

UDC 94(477)(092)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/95-3-3>

Viktorija TELVAK,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X

PhD in History,

*Associate Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com*

Konstantyn KURYLYSHYN,

orcid.org/0000-0003-0104-7292

PhD (History),

*Head of the Department of Ukrainian Studies
Vasyl Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv
(Lviv, Ukraine) kurylyshyn_k@ukr.net*

Vitalii TELVAK,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X

PhD hab. (History),

*Professor at the Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Lviv region, Ukraine) telvak1@yahoo.com*

IMAGES OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY IN THE PAGES OF THE JOURNAL "DILO" (1914–1930S)

The purpose of this study is to examine the multifaceted issue of how the journal Dilo portrayed the life and activities of M. Hrushevsky during the years 1914–1939. The methodological foundation of the study is based on an interdisciplinary approach. Special emphasis is placed on structural-functional system analysis of historiographical facts and the comparative-historical method, grounded in the principles of objectivity and historicism. The research also employs methods of periodization, classification, and typologization. The scientific novelty of this study lies in comprehensive historiographical analysis of publications published in the journal Dilo between 1914 and 1939, which were devoted to M. Hrushevsky. Conclusions. Despite M. Hrushevsky's departure from Galicia in 1914, Dilo consistently informed readers about his life and activities. Moreover, Dilo – often at the risk of censorship and political repercussions – initiated several public campaigns in defense of Hrushevsky. It was also consistently supported the historian's initiatives, striving to convey to readers the reasoning behind even his most controversial decisions. In appreciation of such understanding, Hrushevsky chose the Galician newspaper as his primary platform for communication with Ukrainians both west of the Zbruch and in the emigrant communities abroad. Consequently, a large share of his publications in the interwar daily press appeared precisely in Dilo. Most importantly, Dilo's contributors made a monumental contribution to the posthumous memorialization of Hrushevsky's legacy and to the comprehensive interpretation of his intellectual heritage. Their work resulted in a substantial anthology of memorial Hrushevskiana, which laid the foundation for systematic historiographical research. Although these processes were brutally halted following the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine, the experience and analytical frameworks developed by Dilo's authors proved invaluable to Ukrainian émigré scholars, who in the postwar years went on to establish the field of academic Hrushevsky studies abroad.

Key words: *M. Hrushevsky, "Dilo", editorial policy, cooperation, reception.*

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X

кандидат історичних наук,

доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com**Костянтин КУРИЛИШИН,**

orcid.org/0000-0003-0104-7292

кандидат історичних наук,

завідувач відділу україніки

Львівська національна наукова бібліотека України імені Василя Стефаника
(Львів, Україна) kurylyshyn_k@ukr.net**Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК,**

orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X

доктор історичних наук,

професор кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна) telvak1@yahoo.com

ОБРАЗИ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО НА СТОРІНКАХ ЧАСОПISУ «ДІЛО» (1914–1930-І РР.)

Метою дослідження є з'ясування особливостей висвітлення життєдіяльності М. Грушевського протягом 1914–1939 рр. на сторінках «Діла» Методологічне підґрунтя роботи становить міждисциплінарний підхід. Особливий акцент зроблено на структурно-функціональному системному аналізі історіографічних фактів і порівняльно-історичному методі, виходячи з принципів об'єктивності та історизму. У дослідженні було також використано методи періодизації, класифікації і типологізації. Наукова новизна статті полягає в спробі цілісного історіографічного аналізу публікацій на сторінках часопису «Діло» 1914–1939 рр., присвячених М. Грушевському. Висновки. Попри виїзд М. Грушевського з Галичини в 1914 р., «Діло» регулярно інформувало читача про його життя та діяльність. Незважаючи на ризики переслідувань з боку цензури, часопис постійно ініціював успішні публічні акції на захист історика. Також «Діло» послідовно підтримувало ініціативи М. Грушевського, показуючи читачеві рацію його нерідко контрверсійних вчинків. З вдячністю відвзаємнюючи таке емпатійне ставлення, вчений обрав саме галицьку газету трибуною оперативної комунікації з еміграційною й забручанською громадами. З огляду на це саме на «Діло» припадає значна частина публікацій історика в щоденній пресі міжвоєнного двадцятиліття. Та найбільш суттєвим був внесок співробітників газети в помертну меморіалізацію особи М. Грушевського й всебічне вивчення його доробку. У підсумку постала солідна антологія меморіальної грушевськіани, яка дала поштовх систематичному історіографічному осмисленню. Попри різке зортання цих процесів після окупації радянськими військами Західної України, набутий дописувачами «Діла» досвід інтерпретації феномену Великого Українця став корисним для діаспорних інтелектуалів, які у повоєнні часи започаткували грушевськознавчі студії.

Ключові слова: М. Грушевський, газета «Діло», редакційна політика, співпраця, рецепція.

Relevance of the research topic. As has been repeatedly noted in the scholarly literature, the media portrayals of Mykhailo Hrushevsky and his collaboration with periodicals are important yet still inadequately evaluated aspects of his intellectual biography (Тельвак, 2000а; Тельвак, 2000b). It is in the press that the most dynamic images of the Great Ukrainian's diverse work were presented from various ideological perspectives. These representations often contained little-known or even entirely unfamiliar details of a biographical, historiographical, or reception-related nature. At the same time, as demonstrated in our previous study published in Manuscript and Book Heritage

of Ukraine in 2022 (Тельвак, Курилишин, Тельвак, 2022), the editorial board of Dilo – the most distinguished journal in the Ukrainian press movement – showed particularly sustained and keen interest in the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'*. From his very first creative attempts as a Tiflis high school student and until the newspaper's closure in September 1939, Dilo consistently followed the life and work of one of the leading figures of the Ukrainian national movement. After his death, through numerous commemorative publications, the paper helped to initiate the formation of academic Hrushevsky studies. In light of this, the following section continues our earlier

exploration of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's collaboration with *Dilo* and the reception of his diverse activities by the journal's authors during the years 1914–1939, within the broader context of the historian's intellectual biography during the final two decades of his life.

Analysis of research and publications. The issues surrounding Mykhailo Hrushevsky's multifaceted collaboration with *Dilo*, as well as the ways in which the journal's authors discussed his creative ideas and public initiatives, have often attracted the attention of historians and media scholars (Тельвак, 2011; Тельвак, 2012; Тельвак, 2013; Тельвак, 2021). However, the studies by Svitlana Pankova (Панькова, 2005), Kostiantyn Kurylyshyn, and Vitalii and Viktoriia Telvaks (Тельвак, Курилишин, Тельвак, 2022), among others, have mainly focused on the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when the Ukrainian professor of Lviv University, through *Dilo*, established an active dialogue with the Galician community. As for the later periods of the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'*, we have only reception-oriented studies (Тельвак, 2008: 158–405). Thus, there is currently no comprehensive analysis of the «Hrushevsky and *Dilo*» problem within the context of his intellectual biography during the years of the war, his leadership of the Central Rada, the period of emigration, and the final decade of his life. This gap determines the relevance of our present research.

Purpose of the research. The purpose of this study is to examine the multifaceted issue of how the journal *Dilo* portrayed the life and activities of Mykhailo Hrushevsky during the years 1914–1939.

Presenting of the main material. As is well known, on the eve of the Great War, relations between Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the editorial board of *Dilo* noticeably cooled. This was largely due to his criticism of the policies of the leaders of the National Democratic Party in the early 20th century – criticisms that could not go unanswered and duly found their response in the pages of the party organ of the opposition *narodovtsi*. However, the form that this response took – a series of anonymous satirical attacks authored by Stepan Tomashivsky – proved ethically unacceptable to the Lviv professor. As a result, Hrushevsky completely ceased his collaboration with the newspaper. During the final prewar years, the *Dilo* editorial office continued to monitor the scholar's public initiatives, yet did so purely in an informational manner, without the earlier tone of sympathy toward his active and influential persona.

The outbreak of the First World War rendered past political disputes irrelevant, as an existential threat now loomed over the entire Ukrainian nation. Consequently, the editorial board of *Dilo* reported with

great concern on the difficult circumstances surrounding Mykhailo Hrushevsky's return to Kyiv with his family and his prompt arrest by the gendarmerie – an event that left no doubt about its careful premeditation. Gathering fragments of information from both open and internal sources, the newspaper promptly informed its readers about the details of the historian's arrest and the course of his trial. One *Dilo* contributor aptly summarized the reasons for the imprisonment of one of the leading Ukrainian figures: «The 'crimes' attributed to the distinguished historian are that he wrote history in a Ukrainian, anti-Russian spirit and that he supposedly organized Ukrainian riflemen!» (Проф. Грушевський під воєнним судом, 1915: 7). Thus, the exile of the Ukrainian scholar to the depths of Russia came as no surprise to the readers of the newspaper.

Dilo portrayed the persecution of Mykhailo Hrushevsky within the broader context of the large-scale repressions launched by the Tsarist regime during the war against the Ukrainian national movement and its leaders. The high regard in which the scholar was held by *Dilo*'s contributors is evident from the telling fact that the newspaper often reported on the exile of Hrushevsky and that of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky as parallel tragedies – events of equal magnitude for the Ukrainian nation of the time. At the same time, the exchange of information, complicated by the realities of the front line, often led to the construction of inaccurate reports based on rumors. For instance, the newspaper once announced that the Ukrainian scholar had been sent into exile in Tomsk – a claim that had been unsuccessfully propagated by the pro-monarchist Kyiv press.

Subsequently, *Dilo* continued to keep its readers informed about Mykhailo Hrushevsky's difficult living conditions in exile, relying on information from his relatives and close associates in Galicia with whom he maintained correspondence during that challenging period. A certain note of optimism appeared in reports about the easing of the historian's exile conditions and his eventual permission to relocate to Kazan and later to Moscow, which allowed him to resume at least some scholarly activity. As the newspaper repeatedly informed its readers, these improvements became possible thanks to organized appeals in defense of Hrushevsky by liberal-minded Russian intellectuals and by Western public figures. While the involvement of Russian humanitarians such as Aleksei Shakhmatov, Sergei Platonov, and Aleksandr Lappo-Danilevsky is relatively well known, the protests and gatherings organized by Ukrainian emigrants remain almost completely unexplored by researchers. For instance, *Dilo* reported that on September 18,

1915, Ukrainian immigrants from the territories of the Russian Empire held a large public assembly in New York, where they protested against the imprisonment of Mykhailo Hrushevsky (Організація російських Українців, 1915).

Under the circumstances that imposed severe restrictions on the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'*, Dilo assumed a difficult yet honorable mission – the defense of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's name against the numerous enemies of Ukrainian nationhood. The editorial board focused primarily on countering accusations from the Polish chauvinistic press, which alleged that Hrushevsky had committed treason. This charge – potentially threatening to the historian's property interests in Galicia – was inflated by Polish publicists from an entirely innocuous article he had written for the St. Petersburg newspaper *Rech'* (Грушевський, 1915). In that piece, Hrushevsky argued that Ukrainian leaders, divided by borders, should seek to resolve the political problems of their nation independently, without having any foreign power dictate external orientations to the Ukrainian public. Responding to the claims of Russian chauvinists, the scholar maintained that the Ukrainian movement had never harbored pro-Austrian illusions or sympathies. However, in the wartime conditions of disrupted information channels – when access to Hrushevsky's original text was limited – Polish commentators «edited» his statements to suit their anti-Ukrainian narrative. As a result, his article was widely reprinted in the Galician press in a distorted form (Під приманчиво-сензаційною назвою, 1914).

The editorial board of *Dilo* recognized the full danger of the situation and, through a series of publications, created a powerful informational counterbalance to the media campaign unleashed by the Polish press – a campaign that had grown into a veritable hysteria. The newspaper's authors aptly portrayed these attacks within the broader context of the Polish press's long-standing struggle against Mykhailo Hrushevsky's nation-building and consciousness-raising work, which had always been conducted through crude methods of insinuation and defamation (Telvak, Yanyshyn, Telvak, 2023). Thus, as *Dilo* emphasized, this latest assault on the scholar's good name only confirmed his growing authority among his compatriots – and, consequently, the increased sense of threat he posed to the enemies of the Ukrainian cause.

This time, however, as *Dilo*'s contributors emphasized, the Polish press revealed the depth of its moral decline, deliberately manipulating secondhand information while fully aware that Mykhailo Hrushevsky was unable to defend himself or even issue a response. Moreover, despite knowing well their

opponent's genuine political convictions, Polish publicists grotesquely caricatured him as a supporter of Russophilism (В якій цілі?, 1914). In doing so, they clearly counted on provoking a repressive reaction from the authorities – who, after the Russian occupation of Galicia, were notorious for their relentless persecution. Accordingly, *Dilo* quite rightly described the Polish press campaign against the Tsarist prisoner as «slanderous». As it turned out, the Polish journalists' calculation proved accurate: the Austrian military field court initiated criminal proceedings against Hrushevsky on charges of state treason. However, thanks to *Dilo*'s vigorous public information campaign – skillfully utilized by the military lawyer Pylyp Ewyn – the Ukrainian scholar was ultimately acquitted.

Alongside its efforts to counter the attacks of the Polish tabloid press, *Dilo* also joined in defending Mykhailo Hrushevsky's name against the insinuations of Russian monarchist circles. The newspaper was among the first to draw public attention to the seemingly paradoxical situation in which the governments of two warring empires simultaneously accused the Ukrainian scholar of treason – each claiming he had betrayed them in favor of the other. The central argument advanced by Russian publicists – first voiced by Hrushevsky's former Kyiv University colleague, Yulian Kulakovsky – was the accusation that the Lviv professor had been involved in the formation of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen legions (Лівобічний, 1928). The editorial team of *Dilo* was well aware that the Tsarist secret police closely monitored the Galician press in search of incriminating material. Therefore, in a series of articles, the paper convincingly demonstrated the groundlessness of Kulakovsky's claims (Голос російського націоналіста, 1915). After thoroughly exposing the logical inconsistency of his accusations, one anonymous contributor concluded: «As is known, Professor Hrushevsky took neither direct nor indirect part in the riflemen's organization and stood completely apart from it.» (Проф. Грушевський під воєнним судом, 1915: 7). Interestingly, the arguments presented in Hrushevsky's own written response to Kulakovsky's charges overlapped significantly with those published in *Dilo*, suggesting that the scholar may have been familiar with the Lviv newspaper's defense of him.

Despite the war-torn routine filled with pressing events, the editorial board of *Dilo* did not overlook the celebration of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's fiftieth anniversary, which was marked separately by Ukrainian communities divided by the front line. What is particularly striking, however, is that this was the only instance when the newspaper, instead of publishing an article by one of its own correspondents, reprinted

an anonymous jubilee sketch from a special issue of the *Visnyk of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine* dedicated to the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'*. This choice is especially surprising given that many of Hrushevsky's students and longtime friends were then active contributors to *Dilo*. One might reasonably assume that the editorial decision can be partly explained by the thematic focus of the reprinted article, whose author concentrated exclusively on Hrushevsky's historiographical and scholarly-organizational work (Ювілей історика України, 1916). Had the editorial staff produced their own tribute, they would have been obliged to present a more comprehensive portrait – one encompassing not only his cultural and academic achievements but also his public and political activities. Doing so would have required them to acknowledge both the dubious methods used by the leaders of the National Democratic Party (NDP) in their struggle against the Tsarist exile and the fact – confirmed by the war itself – that Hrushevsky had been right in condemning their behind-the-scenes deals with the Polish authorities of Galicia at the expense of Ukrainian national interests. At that time, the editors of *Dilo* were evidently not ready for such a frank and self-critical discussion.

Alongside its reports on Mykhailo Hrushevsky's life in exile, *Dilo* also followed his journalistic and publicistic activities during the war years. Continuing the tradition established in earlier periods, the newspaper promptly reprinted the historian's most interesting articles for its Galician readership. Given the difficulties of communication between the warring countries at the time, such reprints were evidently published without Hrushevsky's approval, and the editors therefore included only the most noteworthy excerpts from his writings. One example of this practice was his article «An Independent Poland and the Autonomy of Galicia,» in which Hrushevsky prophetically described the alarming situation of the Ukrainian-populated territories within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy following the Vienna government's declaration of Polish independence over lands previously seized by the Tsarist Empire after the partitions of Poland (Незалежна Польща, 1917).

The editorial board of *Dilo* followed Mykhailo Hrushevsky's career with even greater interest during the years of his political ascendancy. Despite the need to report promptly on the independence movement in the Galician territories, the newspaper's staff did not overlook a single event in revolutionary Kyiv involving the head of the Central Rada. Since *Dilo* had no correspondent stationed in the Dnipro-region capital, its main sources of information were the Ukrainian and Russian Kyiv press. Nevertheless, the Galician

readership was informed with considerable sympathy about Hrushevsky's state-building efforts – mass rallies and assemblies, heated parliamentary debates, bold legislative acts of the new government, striking transformations in public life, and the consistent Ukrainization of all spheres of society. Contributors to the Galician newspaper wrote that these achievements in the national awakening of the Dnipro Ukrainians were soon undermined by Muravyov's Bolshevik forces, who captured the Ukrainian capital and carried out a massacre there. In this context, the young government's appeal to its German allies was presented as an entirely justified step – one that saved the fragile Ukrainian statehood from complete destruction.

The editorial board of *Dilo* followed Mykhailo Hrushevsky's activities with even greater interest during the years of his political ascendancy. Despite the need to promptly report on the independence struggle in the Galician territories, not a single event in revolutionary Kyiv involving the head of the Central Rada escaped the attention of the newspaper's staff.

Since *Dilo* had no correspondent stationed in the Dnipro-region capital, its main sources of information were the Ukrainian and Russian press published in Kyiv. Nevertheless, the Galician readership was kept well informed – and with considerable sympathy – about Hrushevsky's state-building efforts: the mass rallies and assemblies, the heated parliamentary debates, the bold legislative acts of the new government, the striking transformations in public life, and the consistent Ukrainization of all spheres of society. According to *Dilo*'s contributors, these achievements in the national awakening of Dnipro Ukraine were soon undermined by Muravyov's Bolshevik forces, who captured the Ukrainian capital and carried out a massacre there. In this context, the young government's appeal to its German allies was presented as an entirely justified step – one that saved the nascent Ukrainian statehood from destruction.

Lacking concrete information about the growing tensions between the Central Rada and the German command, *Dilo*'s correspondents were shocked by the coup d'état carried out with the support of the former allies. The newspaper reported with deep concern about the seizure of power by the followers of General Pavlo Skoropadsky, viewing it as a grave threat to Ukrainian statehood. In their articles, the contributors emphasized the courage and dignity of the head of the Ukrainian parliament, who, as they noted, was the only person in the chamber who refused to raise his hand when ordered to do so by the commander of a German patrol. Moreover, despite having weapons pointed at him, he firmly demanded that the uninvited guests leave the parliamentary premises (Державний замах,

1918). With great enthusiasm, Dilo also reported on the adoption of the Constitution of the Ukrainian People's Republic at the final session of the Central Rada. However, the newspaper mistakenly stated that the head of the Ukrainian parliament had been elected president of the Ukrainian state (Розвиток подій, 1918). Thus, it was in Dilo that the mythical notion of «Hrushevsky as president» first appeared – a concept that would endure in historiography and journalism throughout the 20th century.

Dilo covered Mykhailo Hrushevsky's underground life during the Hetmanate period only fragmentarily, as the scholar himself understandably avoided publicity at that time. Nevertheless, the newspaper's pages contain unique information – little known not only to the general public but even to researchers of the Ukrainian Revolution. For example, historians have long been aware of the assassination attempt on the head of the Central Rada while he was being transported by the Sich Riflemen to their barracks. The attacker's identity, however, has generally been regarded as unknown. It turns out that the Lviv newspaper Dilo, as early as May 9, 1918, citing a report from the German Oberkommando in Kyiv, informed readers that the attempt on Hrushevsky's life had been made by a former Russian officer of Lemko origin, Mykhailo Hrynyk (Korotkov), a supporter of Galician Russophilism. The newspaper wrote that the assailant had been promptly arrested by the Germans and, while being escorted to trial, was shot dead when he tried to escape (Замах на Грушевського, 1918). Thus, to this day, neither the attacker's motives nor the possible organizers of this crime are definitively known.

During the revolutionary years, the Dilo editorial board reprinted a wide range of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's works more frequently than those of any other author. These included his parliamentary speeches, public addresses, and historical-philosophical reflections, among others. In total, we have identified up to twenty such reprints within a single year. The importance that the editorial staff attributed to these texts is evident from their consistent publication on the newspaper's front page. Through Dilo, Galician readers became acquainted with some of Hrushevsky's most emblematic writings, such as «There Is No Turning Back», «What Kind of Autonomy and Federation Does Ukraine Want?», «The State Emblem of the Ukrainian Republic», and many others. This strong demand for the works of the head of the Central Rada was evidently driven not only by a natural interest in the unfolding events of revolutionary Kyiv but also by the striking similarity of challenges faced by the builders of Ukrainian statehood on the Galician lands.

Dilo did not comment in any way on Mykhailo Hrushevsky's decision to leave the territories occupied by the Bolsheviks. However, the newspaper devoted considerable attention to covering the scholar's émigré life. Among other things, it informed readers about the former head of the Ukrainian parliament's active efforts to find supporters for his civic platform in various European political circles. For instance, Dilo reported on Hrushevsky's meeting with his longtime acquaintance, President of Czechoslovakia Tomáš Masaryk, during which he raised pressing issues concerning the living conditions of Ukrainian emigrants (В обороні емігрантів, 1920).

Interestingly, despite the well-known disagreements between the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* and many circles of the Ukrainian émigré community, Dilo never commented on these conflicts. On the contrary, the newspaper often demonstrated complete solidarity with Hrushevsky's views on numerous issues of national life. For example, when Georges Clemenceau called for surrounding Soviet Russia with barbed wire, the Dilo editorial board supported Hrushevsky's position that «Ukraine cannot assume the honorable mission of building, in the interests of the Western great powers, an anti-Bolshevik barrier» («Кільчастий дріт», 1920).

The greatest sympathy in Dilo's coverage was reserved for reports on Mykhailo Hrushevsky's vigorous efforts to rescue Ukrainians suffering from famine in the territories occupied by the Bolsheviks. The newspaper promptly responded to the scholar's requests to publish his appeals on this matter in its pages (На оден шлях, 1920). Dilo also printed extensive periodic reports prepared by Hrushevsky and his colleagues on the activities of the organization he headed, the Union «To the Hungry of Ukraine». These reports played an important role in keeping donors informed about how their contributions were being used (Справоздання, 1920). The historian's attempts to unite Ukrainians in the free world around the humanitarian cause of saving their compatriots in Soviet-ruled lands were also received positively by the newspaper (Грушевський, 1923). Yet what moved Dilo's contributors the most was the personal sacrifice of the Hrushevsky family itself: despite their chronic financial difficulties, they regularly donated significant sums to aid Hutsul communities devastated by flooding.

Alongside its coverage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's public and political activity, Dilo in the early 1920s returned to informing its Galician readers about his scholarly achievements. This shift was prompted by the historian's own decision to withdraw from active politics and devote himself to academic projects car-

ried out within the framework of the Ukrainian Sociological Institute's research program. As a result, a series of new scholarly works appeared, which were met with keen interest and overwhelmingly positive reviews in the pages of Dilo. While the reviews of the first volumes of *The History of Ukrainian Literature* have attracted the attention of modern Hrushevsky scholars, some critical commentaries on his other articles remain virtually unknown even today. One notable example is an insightful review of Hrushevsky's article «Ukrainian Early Printed Books», published in the Viennese journal *Knyha* (The Book) (A. Ц., 1922). In the early 1920s, Hrushevsky himself also resumed his creative collaboration with Dilo, contributing popular-scientific essays to its pages. Among them was his article on the Sokil movement in Galicia – a work completely unknown to researchers of his oeuvre, as it was omitted from all bibliographies of the historian and from the corresponding section of his *Collected Works* in fifty volumes.

Unlike most Ukrainian periodicals in the free world, the editorial board of Dilo showed considerable understanding toward the rumors about Mykhailo Hrushevsky's desire to return to Bolshevik-occupied Kyiv. When these rumors were later confirmed, Dilo was virtually the only newspaper to fully support the scholar's reasoning for going back to his homeland – to engage in cultural and educational work among his compatriots, taking advantage of the temporary liberalization of the Bolsheviks' national policy (Українське «сменовеховство», 1924). Defending the historian against widespread accusations of «capitulating» to his former enemies, an anonymous Dilo contributor wrote: «[...] The situation now is entirely different. Professor Hrushevsky is going to Great Ukraine as a cultural figure and under completely new circumstances. In Great Ukraine, there is now not only no terrorist struggle against the Ukrainian cultural and national movement, but quite clear attempts on the part of the Soviet government to support that movement – and, of course, to use it for its own purposes. If today we can speak of a capitulation, then it is first and foremost the capitulation of yesterday's enemies of Ukrainianism.» (Національне питання 1923: 1). Appreciating the newspaper's understanding of his difficult decision, Mykhailo Hrushevsky chose Dilo as the media platform through which to inform the Ukrainian public about his motives for returning home and his plans to resume work in Kyiv (Грушевський, 1923).

Given its empathetic attitude toward Mykhailo Hrushevsky's decision to return to Ukraine, Dilo provided its readers with detailed coverage of his final days in emigration. The newspaper portrayed the

Soviet government's election of the historian as a full member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences as a significant conciliatory gesture toward its former ideological opponent – an act that formally established his status as a cultural figure on Soviet territory. Particular attention was devoted to the journey itself, since Hrushevsky's route was expected to pass through the western Ukrainian lands. Thanks to Dilo's mediation, a large public gathering was organized at the railway station in Zdolbuniv, where the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* was warmly welcomed by members of the Galician community. At the same time, disruptions in communication and the lack of direct contact with Hrushevsky occasionally led to the publication of completely inaccurate reports. For instance, Dilo once reconstructed his supposed journey as follows: «M. Hrushevsky traveled to his homeland together with his wife, son-in-law, daughter, and two grandchildren. In Warsaw, he stayed for several days, visited the Soviet embassy, and did not meet with any émigrés.» (Ш-ик., 1924: 1). As we know, the Hrushevsky family had neither a son-in-law nor grandchildren, and their route did not pass through Warsaw at all. This example vividly illustrates the challenges Dilo faced in obtaining reliable information amid the limited and fragmented communication of the time.

Dilo's descriptions of the Hrushevsky family's adaptation to their new circumstances were filled with notable optimism (Михайло Грушевський, 1934). The newspaper informed readers about the favorable treatment the newly elected academician received from the Soviet authorities. It emphasized that, with his characteristic energy and pragmatism, Hrushevsky had set about developing the institutional foundations of Ukrainian social and human sciences. The paper provided detailed accounts of the academician's scholarly activities (Лист, 1924), his speeches at meetings of *Ukrholovnauka* (the Ukrainian Main Scientific Committee) (ВУАН і Радвлада, 1926), his research expeditions to various Dnipro-region centers (Українська Равенна, 1924), and his official trips to the capital city of Kharkiv to resolve financial matters (Проф. Мих. Грушевський, 1924). Dilo also highlighted that the intelligentsia of Soviet Ukraine greeted the arrival of one of its most respected leaders with great enthusiasm. Altogether, this reporting led readers to a clear conclusion: the historian's decision to return home had been justified. The remarkable level of detail in Dilo's portrayal of Hrushevsky's first years in Soviet Ukraine was made possible thanks to numerous Galician correspondents – chiefly Kyrylo Studynsky, Mykhailo Mochulsky, and Myron Korduba – who, with Hrushevsky's own permission, pro-

vided the newspaper with information of particular interest to the Western Ukrainian public.

In Hrushevsky's own understanding, this intensive communication with Ukrainians west of the Zbruch River was meant to serve as a kind of safeguard – deterring the Soviet authorities from attempting to suppress their former ideological opponent. The reasoning was that any violations of promises made by the communists, once publicized, would carry reputational consequences for them. For a time, this strategy indeed worked during the first years after his return. However, Hrushevsky's wide-ranging activities – conducted, as DPU *seksoty* put it, «as though Soviet power in Ukraine did not exist» – could not go unanswered by the party apparatus. Dilo's correspondents, therefore, reported with growing concern on the increasing criticism of the academician's cultural work in the communist press. The first such public attack came from Hryhorii Hrynko at the Seventh Congress of the Kyiv Region Soviets in May 1925 (X., 1925). Later, in early March 1926, Vlas Chubar, head of the Kharkiv Council of People's Commissars, voiced sharp ideological accusations against the head of the historical institutions of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (Акад. Грушевський, 1926). Reflecting on the reasons behind these attacks, one Dilo correspondent insightfully noted the rapid consolidation of a regime of ideological intolerance and political dictatorship in Bolshevik-controlled Ukraine: «And here lies the entire tragedy of the current situation in Ukraine. Under the ruling regime, not only can no individual personality oppose itself to authority, but not even a single thought – since every thought is harmful to those in power, for every thought is dangerous to them.» (Акад. Грушевський 1926: 2).

However, the pressure on Mykhailo Hrushevsky temporarily subsided in early October 1926, when, thanks to the efforts of his academic colleagues, a large-scale celebration was organized to mark his sixtieth birthday. The Dilo editorial board took an active part in honoring this milestone, presenting it in the newspaper's pages as a true festival of the entire Ukrainian cultural community. The newspaper's correspondents provided readers with detailed reports on the organizational work of the jubilee committee, chaired by Academician Pavlo Tutkovsky and coordinated by Secretary Fedir Savchenko, both of whom made considerable efforts to ensure that the celebration achieved the scale and dignity befitting such a distinguished scholar.

The greatest attention, however, was devoted to the events of October 3, when a grand celebration honoring the «Great Ukrainian» took place in the academic hall of Kyiv University. Through Dilo, readers

learned about the speeches delivered by numerous local and international guests – including Galicians Kyrylo Studynsky and Ilarion Svetsitsky – as well as representatives of the Soviet authorities and Hrushevsky himself, who was deeply moved by the occasion (Свято української культури, 1926). The newspaper also gave special attention to summarizing the content of the hundreds of congratulatory addresses sent from various academic institutions across Europe and America. These greetings, as Dilo noted, testified to the truly epoch-making significance of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's contribution to contemporary social and human sciences.

Alongside its coverage of the Kyiv celebrations, Dilo became the principal platform for honoring Mykhailo Hrushevsky's jubilee in the Western Ukrainian lands. In extensive articles by Fed Fedortsiv (Федорців, 1926), Roman Kupchynsky (Чіпка Галактіон, 1926), Volodymyr Doroshenko (Дорошенко, 1926), and others, the jubilarian was portrayed as an ideological unifier – a pan-Ukrainian figure whose tireless intellectual and civic work had contributed profoundly to the spiritual revival and unity of compatriots divided by state borders. Depicting the vast scope of Hrushevsky's national service, Dilo's authors wrote: «There is no name more renowned, more widely known in every corner of Ukraine than the name of Hrushevsky. Everywhere it has long since become a synonym for the Ukrainian movement, a synonym for Ukraine's struggle for liberation. [...] His activity in every field deserves a separate monograph: Hrushevsky the historian, Hrushevsky the organizer of scholarly life, Hrushevsky the public figure, politician, journalist, even the belletrist.» (Дорошенко, 1926: 2). In addition, the newspaper reprinted articles about Hrushevsky written by prominent scholars from Central and Eastern European countries (Проф. Бідльо, 1926), lending the celebration a distinctly pan-European resonance. Overall, these and other laudatory pieces in Dilo contributed to the revival – on the pages of the Galician press – of the image of «Father Hrushevsky», an archetype originally formed during the revolutionary years (В. М., 1926).

The transformation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's media image was further influenced by developments in Soviet-controlled Ukraine. The 1926 jubilee had clearly demonstrated to the communist leadership the futility of attempting to instrumentalize Hrushevsky – either for their campaign against the Ukrainian émigré community or to undermine the «unreliable» academic leadership embodied by Ahatanhel Krymsky and Serhii Yefremov. As a result, the Soviet authorities embarked on a course aimed at dismantling the

institutions Hrushevsky had founded, correctly recognizing this as the most effective means of exerting pressure on him. These gradual steps toward the destruction of the carefully built academic framework created by the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* deeply disturbed Dilo's contributors. Moreover, the rapid establishment of the «Iron Curtain» around the USSR intensified the sense of anxiety and led to increasingly somber interpretations of the limited information that managed to pass through the censorship barriers from Kyiv. After Hrushevsky's arrest in Moscow in March 1931, the newspaper typically portrayed him as a self-sacrificing and steadfast defender of the cultural rights of Ukrainians subjugated by the Bolsheviks. His fate, predictably, evoked parallels in Dilo's articles with that of many of his predecessors – the prisoners of Tsarism (Проф. Мих. Грушевський, 1929).

Alongside its coverage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's unequal struggle with Soviet officials, Dilo also turned its attention to his conflict with the leadership of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Since the newspaper's information on this matter came exclusively from Galician sympathizers of the Kyiv academician – most notably Kyrylo Studynsky – the internal disputes within the Academy were presented entirely from Hrushevsky's point of view. Unable to maintain neutrality in this complex and, from the standpoint of national unity, delicate issue, Dilo opened its pages to Studynsky, who, writing under the pseudonym «Livobichnyi» («The Left-Banker»), accused Serhii Yefremov and Ahatanhel Krymsky of representing and defending exclusively pro-Russian interests within the Academy. The implication was clear: the Academy should rightly be headed by the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* (Лівобічний, 1928). In Kyiv, the publication of these articles was understandably associated with Hrushevsky himself. As is well known, this dramatic internal conflict within All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences ultimately made it easier for the communist authorities to gain control over what had been the last stronghold of Ukrainian culture in the Dnipro region.

The untimely death of Mykhailo Hrushevsky reverberated across the pages of all Ukrainian patriotic periodicals. Upon receiving the news from the other side of the Iron Curtain, Dilo published a front-page editorial bordered in mourning. In its extensive tribute, the newspaper meticulously reconstructed the phenomenal scope of the late scholar's contribution to the treasury of national culture – leaving readers in no doubt that Ukrainians had suffered a «great and irreplaceable loss» (Михайло Грушевський, 1934). Equally moving was the newspaper's condemnation

of the cynicism of Soviet officials, who – after years of persecution and humiliation of the historian – suddenly changed their tone, «acknowledging his exceptional scholarly merits» and hastily taking charge of organizing a state-funded funeral. A telling sign of the difficulties in obtaining reliable information from within the Soviet Union was that the obituary in Dilo incorrectly listed Moscow as the place of Hrushevsky's death. This error poignantly illustrated the isolation imposed by the «Iron Curtain» and the challenges faced by the Galician press in documenting the final chapter of the life of one of Ukraine's greatest national figures.

Amid the Galician public's confusion and grief following the tragic news from Kislovodsk, Dilo assumed the difficult role of coordinating memorial activities in honor of Mykhailo Hrushevsky. The editorial board proposed that members of the Prosvita society organize mourning events in every city and village across the region. To assist Ukrainian activists in the provinces, the newspaper's staff prepared a template for an informational lecture on Hrushevsky and outlined a recommended structure for memorial gatherings, which included a solemn requiem service, a biographical presentation, and a poetry-and-music program. To ensure timely and comprehensive coverage of these commemorative activities, Dilo launched a special column titled «After the Death of Mykhailo Hrushevsky», which ran for several months – from December 1934 to March 1935. Thanks to this editorial initiative, a remarkably detailed chronicle of the Hrushevsky memorial movement emerged, documenting how the memory of the Great Ukrainian was honored not only in Galicia but also in Soviet Ukraine and in numerous émigré communities across Western Europe and North America. This column also included valuable references to memorial publications in major international media, which significantly broadened modern scholars' understanding of Western reception of Hrushevsky's legacy. Notably, Dilo was the only publication to mention the existence of an obituary dedicated to the historian in the official newspaper of the Nazi Party, the *Völkischer Beobachter* (Telvak, Yanyshyn, 2021; Telvak, Yanyshyn, Telvak, 2021).

Alongside its meticulous documentation of the memorial movement, Dilo also took the initiative in promoting a comprehensive re-evaluation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's legacy of national service. To this end, the newspaper published a series of essays examining his scholarly, cultural-pedagogical, and civic-political activities. Among the contributors were prominent Ukrainian intellectuals such as Kost Levytsky, Zenon Kuzelia, and Ivan Krypiakievych, who consistently emphasized the vast scope of Hru-

shevsky's contributions to the modernization of virtually every sphere of Ukrainian life. Taken together, these reflections convinced Dilo's readers of the truth behind Roman Kupchynsky's poignant observation that the late historian was owed an immeasurable debt by his people – indeed, that «the Ukrainian nation owes him almost as much as to another Hrushevsky – Taras» (Галактіон Чіпка, 1934), drawing a symbolic parallel between Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Taras Shevchenko as two foundational figures of Ukrainian national awakening.

Dilo also drew its readers' attention to the growing importance of memoir literature about Mykhailo Hrushevsky, recognizing it as an essential part of preserving his legacy. Alongside reprints of relevant excerpts from the well-known works of Oleksandr Lototsky and Maksym Kovalevsky, the newspaper diligently recorded firsthand recollections of the Great Ukrainian shared during various commemorative events. Some of these testimonies contained information entirely unknown to modern researchers. For instance, during a memorial gathering of Ukrainian émigrés in Prague on January 27, 1935, an unnamed participant disclosed details of an alleged plan to rescue Hrushevsky from exile in Moscow (Не судилося, 1935). According to his account, members of the Western European Ukrainian diaspora had collected funds to secure the historian's release from Bolshevik captivity and arrange his appointment as a lecturer at a British university. A chair of Ukrainian history was reportedly to be established for him, financed by Yaroslav Makohin. However, the Soviet authorities allegedly refused outright to permit Hrushevsky's departure. While such recollections understandably invite skepticism from today's historians, Dilo's decision to document and publish them illustrates the deep concern and empathy felt by the émigré community for the fate of the «Moscow captive.» These accounts also testify to the powerful transnational resonance of Hrushevsky's figure within the broader Ukrainian diaspora of the interwar period.

Overall, the intensive efforts of Dilo's editorial board to memorialize the figure of the author of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* gave rise to the formation of a national cult of Mykhailo Hrushevsky among Galicians – one comparable in influence to the already established cults of the Kobzar (Taras Shevchenko) and the Kamenyar (Ivan Franko). Moreover, the newspaper's numerous and thematically diverse articles about Hrushevsky stimulated the emergence of systematic Hrushevsky studies during the latter half of the 1930s. The culmination of this scholarly momentum was to be a dedicated 1939 thematic volume of the *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Soci-*

ety. Unfortunately, both of these promising developments were cut short by the outbreak of World War II and the ensuing Sovietization of all spheres of public life, which extinguished the independent intellectual and cultural initiatives that had flourished around Hrushevsky's legacy in interwar Galicia.

In the final prewar years, Mykhailo Hrushevsky's name virtually disappeared from the pages of Dilo. After marking the anniversary of his death, the newspaper shifted its focus entirely to the pressing realities of Ukrainian life within the Second Polish Republic and to reflections on the mounting national challenges amid the global tensions that world media increasingly predicted would lead to war. Nonetheless, in discussions of cultural policy within the Soviet Union, Hrushevsky's name occasionally resurfaced. The Dilo editorial board repeatedly observed that the growth of totalitarian tendencies in Soviet public life went hand in hand with an intensifying assault on Ukrainian culture and its most prominent figures. The newspaper lamented that party ideologues directed particular venom toward the memory of the distinguished historian, noting with sorrow the crude and abusive tone that marked official Soviet discourse about him (Борщак, 1938). This final period thus marked the eclipse of Hrushevsky's public image in Galicia – overshadowed first by the looming catastrophe of war and then by the violent erasure of independent Ukrainian culture that followed in its wake.

Conclusions. As the conducted research demonstrates, despite Mykhailo Hrushevsky's departure from Galicia in 1914, Dilo continued to follow his life and work with unwavering attention. Having turned the page on their prewar conflict, the newspaper consistently informed its readers about both the hardships and successes of its longtime contributor. Moreover, Dilo – often at the risk of censorship and political repercussions – boldly initiated several public campaigns in defense of Hrushevsky's honor and dignity. It was also one of the very few newspapers in the free world that consistently supported all of the historian's civic and creative initiatives, striving to convey to readers the reasoning behind even his most controversial decisions. In appreciation of such understanding, Hrushevsky chose the Galician newspaper as his primary platform for communication with Ukrainians both west of the Zbruch and in the emigrant communities abroad. Consequently, a large share of his publications in the interwar daily press appeared precisely in Dilo. Most importantly, Dilo's contributors made a monumental contribution to the posthumous memorialization of Hrushevsky's legacy and to the comprehensive interpretation of his intellectual heritage. Their work resulted in a substantial

anthology of memorial Hrushevskiana, which laid the foundation for systematic historiographical research. Although these processes were brutally halted following the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine, the experience and analytical frameworks developed by Dilo's authors proved invaluable to Ukrainian émigré scholars, who in the postwar years went on to establish the field of academic Hrushevsky studies abroad.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. «Кільчастий дріт» і проф. Грушевський. *Громадська думка*. 1920. Ч. 12. С. 2.
2. Акад. Грушевський далі в неласці. *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 62. С. 1, 2.
3. В обороні емігрантів. *Громадська думка*. 1920. Ч. 22. С. 1.
4. В якій цілі? До характеристики метод польської преси. *Діло*. 1914. Ч. 190. С. 1–2.
5. ВУАН і Радвіада (Виступ акад. Грушевського на 264 пленумі Укрголовнауки в Києві). *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 30. С. 2.
6. Голос російського націоналіста. *Діло*. 1915. Ч. 106. С. 2.
7. Державний замах на Україні. *Діло*. 1918. Ч. 100. С. 1, 2.
8. Замах на Грушевського.... *Діло*. 1918. Ч. 103. С. 4.
9. Лист з Києва. *Діло*. 1924. Ч. 122. С. 1, 2.
10. М. Грушевський про свій поворот. *Діло*. 1924. Ч. 67. С. 2, 3.
11. Михайло Грушевський. *Діло*. 1934. Ч. 320. С. 1.
12. На оден шлях (Проф. М. Грушевський до Американських Українців). *Громадська думка*. 1920. Ч. 30. С. 4.
13. Національне питання в комуністів. *Діло*. 1923. Ч. 188. С. 1.
14. Не судилося вдруге побачити волю (Ще з приводу смерті проф. М. Грушевського). *Діло*. 1935. Ч. 30. С. 3.
15. Незалежна Польща і автономія Галичини. Стаття проф. М. Грушевського з приводу актів 4 падолиста 1916 [аналіз]. *Діло*. 1917. Ч. 67. С. 1.
16. Організація російських Українців і велике українське віче в Нью Йорку. *Діло*. 1915. Ч. 67. С. 3.
17. Під приманчиво-сензаційною назвою.... *Діло*. 1914. Ч. 98. С. 1, 2.
18. Проф. Грушевський під воєнним судом. *Діло*. 1915. Ч. 214 (6). С. 7.
19. Проф. Мих. Грушевський арештований?. *Діло*. 1929. Ч. 20. С. 4.
20. Проф. Мих. Грушевський в Харкові. *Діло*. 1924. Ч. 79. С. 2.
21. Розвиток подій в Києві. *Діло*. 1918. Ч. 101. С. 1–2.
22. Свято української культури (Величавий ювілей проф. М. Грушевського) (Власна телеграма). *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 223. С. 2.
23. Справоздання Союзу «Голодним Україні». *Громадська думка*. 1920. Ч. 111. С. 5.
24. Українська Равенна. Проф. М. Грушевський у Чернигові. *Діло*. 1924. Ч. 192. С. 2, 3.
25. Українське «сменовеховство». *Діло*. 1924. Ч. 11. С. 2.
26. Ювілей історика України. З нагоди 50-ліття уродин проф. Михайла Грушевського. *Діло*. 1916. Ч. 298. С. 1, 2.
27. А. Ц. З полиці бібліофіла. М. Грушевський: Українські стародруки – «Книга» Відень-Київ. Грудень 1921. Ч. I. Ст. 2–4. *Громадський вісник*. 1922. Ч. 50. С. 7.
28. Борщак І. Чи з лекцій історії користають російські історики?. *Діло*. 1938. Ч. 265. С. 2–4.
29. В. М. «Найбільший апостол України» (Ювілейна китиця акад. Грушевському). *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 227. С. 2, 3.
30. Галактіон Чіпка. Грушевський. *Діло*. 1934. Ч. 320. С. 3.
31. Грушевський М. Ветхий прах. *Речь*. 1915. № 281. С. 4.
32. Грушевський М. Привіт віденського Комітету для львівського Комітету «Голодній Україні». *Діло*. 1923. Ч. 141. С. 8.
33. Грушевський М. Шановна Редакціє!. *Діло*. 1923. Ч. 191. С. 6.
34. Дорошенко В. Всеукраїнське свято (Ювілей акад. М. Грушевського). *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 218. С. 2–3. С. 2.
35. Кулаковский Ю. Русским людям, именующим себя «украинцами». *Киевлянин*. 1915. № 258. С. 1.
36. Лівобічний. За Українську Академію Наук. *Діло*. 1928. Ч. 109. С. 1, 2; 19 трав. Ч. 110. С. 1, 2; Ч. 111. С. 2.
37. Панькова С. Публіцистика Михайла Грушевського поміж двох революцій. *Грушевський М. С. Твори у 50 т. Т. 3 : Серія «Суспільно-політичні твори (1907 – березень 1917)»*. Львів : Світ, 2005. С. V–XVI.
38. Проф. Бідльо про М. Грушевського. *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 218. С. 1–3.
39. Тельвак В. В., Тельвак В. П. Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи. *Український історичний журнал*. 2021. № 5. С. 4–16.
40. Тельвак В. Грушевська кіана на сторінках «Українського історичного журналу» (1991–2010 рр.). *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2012. Вип. 22. С. 483–498.
41. Тельвак В. Монографічна грушевська кіана: спроба узагальнення. *Гуржіївські історичні читання: Збірник наукових праць*. 2013. Вип. 6. С. 104–107.
42. Тельвак В. Грушевська кіана Руслана Пирого. *Архіви України*. 2011. Вип. 2–3 (273), квітень-червень С. 290–298.
43. Тельвак В. Історико-теоретичні дослідження в грушевськознавстві (90-ті рр. ХХ ст.). *Проблеми гуманітарних наук : наукові записки ДДПУ*. 2000а. Вип. 5. С. 163–174.
44. Тельвак В. Вивчення історико-теоретичної спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (1939–1990 рр.). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. 2000б. № 35–36. С. 354–366.
45. Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець ХІХ – 30-ті роки ХХ століття). Київ–Дрогобич : «Вимір», 2008. 494 с.
46. Тельвак В., Курилович К., Тельвак В. Михайло Грушевський та часопис «Діло»: співпраця, конфлікти, рецепція (до 1914 р.). *Рукописна та книжкова спадщина України*. 2022. Вип. 28. С. 347–371. <https://doi.org/10.15407/rksu.28.347>

47. Федорців Ф. Воля народу. *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 218. С. 1–2.
48. Х. Гринько проти Грушевського!. *Діло*. 1925. Ч. 102. С. 2.
49. Чіпка Галактіон. Михайло Галицький. *Діло*. 1926. Ч. 218. С. 5.
50. Ш-ик. В переїзді на Батьківщину (Поворот проф. М. Грушевського на Велику Україну) (Від власного кореспондента). *Діло*. 1924. Ч. 72. С. 1.
51. 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. 25. No. 1. P. 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.17846/SHN.2021.25.1.71-90>
52. Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V. Between cooperation and conflict: Mykhailo Hrushevskiy through the eyes of Polish intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Echa Przeszłości*. 2023. Vol. XXIV/2. P. 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.31648/ep.9668>
53. 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. R. XX. Nr 2. S. 103–125. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1644-857X.20.02.05>

REFERENCES

1. «Kilchastyi drit» i prof. Hrushevskiyi ["Ring wire" and prof. Hrushevsky]. *Hromadska dumka*, 12, 2. [In Ukrainian].
2. Akad. Hrushevskiyi dali v nelastsi [Acad. Hrushevsky is still in disgrace]. *Dilo*, 62, 1, 2. [In Ukrainian].
3. V oboroni emigrantiv [In defense of emigrants]. *Hromadska dumka*, 22, 1. [In Ukrainian].
4. V yakii tsily? Do kharakterystyky metod polskoi presy [In what purpose? To characterize the method of the Polish press]. *Dilo*, 190, 1–2. [In Ukrainian].
5. VUAN i Radvlada (Vystup akad. Hrushevskoho na 264 plienumi Ukrholovnauky v Kyivi) [All-Ukrainian Academy and the Soviet power (Speech of Academician Hrushevskiyi at the 264th Plenum of Ukrainian Chief Science in Kyiv)]. *Dilo*, 30, 2. [In Ukrainian].
6. Holos rosyiskoho natsionalista [Voice of a Russian nationalist]. *Dilo*, 106, 2. [In Ukrainian].
7. Derzhavnyi zamakh na Ukraini [State attempt on Ukraine]. *Dilo*, 100, 1, 2. [In Ukrainian].
8. Zamakh na Hrushevskoho... [Attempt on Hrushevskiyi...]. *Dilo*, 103, 4. [In Ukrainian].
9. Lyst z Kyiva [A letter from Kyiv]. *Dilo*, 122, 1, 2. [In Ukrainian].
10. M. Hrushevskiyi pro svii povorot [M. Hrushevskiyi about his turn]. *Dilo*, 67, 2, 3. [In Ukrainian].
11. Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi [Mykhailo Hrushevskiyi]. *Dilo*, 320, 1. [In Ukrainian].
12. Na oden shliakh (Prof. M. Hrushevskiyi do Amerykanskyykh Ukraintsiv) [On one way (Prof. M. Hrushevskiyi to American Ukrainians)]. *Hromadska dumka*, 30, 4. [In Ukrainian].
13. Natsionalne pytannia v komunistiv [Communists have a national question]. *Dilo*, 188, 1. [In Ukrainian].
14. Ne sudylosia vdrue pobachyty voliu (Shche z pryvodu smerty prof. M. Hrushevskoho) [It was not destined to see the will a second time (More about the death of Prof. M. Hrushevskiyi)]. *Dilo*, 30, 3. [In Ukrainian].
15. Nezalezhna Polshcha i avtonomiia Halychyny. Statia prof. M. Hrushevskoho z pryvodu aktiv 4 padolysta 1916 [analiz] [Independent Poland and the autonomy of Galicia. Article by Prof. M. Hrushevsky regarding the acts of the 4th of October 1916 [analysis]]. *Dilo*, 67, 1. [In Ukrainian].
16. Orhanizatsiia rosiiskyykh Ukraintsiv i velyke ukrainske viche v Niu Yorku [The Organization of Russian Ukrainians and the Great Ukrainian Event in New York]. *Dilo*, 67, 3. [In Ukrainian].
17. Pid prymanchyvo-senzatsyinoiu nazvoiu... [Under the enticing and sensational name...]. *Dilo*, 98, 1, 2. [In Ukrainian].
18. Prof. Hrushevskiyi pid voienym sudom [Prof. Hrushevskiyi under military court]. *Dilo*, 214 (6), 7. [In Ukrainian].
19. Prof. Mykh. Hrushevskiyi areshтовanyi? [Has Prof. Mychailo Hrushevskiyi been arrested?]. *Dilo*, 20, 4. [In Ukrainian].
20. Prof. Mykh. Hrushevskiyi v Kharkovi [Prof. Mychailo Hrushevskiyi in Kharkiv]. *Dilo*, 79, 2. [In Ukrainian].
21. Rozvytok podii v Kyivi [Development of events in Kyiv]. *Dilo*, 101, 1–2. [In Ukrainian].
22. Sviato ukrainskoi kultury (Velychavyi yuvylei prof. M. Hrushevskoho) (Vlasna teliegrama) [Holiday of Ukrainian culture (Grand anniversary of Prof. M. Hrushevskiyi) (Own Telegram)]. *Dilo*, 223, 2. [In Ukrainian].
23. Spravozdannia Soiuzu «Holodnym Ukrainy» [Report of the Union "Hungry of Ukraine"]. *Hromadska dumka*, 111, 5. [In Ukrainian].
24. Ukrainska Ravenna. Prof. M. Hrushevskiyi u Chernyhovi [Ukrainian Ravenna. Prof. M. Hrushevskiyi in Chernihiv]. *Dilo*, 192, 2, 3. [In Ukrainian].
25. Ukrainske «smienoviekhovstvo» [Ukrainian "shift work"]. *Dilo*, 11, 2. [In Ukrainian].
26. Yuvilei istoryka Ukrainy. Z nahody 50-litia urodyn prof. Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Anniversary of the historian of Ukraine. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the birth of Prof. Mykhailo Hrushevsky]. *Dilo*, 298, 1, 2. [In Ukrainian].
27. A. Ts. Z polytsi bibliofila. M. Hrushevskiyi: Ukrainski starodruky – «Knyha» Viden–Kyiv. Hruden 1921. Iss. I. St. 2–4 [From the shelf of a bibliophile. M. Hrushevskiyi: Ukrainian Old Prints – "Book" Vienna-Kyiv. December 1921. Ch. I. Art. 2–4]. *Hromadska dumka*, 50, 7. [In Ukrainian].
28. Borshchak I. (1938). Chy z liektstii istorii korystaiut rosiiski istoryky? [Do Russian historians benefit from history lectures?]. *Dilo*, 265, 2–4. [In Ukrainian].
29. V. M. (1926). «Naibilshyi apostol Ukrainy» (Yuvyleina kytysia akad. Hrushevskomu) ["The Greatest Apostle of Ukraine" (Anniversary Bouquet to Acad. Hrushevskiyi)]. *Dilo*, 227, 2, 3. [In Ukrainian].
30. Halaktion Chipka. (1934). Hrushevskiyi [Hrushevskiyi]. *Dilo*, 320, 3. [In Ukrainian].
31. Hrushevskiyi M. Vetkhyi prakh [Old ashes]. *Retch*, 281, 4. [In Russian].

32. Hrushevskiy M. (1923). Pryvit videnskoho Komitetu dlia Lvivskoho Komitetu «Holodnii Ukraini» [Greetings from the Vienna Committee for the Lviv Committee "Hungry Ukraine"]. *Dilo*, 141, 8. [In Ukrainian].
33. Hrushevskiy M. (1923). Shanovna Redaktsiie! [Dear Editor!]. *Dilo*, 191, 6. [In Ukrainian].
34. Doroshenko V. (1926). Vseukrainske sviato (Yuvylei akad. M. Hrushevskoho) [All-Ukrainian holiday (Acad. M. Hrushevsky's anniversary)]. *Dilo*, 218, 2–3, 2. [In Ukrainian].
35. Kulakovskiy Yu. (1915). Russkym liudiam, ymenuiushchym sebia «ukrayntsamy» [To Russian people who call themselves "Ukrainians"]. *Kyevlianin*, 258, 1. [In Ukrainian].
36. Livobichnyi. (1928). Za Ukrainsku Akademiiu Nauk [For the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences]. *Dilo*, 109, 1, 2; 110, 1, 2; Iss. 111, 2. [In Ukrainian].
37. Pankova S. (2005). Publitsystyka Mykhaila Hrushevskoho pomizh dvokh revoliutsii [Mykhailo Hrushevsky's journalism between two revolutions]. *Hrushevskiy M.S. Tvory u 50 t. T. 3 : Serii «Suspilno-politychni tvory (1907 – berezen 1917)»*, Lviv, V–XVI. [In Ukrainian].
38. (1926). Prof. Bidlo pro M. Hrushevskoho [Prof. Badlyo about M. Hrushevsky]. *Dilo*, 218, 1–3. [In Ukrainian].
39. Telvak, V.V., Telvak, V.P. (2021). Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdotuky, vtraty, perspektyvy. [Modern Hrushevsky studies: gains, losses, prospects]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 5. 4–16. [in Ukrainian].
40. 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].
41. Telvak, V. (2013). Monografichna hrushevskiana: sproba uzahalnennia. [Monographic Hrushevskiana: an attempt at generalization]. *Hurzhiivski istorychni chytannia: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. 6 104–107. [in Ukrainian].
42. Telvak, V. (2011). Hrushevskiana Ruslana Pyroha [Hrushevskiana of Ruslan Pyrig]. *Arkhivy Ukrainy*. 2–3 (273), kviten-cherven 290–298. [in Ukrainian].
43. 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 : naukovi zapysky DDPU*. 5. 163–174. [in Ukrainian].
44. Telvak, V. (2000b). Vyvchennia 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. Serii istorychna*. 35–36. 354–366. [in Ukrainian].
45. Telvak V. (2008). Tvorchyna spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykh (kinets XIXh – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Mykhailo Hrushevsky's creative heritage in the assessments of contemporaries (end of the XIX – 30s of the XX century)]. Kyiv–Drohobych, 494 p. [In Ukrainian].
46. Telvak V., Kurylyshyn K., Telvak V. (2022). Mykhailo Hrushevskiy ta chasopys «Dilo»: spivpratsia, konflikty, retseptsiia (do 1914 r.) [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and «Dilo» newspaper: cooperation, conflicts, reception (before 1914)]. *Rukopysna ta knyzhкова spadshchyna Ukrainy*, 28, 347–371. <https://doi.org/10.15407/rksu.28.347> [In Ukrainian].
47. Fedortsiv F. (1926). Volia narodu [Will of the people]. *Dilo*, 218, 1–2. [In Ukrainian].
48. Kh. Hryenko proty Hrushevskoho! [Gryenko against Hrushevskiy!]. *Dilo*, 102, 2. [In Ukrainian].
49. Chipka Halaktion. (1926). Mykhailo Halytskyi [Mykhailo Halytsky]. *Dilo*, 218, 5. [In Ukrainian].
50. Sh-yk. (1924). V perezidi na Batkivshchynu (Povorot prof. M. Hrushevskoho na Velyku Ukrainu) (Vid vlasnoho korespondenta) [Moving to the Motherland (Professor M. Hrushevsky's return to Great Ukraine) (From own correspondent)]. *Dilo*, 72, 1. [In Ukrainian].
51. Telvak V., Yanyshyn B. (2021). «Geschichte des Ukrainischen (Ruthenischen) volkes» of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the discussions of the beginning of the XXth century. *Studia Historica Nitriensia*, 25, 1, 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.17846/SHN.2021.25.1.71-90>
52. Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V. (2023). Between cooperation and conflict: Mykhailo Hrushevskiy through the eyes of Polish intellectuals of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Echa Przeszłości*, XXIV/2, 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.31648/ep.9668>
53. Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V. (2021). Between history and politics: the image of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in German Slavic studies of the first third of the 20th century. *Przegląd nauk historyczny*, XX, 2, 103–125. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1644-857X.20.02.05>

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)

