicates – to some extent – a mechanical consolidation of journal articles into a book-length publication.

In the first part, the head of the Ukrainian Historical Society examined Mykhailo Hrushevsky's cooperation with the Society up to the point when he assumed the presidency of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1897. The author begins by reconstructing the historiographical context of the problem, briefly addressing the origins of this first fully national scholarly institution. L. Vynar then traces the establishment of Hrushevsky's cooperation with the notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. As the scholar rightly notes, Hrushevsky's activity within the Shevchenko Scientific Society forum acquired an entirely new quality after his relocation to Lviv in 1894. From that moment, the young professor immediately became head of the Society's Historical-Philosophical Section and soon thereafter assumed the editorship of the notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, which, within a short period, transformed into the most authoritative Ukrainian studies publication, thereby attesting to the exceptional character of Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational abilities. L. Vynar aptly emphasised that during this period, the historian concentrated his efforts on implementing a project of the Society's gradual «academization.» This was to be facilitated through reform of its statutes, the expansion of sections and commissions, the broadening of the range of scholarly publications, and the enhancement of their professional standards.

Quite expectedly, the second chapter of the book is the most extensive, being devoted to an examination of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's activity as head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Drawing on the wide range of sources available at the time, L. Vynar offers a fairly detailed account – against the background of the complex socio-political situation in contemporary Eastern Galicia – of the circumstances surrounding the election of the Ukrainian professor as president of the Society. Having vividly demonstrated the exceptional nature of the Society head's organisational talent, the historiographer rightly notes that Hrushevsky's work within the Shevchenko Scientific Society during that not-quite-twenty-year period constitutes a true epoch in the development of Ukrainian scholarly life. In this chapter, with considerable detail and persuasive argumentation, supported by numerous examples, Vynar reconstructs the remarkable intensity of the Lviv professor's scholarly-organisational, editorial-publishing, and administrative activity within the Society. He convincingly shows that it was precisely under

Hrushevsky's leadership that Shevchenko Scientific Society gradually evolved into the most authoritative national scholarly institution, acquiring all the essential features of an Academy of Sciences, yet – due to the anti-Ukrainian policies pursued by the Polish authorities of the region – never succeeded in formally securing such a status. At the end of the chapter, L. Vynar turns to the then little-known issue of the conflict within the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1913, which resulted in Hrushevsky's resignation from the presidency of the Society and provoked serious crisis phenomena within the institution itself.

The final part of L. Vynar's book is devoted to clarifying the specific features of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's cooperation with the Society during 1914–1934. Within this broad chronological framework, the researcher justifiably distinguishes several sub-periods marked by varying degrees of intensity and depth in the eminent intellectual's relations with the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Thus, while during 1914–1923 such contacts – due to several objective circumstances – were largely sporadic, after Hrushevsky's return to Ukraine in 1924, they became increasingly active. This development was largely facilitated by the scholar's cordial relations with the then-president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Kyrylo Studynskyi. Summarising Hrushevsky's cooperation with the Society during this period, the author emphasises that its primary goal was to promote the unity of Ukrainian lands divided by borders, through the consolidation of the intellectual forces of the national intelligentsia on both sides of the Zbruch River.

The «Appendices» to the book proved to be exceptionally valuable; in an unusual move, L. Vynar placed them in a separate fourth chapter. There, the author compiled sources that were difficult for the diaspora reader to access, thereby enabling a more nuanced perspective on the issues addressed in the book. Among these materials are several texts by Mykhailo Hrushevsky himself, including «Memorandum for the General Assembly of 1898,» «On the Occasion of the 150th Volume of the Proceedings,» and «Galician–Ukrainian Relations.» Also noteworthy is Hrushevsky's little-known 1913 letter to Yevhen Chykalenko, in which he set out his interpretation of the conflicts within the Society. Finally, Vynar reprinted the jubilee addresses sent by the Shevchenko Scientific Society to its former president in 1926.

The analysed study by L. Vynar attracted considerable interest and received favourable discussion in professional circles, as evidenced by several Ukrainian– and English-language reviews published in the periodicals of the time. By way of example, one may mention the survey review by the author-

itative Hrushevsky scholar O. Dombrovskyi, published in the newspaper *Svoboda*. The reviewer aptly emphasised the multidimensional character of the «Hrushevsky and the Shevchenko Scientific Society» problem, as well as the significant source– and methodology-related risks confronting any researcher who undertakes it. Vynar, the critic notes, fully rose to these numerous challenges and provided the Ukrainian community with an objective work – profound in its observations and masterfully written (Dombrovskyi, 1971: 4). These assessments were fully shared by M. Andrusyak, a younger contemporary of Hrushevsky, who characterised Vynar's book as «impeccable» (Andrusyak, 1971: 121–122). It should be emphasised that even today the book – published more than half a century ago by the founder of the Ukrainian Historical Society – remains the most authoritative and still the only monographic treatment of the problem of Hrushevsky's multifaceted activity within the Shevchenko Scientific Society forum, as was noted by reviewers upon its reissue in 2006 (Telvak, 2006–2007a).

The problem of «Hrushevsky and the Shevchenko Scientific Society,» explored by L. Vynar, was significantly revitalised by the large-scale commemoration – organised by the Ukrainian community abroad – of the centennial and the 110th anniversary of this, the oldest Ukrainian scholarly institution, in 1973 and 1983. It is self-evident that in many of the publications produced to mark these events, it was impossible to bypass the figure who had created the «golden age» in the history of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Accordingly, the prominent role of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the development of the Shevchenko Scientific Society was mentioned, to a greater or lesser extent, by the authors of virtually all jubilee essays (Drazhevskaya, 1974). In this context, it was invariably emphasised that «the Hrushevsky period was truly the golden age in the history of the Shevchenko Scientific Society» (Lentsyk, 1984a: 2). Vasyl Veryha, for example, stressed: «Favourable political circumstances enabled Hrushevsky to demonstrate his exceptional talent as a scholar and organiser, which in turn provoked a beneficial response for the development of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and for the spread of national consciousness among broader circles of the Ukrainian people» (Veryha, 1977: 32). Alongside such generally accepted evaluations, there also appeared genuinely innovative observations that deepened understanding of Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational work within the Shevchenko Scientific Society. For instance, L. Vynar – owing to objective circumstances and having access to a rather limited source base – reasonably suggested that the

Society headed by the Lviv professor constituted one of the institutional foundations of the Lviv school of Ukrainian studies scholars (Vynar, 1974: 2–3).

One of the least familiar aspects of the «Hrushevsky and the Shevchenko Scientific Society» issue received special scholarly treatment. This concerns the conflict within the Society – destructive in its consequences – which led to Mykhailo Hrushevsky's departure from the post of head of the institution and inflicted significant reputational damage upon the Ukrainian scholarly movement. In a separate study, an attempt to clarify this complex problem was undertaken by L. Vynar (Vynar, 1984). Drawing upon previously unknown documents, he was the first to investigate – based on these materials – the genesis and content of several polemical publications by both opponents and supporters of Hrushevsky that appeared in connection with his presidency of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, as well as with attempts by leading members of the Galician National Democratic Party to remove the historian from his position in the Society (Telvak, 2006–2007). To substantiate his conclusions regarding the brutality of the opponents' actions and their harmfulness to the progress of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Vynar published excerpts from two polemical pamphlets, along with Hrushevsky's letter to Yevhen Chykalenko dated 23 August 1913, in which he clearly articulated his attitude both toward the events of 29 June and toward the internal affairs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Moreover, for the first time Vynar reprinted an exceptionally rare publication of the Kyiv members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society – On the Question of Amending the Statute of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv (Kyiv, 1913) – which reflects the views of the Dni-pro-region members of the Society regarding the statutory amendments introduced to their disadvantage, and also clarifies the attitude of Kyiv scholars toward Hrushevsky's resignation from the presidency of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. «These materials,» Vynar emphasised, «are exceptionally important for studying the true history of the Shevchenko Scientific Society during the period of Hrushevsky's activity in Galicia, as well as for understanding the moral atmosphere in Lviv on the eve of and during the annual assemblies of this meritorious Society.»

Another important aspect of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational work during the Lviv period also attracted considerable discussion in the two decades under review. This concerns the phenomenon of the Lviv school of Ukrainian studies scholars, which played a decisive role in the professionalisation of national historical scholarship. At the same time, whereas historians originating from

the Dni-pro-region largely limited themselves to noting «Hrushevsky's great заслуга in creating a historical 'school' in Lviv,» Western Ukrainian émigré historians sought to approach this problem in a more nuanced manner. Particular attention to the phenomenon of the Lviv school was devoted by Mykola Chubatyi, one of Hrushevsky's younger-generation students. It was he who made the first successful attempt to define the personal composition of the school, and who advanced the subsequently widespread claim concerning conceptual divergences between the teacher and most of his pupils. Concerning this latter issue, Chubatyi observed: «The students of Mykhailo Hrushevsky adopted from their teacher a solid methodology of historical research; all without exception accepted his historical scheme of dividing *Eastern Slavia* into three parts; however, they did not accept the master's thesis that the people are the chief driving force in the history of Ukraine. They [...] adopted the principle that the creation of a state is, in fact, the culmination of the full life of a people as a nation» (Chubatyi, 1971: 18).

The phenomenon of the Lviv school was also addressed by Mykhailo Hrushevsky's ideological opponent, O. Pritsak. He advanced an original historiographical idea: that the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'* was not the creator of his own school, but rather the continuer of a multi-generational scholarly Kyiv documentary tradition associated with Maksymovych and Antonovych. Explaining his historiographical logic, the prominent Orientalist noted: «He [M. Hrushevsky], based on the 'bricks' laid by Maksymovych, Antonovych, and members of their school, created the first modern scholarly scheme of the Ukrainian historical process and demonstrated remarkable talent and inexhaustible energy, subordinating all work – both his own and that of his students – to one central task of the school: to fill the created scheme with content. [...] Yet for all that, Mykhailo Hrushevsky could not have been the creator of the documentary school, because it had been in the process of formation even before his birth» (Pritsak, 1973: 101–102). Developing this line of reasoning, O. Pritsak and the Ukrainian studies centre he headed at Harvard regarded themselves as the continuation of the aforementioned scholarly tradition. «Thus,» the researcher concluded, «the Harvard school and Hrushevsky's school are not contradictory entities – they are the same!» (Pritsak, 1973: 106). It should be noted that these claims were subjected to thorough and well-argued criticism by O. Dombrovskyi (Dombrovskyi, 1974). We may also add that Pritsak evidently conflates the concepts of «school» and «trend» in historiography, and does so incorrectly (Telvak, 2010; Telvak & Pedych, 2016).

In addition to these points, the historiographer briefly turned to the problem of the school's personal dimension, indicating that Hrushevsky's students should be divided – according to territorial and generational criteria – into an older Lviv cohort (S. Tomashivskiy, M. Korduba, B. Barvinskyi, V. Harasymchuk, I. Dzhydzhora, and I. Krypiakevych) and a younger Kyiv cohort (M. Tkachenko, V. Yurkhevych, S. Hlushko, M. Karachkivskiy, K. Hrushevskaya, and S. Shamrai).

During the period under review, the problem of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's relations with his Galician students acquired a deeper and more nuanced interpretation owing to the introduction of new source material. First and foremost, one should mention M. Antonovych's publication of the originals and translations of S. Tomashivskiy's testimony before the military field court in the city of Lviv, which revealed the depth and the unseemly character of the misunderstandings between the founder of the Lviv school and his eminent disciple. Based on materials published from Viennese archives, the researcher arrived at the following conclusion: «The testimony of Dr S. Tomashivskiy is a sad document of its time and an involuntary confirmation of the correctness of the positions advanced by M. Hrushevsky in his book *Our Politics* (Lviv, 1911). Several times S. Tomashivskiy refers to M. Hrushevsky as 'the accused,' yet, contrary to the laws of ethics and morality, he accuses him of various 'crimes.' Because S. Tomashivskiy owed a great deal to M. Hrushevsky from his student years and that at first he had been his ardent supporter, these accusations acquire an even darker hue» (Antonovych, 1972: 93).

Such assessments, unfavourable to S. Tomashivskiy, prompted a response from Yurii Herych. The scholar offered his own interpretation of the published documents, disputing his colleague's conclusions: «He [S. Tomashivskiy] may have been wrong on one issue or another, may have erred in his assessment of Hrushevsky as a person, may have succumbed to passing moods [...], but to claim that he – mayor of a central Ukrainian institution, a Ukrainian patriot – would make 'denunciations' against someone whom only a few years earlier he had hailed as his teacher and leader is sheer nonsense; it is an invective that, by an unfortunate coincidence, found its way into 'memoirs' and from there acquired historical force» (Herych, 1972: 71). This debate was joined by the editor-in-chief of *The Ukrainian Historian*, who, presenting his own reasoned perspective, supported M. Antonovych's observations (Vynar, 1972).

An attempt to summarise the problem of Hrushevsky's pupils' attitudes toward their teacher was made by Vasyl Lentsyk. He rightly noted that the per-

sonalities of representatives of the Lviv school bore «the imprint of Hrushevsky's great individuality» (Lentsyk, 1984: 123). Having generalised the published testimonies of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'*'s disciples about their mentor, the historiographer recorded the unwavering respect of the emerging historians toward their maestro. The researcher observed: «Many of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's students became well-known scholars of Ukrainian historiography; however, all of them do not forget that they emerged from Hrushevsky's renowned school and, with great reverence, recall their teacher in their assessments» (Lentsyk, 1984: 123). It should be noted that a persuasive confirmation of Lentsyk's conclusions was provided by the publication in *The Ukrainian Historian* of Mykola Chubatyi's memoirs of his student years, as well as the translation of Myron Korduba's Polish-language memorial Hrushevsky studies essay.

In general, summarizing the diaspora discourse on Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly practices, we fully concur with the assessment offered by contemporary researchers of the Lviv historical school: «Summarizing our review of the diaspora period, we may conclude that in Hrushevsky studies of the 1940s–1980s the problem of articulating in historiography the phenomenon of Hrushevsky's Lviv school was, for the first time, posed as an independent issue, although it did not receive a detailed monographic interpretation. The study of various aspects of the formation and functioning of Hrushevsky's scholarly school in Galicia acquired greater systematic character and organization with the emergence of a new Ukrainian studies discipline – Hrushevsky studies – as well as with the establishment in the United States of the Ukrainian Historical Society and its printed organ, the journal *The Ukrainian Historian*» (Telvak & Pedych, 2015: 94).

Alongside the Galician period, a number of aspects of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational activity during the final Soviet period of his life were also examined at a serious research level. In this context, particular innovativeness characterised Arkadii Zhukovskiy's study of one of the scholar's most successful academic projects – the journal *Ukraina*. Making this issue relevant, the historiographer rightly noted that *Ukraina* is associated with the final stage of the historian's creative work: it was here that his last studies appeared, including articles from various fields of Ukrainian studies. It was also his final editorial endeavour, as well as his final undertaking as an organiser of Ukrainian scholarship.

For A. Zhukovskiy, the most important task was to determine the place of the journal within Ukrainian humanities scholarship of that period. Accordingly, he focused in detail on the journal's editorial policy,

its circle of contributors, the historiographical issues it addressed, and related matters. The historiographer also comprehensively examined questions connected with the repressions directed against *Ukraina*, which the communist authorities branded a «nationalist bourgeois organ.» Based on a wide range of testimonies, Zhukovskiy convincingly demonstrated that, among all Academy publications, *Ukraina* became the most dangerous opponent – both because of the figure of its editor and, to a significant extent, because of its content, which exposed the imperialist and anti-Ukrainian policies of both tsarist and communist Russia. Therefore, in 1929, party ideologues were tasked with crushing Mykhailo Hrushevsky and his *Ukraina*. In conclusion, Zhukovskiy emphasised that «from the standpoint of sovereignty and the complete independence of Ukrainian culture from Russia, and its orientation toward Europe, this journal resonated with the broader national process of the 1920s. To a certain extent, it was not only a scholarly journal of Ukrainian studies, but also fulfilled a general national and even political role» (Zhukovskiy, 1986: 19).

Finally, it should be noted that a deeper public understanding of the distinctive features of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational work was greatly facilitated by the intensive archaeological activity of historians abroad, most of whom were members of the Ukrainian Historical Society. It was on the pages of the Society's official periodical and in the appendices to Hrushevsky-studies publications that several important programmatic articles by the eminent scholar were published, addressing various aspects of the development of Ukrainian scholarship. By way of example, one may mention such seminal works as «Three Academies,» «The Development of Ukrainian Studies in the Nineteenth Century and the Manifestation within Them of the Fundamental Questions of Ukrainian Studies,» as well as his report delivered at the first meeting of the Ukrainian

Scientific Society on 29 April 1907, and many others. A significant characteristic of this archaeological work was the presence of substantial accompanying materials, which outlined the context in which Hrushevsky's texts emerged, explained the innovative nature of his observations, and clarified the specific features of their historiographical reception, among other matters.

**Conclusions.** A distinctive feature of the historiographical discourse of diaspora Ukrainian studies – focused on a broad range of issues concerning Mykhailo Hrushevsky's scholarly and organisational activity – was its progressive specialisation. This tendency manifested itself in the rapid expansion of the range of topics brought into scholarly circulation regarding the author of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* as a scientific manager, made possible by new source discoveries and the application of Western methodological approaches. In this way, innovative historiographical studies emerged, some of which to this day have not only retained their scholarly significance but also have not been reinterpreted within contemporary social sciences and the humanities (for example, research on the period of Hrushevsky's presidency of the Shevchenko Scientific Society). At the same time, the inability – due to objective circumstances – to conduct in-depth work in archives on the mainland resulted in the thematic and problem-oriented fragmentation of diaspora Hrushevsky studies. Thus, during the 1960s–1980s, no comprehensive study appeared addressing the issues of Hrushevsky's organisation of scholarly work within the framework of the Ukrainian Scientific Society or the Ukrainian Sociological Institute. In turn, this made it impossible to offer a panoramic analysis of the eminent scholar's scholarly-organisational legacy. Nevertheless, it was precisely the historiographical work of diaspora intellectuals that provided the impetus for the rapid development of modern, Ukraine-based Hrushevsky studies.

#### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Андрусак Ник. Рец. на: Любомир Винар, Михайло Грушевський і Наукове Товариство ім. Тараса Шевченка 1892–1930. *Український історик*. 1971. № 1–2. С. 121–122.
2. Антонович М. Зізнання Степана Томашівського: коментарі і переклад. *Український історик*. 1972. № 1–2. С. 91–99.
3. Атаманенко А. Українське історичне товариство: ідеї, постаті, діяльність. Острого: Вид-во Національного університету «Острозька академія», 2010. 672 с.
4. Верига В. Наукове Товариство ім. Шевченка в добу Грушевського (3 нагоди 40-річчя смерті Михайла Грушевського). *Ювілейний збірник наукових праць з нагоди 125-ліття НТШ і 50-ліття НТШ у Канаді*. Торонто: Наукове Товариство ім. Шевченка в Канаді, 1977. С. 15–32.
5. Винар Л. Михайло Грушевський і Наукове товариство ім. Шевченка, 1892–1930. Мюнхен: Дніпрова хвиля, 1970. 111 с.
6. Винар Л. Замітки до статті Ю. Герича "До біографії М. Грушевського". *Український історик*. 1972. № 1–2. С. 85–90.
7. Винар Л. Історична школа Михайла Грушевського і НТШ. *Свобода*. 1974. № 7. С. 2–3.
8. Винар Л. Михайло Грушевський і загальні збори НТШ у 1913 році. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1–4. С. 64–81.
9. Герич Ю. До біографії М. Грушевського (Деяко про конфлікт в НТШ і про "донос", якого не було). *Український історик*. 1972. № 1–2. С. 66–84.
10. Домбровський О. Важливий вклад до дослідів над історією української науки. *Свобода*. 1971. № 90. С. 4.
11. Домбровський О. До питання української історичної школи в діаспорі. *Український історик*. 1974. № 4. С. 74–84.

12. Дражевська Л. УВАН у ЗСА у 100-річчя НТШ. *Свобода*. 1974. № 1. С. 2.
13. Жуковський А. Михайло Грушевський і журнал «Україна». *Український історик*. 1986. № 1-2. С. 5–20.
14. Ленчик В. Михайло Грушевський в оцінці своїх студентів. *Український історик*. 1984. № 1–4. С. 123–131.
15. Ленчик В. НТШ – некоронована Академія наук українського народу. *Свобода*. 1984а. № 108. С. 2, 6.
16. Прицак О. Чому катедри українознавства в Гарварді? Кембридж, Масс.: Фонд Катедр Українознавства, 1973). 188 с.
17. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
18. Тельвак В. Грушевськіана на сторінках «Українського історичного журналу» (1991–2010 рр.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2012. Вип. 22. С. 483–498.
19. Тельвак В. Монографічна грушевськіана: спроба узагальнення. *Гуржійські історичні читання: Збірник наукових праць*. 2013. Вип. 6. С. 104–107.
20. Тельвак В. Грушевськіана Руслана Пирога. *Архіви України*. 2011. Вип. 2–3 (273), квітень-червень С. 290–298.
21. Тельвак В. Історико-теоретичні дослідження в грушевськознавстві (90-ті рр. ХХ ст.). *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: наукові записки ДДПУ*. 2000а. Вип. 5. С. 163–174.
22. Тельвак В. Перший том "Історії України-Руси" М.Грушевського (до проблеми еволюції історико-теоретичних поглядів). *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка: збірник наукових праць*. 2000б. Вип. 3. С. 252–256.
23. Тельвак В. Перший том "Історії України-Руси" Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2007. Вип. 17. С. 16–38.
24. Тельвак В. & Педич В. Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського: діаспорний дискурс. *Наукові записки Національного університету "Острозька академія". Серія "Історичні науки"*. 2015. № 23. С. 94–102.
25. Тельвак В. & Педич В. Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського. Львів: Світ, 2016. 484 с.
26. Тельвак В. & Сабінський М. «Бої за Грушевського»: доба Української революції в дискусіях діаспорних інтелектуалів повного двадцятиліття. *Eminak*. 2022. № 1 (37). С. 100–109.
27. Тельвак В. Вивчення історико-теоретичної спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (1939–1990 рр.). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. 2000. № 35–36. С. 354–366.
28. Тельвак В. *Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець ХІХ – початок ХХ століття)*. Дрогобич: "Вимір", 2002. 234 с.
29. Тельвак В. Проблема «Франко-Грушевський» в українській історіографії. *Український історик*. 2006–2007. № 4 / 1–2. С. 183–199.
30. Тельвак В. Рец. на: Любомир Винар. Михайло Грушевський і Наукове товариство ім. Шевченка: 1892–1934. *Український історик*. 2006–2007а. № 4 / 1–2. С. 372–376.
31. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець ХІХ – 30-ті роки ХХ століття). Київ–Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.
32. Тельвак В. Грушевськознавство: методологічні проблеми поступу. *Красзнавство*. 2010. № 3. С. 29–35.
33. Чубатий М. *Українська історична наука (її розвиток та досягнення)*. Філадельфія: «Америка», 1971. 35 с.

## REFERENCES

1. Andrusiak, Nyk. (1971). Rets. na: Liubomyr Vynar, Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i Naukove Tovarystvo im. Tarasa Shevchenka 1892–1930 [Lyubomyr Vynar, Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and Scientific Society named after Taras Shevchenko 1892–1930]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–2. 121–122. [in Ukrainian].
2. Antonovych, M. (1972). Ziznannia Stepana Tomashivskoho: komentari i pereklad [Stepan Tomashivsky's confession: Comments and Translation]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–2. 91–99. [in Ukrainian].
3. Atamanenko, A. (2010). *Ukrainske istorychne tovarystvo: idei, postati, dialnist [Ukrainian Historical Association: ideas, individuals, activities (1965–1991)]*. Ostroh: Vyd-vo Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademii». [in Ukrainian].
4. Veryha, V. (1977). Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka v dobi Hrushevskoho (Z nahody 40-richchia smerty Mykhaila Hrushevskoho) [Scientific Society. Shevchenko in Hrushevsky's day (on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Mikhail Hrushevsky's death)]. *Yuvileinyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats z nahody 125-littia NTSh i 50-littia NTSh u Kanadi*. Toronto: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka v Kanadi. 15–32. [in Ukrainian].
5. Vynar, L. (1970). *Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1892–1930 [Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Scientific Society. Shevchenko, 1892–1930]*. Miunkhen : Dniprova khvyliya. [in Ukrainian].
6. Vynar, L. (1972). Zamitky do statii Yu. Herycha "Do biohrafii M. Hrushevskoho" [Notes to Yu. Gerych's article "To the biography of M. Hrushevskiy"]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–2. 85–90. [in Ukrainian].
7. Vynar, L. (1974). Istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho i NTSh [Historical School of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and National Academy of Sciences]. *Svoboda*. 7. 2–3. [in Ukrainian].
8. Vynar, L. (1984). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i zahalni zbory NTSh u 1913 rotsi [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and the general assembly of the National Academy of Sciences in 1913]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–4. 64–81. [in Ukrainian].
9. Gerych, Yu. (1972). Do biohrafii M. Hrushevskoho (Deshcho pro konflikt v NTSh i pro "donos", yakoho ne bulo) [To the biography of M. Hrushevskiy (Something about the conflict in the NTSh and the "denunciation", which did not happen)]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–2. 66–84. [in Ukrainian].
10. Dombrovskiy, O. (1971). Vazhlyvyi vklad do doslidiv nad istoriieiu ukrainskoi nauky [An important contribution to research on the history of Ukrainian science]. *Svoboda*. 90. 4. [in Ukrainian].
11. Dombrovskiy, O. (1974). Do pytannia ukrainskoi istorychnoi shkoly v diiaspori [On the question of the Ukrainian historical school in the diaspora]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 4. 74–84. [in Ukrainian].
12. Drazhevska, L. (1974). UVAN u ZSA u 100-richchia NTSh [UVAN in the USA on the 100th anniversary of the NTSH]. *Svoboda*. 1 2. [in Ukrainian].

13. Zhukovskiy, A. (1986). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i zhurnal «Ukraina» [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and the magazine "Ukraine"]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–2. 5–20. [in Ukrainian].
14. Lentsyk, V. (1984). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy v otsyntsi svoikh studentiv [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in the assessment of his students]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 1–4. 123–131. [in Ukrainian].
15. Lentsyk, V. (1984a). NTSh – nekoronovana Akademiia nauk ukrainskoho narodu [National Academy of Sciences is the uncrowned Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian People]. *Svoboda*. 108. 2, 6. [in Ukrainian].
16. Pritsak, O. (1973). *Chomu katedry ukrainoznavstva v Harvardi? [Why departments of Ukrainian studies at Harvard?]*. Kembrydzh, Mass.: Fond Katedr Ukrainoznavstva. [in Ukrainian].
17. Telvak, V.V., Telvak, V.P. (2021). Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy. [Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 5. 4–16. [in Ukrainian].
18. Telvak, V. (2012). Hrushevskiana na storinkakh «Ukrainskoho istorychnoho zhurnalu» (1991–2010 rr.). [Hrushevskiana on the pages of the "Ukrainian Historical Journal" (1991–2010)]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini*. 22. 483–498. [in Ukrainian].
19. Telvak, V. (2013). Monografichna hrushevskiana: sproba uzahalnennia. [Monographic Hrushevskiana: an attempt at generalization]. *Hurzhiivski istorychni chytannia: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. 6 104–107. [in Ukrainian].
20. Telvak, V. (2011). Hrushevskiana Ruslana Pyroha [Hrushevskiana of Ruslan Pyrig]. *Arkhivy Ukrainy*. 2–3 (273), kviten-cherven 290–298. [in Ukrainian].
21. Telvak, V. (2000a). Istoryko-teoretychni doslidzhennia v hrushevskoznavstvi (90-ti rr. XX st.) [Historical and theoretical research in Hrushevsky studies (90s of the 20th century)]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk : naukovy zapysky DDPU*. 5. 163–174. [in Ukrainian].
22. Telvak, V. (2000b). Pershyi tom "Istorii Ukrainy-Rusy" M.Hrushevskoho (do problemy evoliutsii istoryko-teoretychnykh pohliadiv) [The first volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" by M. Hrushevsky (on the problem of the evolution of historical and theoretical views)]. *Naukovi zoshyty istorychnoho fakultetu Lvivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka : zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. 3. 252–256. [in Ukrainian].
23. Telvak, V. (2007). Pershyi tom "Istorii Ukrainy-Rusy" Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv [The first volume of "History of Ukraine-Rus" by Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the assessments of contemporaries]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini*. 17. 16–38. [in Ukrainian].
24. Telvak, V., Pedych, V. (2015). Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho: diaspornyi diskurs [Mikhail Hrushevsky, Lviv History School: Diaspora Discourse]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Ostrozka akademiia". Seriia "Istorychni nauky"*. 23. 94–102. [in Ukrainian].
25. Telvak, V., Pedych, V. (2016). *Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky]*. Lviv: Svit. [in Ukrainian].
26. Telvak, V., Sabinskyi M. (2022). «Boi za Hrushevskoho»: doba Ukrainskoi revoliutsii v diskusiiakh diaspornykh intelektualiv povoiennoho dvadtsiatylittia [«A Fight for Hrushevsky»: the era of the Ukrainian revolution in the discussions of diaspora intellectuals of the postwar years of XX century]. *Eminak*. 1 (37). 100–109. [in Ukrainian].
27. Telvak, V. (2000). Vychennia istoryko-teoretychnoi spadshchyny Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v istoriografii ukrainskoi diaspori (1939–1990 rr.) [Study of the historical and theoretical heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora (1939–1990)]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia istorychna*. 35–36. 354–366. [in Ukrainian].
28. Telvak, V. (2002). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorychnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia) [Theoretical and methodological bases of historical views of Mykhailo Hrushevsky (end of the XIX – beginning of the XX century)]*. Drohobych: "Vymir". [in Ukrainian].
29. Telvak, V. (2006–2007). Problema «Franko-Hrushevskiy» v ukrainskii istoriografii [The "Franko-Hrushevsky" problem in Ukrainian historiography]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 4 / –2. 183–199. [in Ukrainian].
30. Telvak, V. (2006–2007a). Retsenzii: Liubomyr Vynar. Mykhailo Hrushevskiy i Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka: 1892–1934 [Review: Lubomyr Vynar. Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and the Scientific Society named after Shevchenko: 1892–1934]. *Ukrainskyi istoryk*. 4 / 1–2. 372–376. [in Ukrainian].
31. Telvak, V. (2008). *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]*. Kyiv-Drohobych. [in Ukrainian].
32. Telvak, V. (2010). Hrushevskoznavstvo: metodolohichni problemy postupu [Hrushevsky studies: methodological problems of progress]. *Kraieznavstvo*. 3. 29–35. [in Ukrainian].
33. Chubatyi, M. (1971). *Ukrainska istorychna nauka (ii rozvytok ta dosiahnennia) [Ukrainian historical science (its development and achievements)]*. Filadelfia: «Ameryka». [in Ukrainian].

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 19.01.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 20.02.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 27.03.2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

