

Науковий вісник Чернівецького
університету імені Юрія Федьковича:
Історія. № 2. 2025. С. 131–137.

History Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych
Chernivtsi National University.

№ 2. 2025. Pp. 131–137.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31861/hj2025.62.131-137>
hj.chnu.edu.ua

УДК 94 (477) (092)

© Mykhailo Sabinskyi* (Kyiv)

© Yuriy Stepanchuk** (Vinnytsia)

© Fadei Yatseniuk*** (Chernivtsi)

THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI IN THE LATE IMPERIAL PERIOD, IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF DIASPORA HISTORIANS DURING THE POSTWAR DECADES

The goal of the article is to identify the specific features of the reception of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's pre-revolutionary socio-political activity in Ukrainian diaspora historiography of the 1940s through the first half of the 1960s. The material presented allows us to conclude that Ukrainian diaspora intellectuals during the second half of the 1940s through the first half of the 1960s demonstrated sustained and intensive interest in the Lviv period of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's socio-political service. Overall, interpretations of the scholar's public initiatives were predominantly favourable, as historians consistently emphasised the unifying (sobornist) imperative underlying both the socio-political and the cultural-scholarly activities of the author of History of Ukraine-Rus'. In their reconstructions of Hrushevskyi's political biography, however, diaspora Ukrainian studies were largely not original, as they generally relied on the historiographical tradition of jubilee and memoir-based Hrushevskyi studies produced during the first third of the twentieth century. At the same time, diaries and memoirs of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's contemporaries who were able to emigrate to the West in the postwar period introduced a substantial amount of new factual material and original interpretive models. Thus, the historiographical achievements of the postwar two decades made possible the emergence of Hrushevskyi studies as an interdisciplinary field in the year marking the centenary of the Great Ukrainian.

Keywords: Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, Public Service, the Late Imperial Period, Diaspora Historians, Postwar Decades.

Михайло Сабінський (Київ)

Юрій Степанчук (Вінниця)

Фадей Яценюк (Чернівці)

ГРОМАДСЬКЕ СЛУЖІННЯ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО ПІЗНЬОІМПЕРСЬКОЇ ДОБИ В СТУДІЯХ ДІАСПОРНИХ ІСТОРИКІВ ПОВОЄННОГО ДВАДЦЯТИЛІТТЯ

Анотація. Метою статті є з'ясування особливостей реценції дореволюційної доби суспільно-політичної діяльності М. Грушевського в українській закордонній історіографії другої половини 1940-х – першої половини 1960-х рр. Проаналізований матеріал довів, що українські діаспорні інтелектуали протягом другої половини 1940-х – першої половини 1960-х років інтенсивно цікавилися львівською добою суспільно-політичного служіння М. Грушевського. При цьому інтерпретації громадських ініціатив вченого були в цілому схвальними, адже

* к.і.н., Служба безпеки України.

PhD in History, Security Service of Ukraine.

orcid.org/0000-0001-9506-2789

e-mail: mikhailo.sabinskyi@gmail.com

** д.і.н., доцент кафедри суспільно-гуманітарних наук Комунального закладу вищої освіти «Вінницький гуманітарно-педагогічний коледж».

Doctor of History, Associate Professor, Department of Social and Human Sciences,

Municipal Institution of Higher Education «Vinnytsia Humanitarian and Pedagogical College».

orcid.org/0000-0001-6693-1463

e-mail: iepp@ukr.net

*** к.і.н., доцент кафедри історії України Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича.

PhD in History, Associate Professor, Department of History of Ukraine, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University.

orcid.org/0000-0002-2054-9805

e-mail: f.yatseyuk@chnu.edu.ua

історіографи виопуклювали соборницький імператив як громадсько-політичної, так і культурно-наукової діяльності автора «Історії України-Руси». В своїх реконструкціях біографії Грушевського-політика закордонні українознавці здебільшого не було оригінальними, адже як правило орієнтувалося на історіографічну традицію ювілейної та мемуарної грушевськіани, створеної протягом першої третини ХХ ст. У той же час, чимало нового фактичного матеріалу та оригінальних інтерпретативних моделей приносили щоденники та спогади сучасників М. Грушевського, яким пощастило у повоєнний час виїхати на захід. Також і динамічний розвиток української соціогуманітаристики у вільному світі підштовхував історіографів до постійного переосмислення класичних грушевськознавчих сюжетів у напрямку їх контекстуальної та компаративної інтерпретації. Внаслідок цього, приміром, був обґрунтована інтерпретація громадської публіцистики львівського професора як ефективного інструменту національно-культурного виховання поділених імперським кордоном українців. Таким чином, історіографічні здобутки повоєнного двадцятиліття уможливили появу грушевськознавства як міждисциплінарної галузі у рік відзначення столітнього ювілею Великого Українця.

Ключові слова: Михайло Грушевський, громадське служіння, пізньоімперська доба, діаспорні історики, повоєнне двадцятиліття.

Problem Statement. In Ukrainian historiography, a stereotypical assumption has become established that representatives of diaspora social thought approached the multifaceted legacy of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi with varying degrees of scepticism. In particular, assessments of his socio-political activity were marked by pronounced criticality in light of the defeat of the Ukrainian Liberation Struggles, as a result of which Ukraine became part of the Soviet empire for several decades. It is often asserted that only the emergence of Hrushevskyi studies around the centenary of the Great Ukrainian's birth to some extent shifted evaluative emphases, redirecting discussions into a more strictly academic framework. While fully acknowledging the significance of the disciplinary initiative launched by Liubomyr Wynar and his associates in 1966 for the study of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, we nevertheless consider it necessary to deconstruct the aforementioned stereotype. To this end, this study seeks to reconstruct the broad spectrum of assessments of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's public service in the pre-revolutionary period as presented in Ukrainian studies abroad during the second half of the 1940s through the first half of the 1960s. The problem of reception will be examined from a chronological perspective, corresponding to the stages of the eminent Ukrainian figure's own biography from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century.

Recent research analysis. To date, a substantial body of diverse scholarly publications has been devoted to Hrushevskyi's studies of the Ukrainian diaspora. This scholarship has also addressed the contribution of diaspora historians of the 1940s–1960s to the reinterpretation of the socio-political activities of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'* during the pre-revolutionary period. In particular, this issue was concisely outlined by Alla Atamanenko in her monograph devoted to the Ukrainian Historical Society¹. Considerable attention to diaspora Hrushevskyi studies was also paid by Vitalii Telvak². However, in these works, the authors primarily focused on the historiographical period of the second half of the 1960s through the 1980s, when a new interdisciplinary field emerged and developed. By contrast, the historiographical achievements of the wartime years and the first two postwar decades were summarised largely in a fragmentary manner. These circumstances account for the relevance and timeliness of the present study.

Main material presentation. With regard to the problem of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's formation as a public figure, Ukrainian diaspora historiography was virtually unanimous in recognising the significant influence exerted on his youthful worldview by the Kyiv Stara Hromada activists Volodymyr Antonovych and Oleksandr Konyskyi³. During the period under study, this issue was not treated as an independent subject of inquiry; rather, biographical sketches devoted to the historian typically reiterated well-established prewar Hrushevskyi studies theses concerning the rapid rise of the young scholar's authority within the milieu of Dnipro-region Ukrainianophiles and his active efforts toward the national awakening of Ukrainian students in Kyiv⁴.

A similar unanimity of favourable assessments – though articulated in considerably greater detail and with more nuance – characterised the treatment of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's public activity in Lviv and Kyiv contexts during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In addressing this issue, Ukrainian diaspora scholars, like their predecessors in the first half of the twentieth century, emphasised the unifying mission (sobornytska role) of the representative of the Kyiv academic tradition who, upon relocating to Lviv for teaching purposes, embodied a synthesis of Dnipro-region and Dniester-region Ukrainian communities. Reflecting on this phenomenon, Mykola Andrusiak aptly described the historian as an «ambassador of Kyiv in Lviv»⁵, a characterisation that remains current in Hrushevskyi studies to this day. In this context, comparisons between Hrushevskyi's consolidating efforts and the activities of his distinguished predecessor Mykhailo Drahomanov became widespread. At the same time, scholars recalled the well-known fact of Hrushevskyi's active participation in the founding of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party in 1899 and explained the reasons for

his brief involvement therein by the desire of Galician politicians to continue engaging in behind-the-scenes dealings with the Polish leadership of the region.

Equally favourable – largely under the influence of the prewar historiographical tradition⁶ – was the portrayal of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's activities in the Dnipro region following the outbreak of the Russian Revolution of 1905. Scholars explained the historian's deliberate expansion of his activities into the territories under Russian rule by his firm conviction that «in the future it would not be Lviv, but Kyiv that would determine the fate of Ukraine»⁷. The most prominent themes in this context included the scholar's initiatives toward the establishment of the supra-party Society of Ukrainian Progressives; his participation in moderating the activities of the Ukrainian faction in the First State Duma and in shaping the ideological orientation of its printed organ, *Ukrainskii Vestnik*; his efforts to develop periodical publishing and publishing houses in the territories under Russian rule; as well as his active scholarly-popularizing and publicistic work of an awakening (*budytel'skyi*) character, among others.

In terms of events, reconstructions of Lviv twenty-year period were dominated by portrayals of the conflict between Mykhailo Hrushevskyi and the leaders of the Galician *Narodovtsi* in 1913 – a conflict destructive in its consequences. In addressing this episode of Lviv professor's biography, diaspora historiography of the period under review likewise largely followed the interpretive framework established by interwar Hrushevskyi studies. One of the most detailed reconstructions of the genesis of the confrontation between Galician politicians and Lviv professor was offered by his former student and colleague at the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Volodymyr Doroshenko. As a direct participant in the events, the Society's librarian provided a thorough explanation of the logic behind Hrushevskyi's criticisms of the policies pursued by the Galician *Narodovtsi*, articulated in the collection of his publicistic writings *Our Politics*, and effectively expressed solidarity with his senior colleague. In a similar vein, the conflict within the Shevchenko Scientific Society was described by Mykola Kovalevskyi – former Minister of Land Affairs of the Ukrainian People's Republic, cooperator, poet, and publicist – who asserted that «it was a revolt of small men against a giant of scholarship»⁸.

Alongside such assessments, there also existed isolated interpretations of this conflict from the perspective of the opponents of the head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Thus, Mykola Andrusiak was virtually the only diaspora historian to popularise the following explanation: «Tomashivskyi led the opposition against Hrushevskyi's administration in the Shevchenko Scientific Society, where Hrushevskyi acted as an autocrat and selected associates who merely echoed his views – something that displeased those members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society who had developed their own vision for the Society's development. Opposition to Hrushevskyi grew, and in response to it, he resigned from the chairmanship of the Shevchenko Scientific Society on the eve of the First World War»⁹. Scepticism toward Hrushevskyi's criticism of Galician political leaders was also expressed by his ideological opponent Yaroslav Pelenskyi, who, with a certain irony, observed that, unlike the leaders of the National Democratic Party, the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'* was accountable for his political actions only to himself¹⁰. It is noteworthy that, despite the fact that diaspora historians were aware of Stanislav Tomashivskyi's authorship of the brochure «*Our Politics*» and Professor Hrushevskyi, none explicitly mentioned his name, although readers could readily infer from the context that the principal opponent at the general assembly of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1913 had been.

In terms of thematic focus, diaspora historians devoted perhaps the greatest attention to the phenomenon of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's pre-revolutionary publicistic writings, emphasising their formative and educational impact on the Ukrainian civic community of the time. For instance, Yaroslav Pelenskyi noted that «in the years preceding the First World War, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi was undoubtedly one of the most popular Ukrainian publicists»¹¹. At the same time, scholars quite rightly stressed that the historian's public initiatives should be evaluated strictly in accordance with the principle of historicism – that is, within the context of the conditions and tasks facing Ukrainian society at the turn of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This position was articulated most clearly by Volodymyr Doroshenko, who wrote: «It goes without saying that we must assess Hrushevskyi's publicistic writings from a historical perspective, rather than from the level of national development attained after their composition»¹². Therefore, the noted bibliographer explained, it would be absurd to reproach Hrushevskyi's publicistic output of the period for a lack of state-centred ideas, since Ukrainian society – particularly in the Dnipro region – was simply not prepared to assimilate such slogans at that time. Proceeding from this understanding, a new perspective on the publicistic writings of Lviv professor after the outbreak of the First Russian Revolution gradually took shape in Hrushevskyi's studies of the period under consideration. Thus, the aforementioned Yaroslav Pelenskyi convincingly contrasted the predominantly culturalist civic activities of the leaders of sub-imperial Ukrainian society at the turn of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the clearly articulated political demands advanced by Mykhailo Hrushevskyi,

which were comprehensively outlined in his well-known work «The Constitutional Question and Ukrainianism in Russia»¹³. As scholars have rightly noted, it was precisely Hrushevskyi's publicistic output of the final prewar decade that significantly contributed to the politicisation of the Ukrainian movement, while the demands substantiated therein soon became slogans of the revolutionary era. In offering an integrated interpretation of Hrushevskyi's publicistic writings, historians persuasively emphasised that the guiding idea of his work in the early twentieth century was sobornist – the principle of national unity.

One of the themes of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's pre-revolutionary publicistic writings received independent and comprehensive treatment during the period under review. Thus, in the pages of the Paris-based journal «Ukraina», the prominent Ukrainian linguist Panteleimon Kovaliv for the first time synthesised Lviv professor's position in the well-known debate concerning the standardisation of norms for a unified Ukrainian orthography. According to the scholar's well-founded assessment, «Mykhailo Hrushevskyi regarded the language question as an organic component of the broader Ukrainian question»¹⁴. In addressing this issue, Lviv historian approached it not from philological premises or through a purely linguistic lens, but as a powerful cultural and unifying (sobornytskyi) factor. Providing a detailed review of Hrushevskyi's writings on the language question, Kovaliv fully aligned himself with the author's views and affirmed the soundness of his proposals from the vantage point of the achievements of Ukrainian linguistics in the mid-twentieth century.

Similar to the aforementioned episodes in the biography of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, Ukrainian diaspora studies contributed relatively little new material to the reconstruction of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's public activity during the period of the First World War. Ukrainian diaspora historians largely reiterated well-known facts concerning the scholar's skeptical attitude toward the Austrophilism of Galician politicians who established the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, his appeals to prevent any of the belligerent powers from manipulating Ukrainian society for their own interests, and his return to Kyiv, which was explained by his desire to defend Ukrainian society against accusations by right-monarchist figures of his alleged separatist inclinations, among other issues. At the same time, individual previously little-known facts were also introduced, gradually enriching Hrushevskyi's biography with important nuances. Thus, Volodymyr Doroshenko maintained that the historian anticipated a rapid conclusion to the global conflict and travelled from Kryvorivnia to Vienna ostensibly in the hope that an international peace congress would soon convene there to regulate postwar relations in Europe – an arena in which his voice as a historian might prove significant for Ukraine's future fate¹⁵. We also learn of Hrushevskyi's brief stay in Italy in the autumn of 1914, during which he met with several Russian public figures, including the journalist Mikhail Osorgin¹⁶.

A similar degree of conciseness and dependence on earlier Hrushevskyi studies characterised the treatment of the issue of the scholar's criminal prosecution and his activities during the years of exile¹⁷. Researchers were unanimous in pointing out the absurdity of a situation in which Mykhailo Hrushevskyi faced virtually mutually exclusive charges of high treason in both the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires. However, unlike in constitutional Austria-Hungary, in the Romanov state, the fate of the Ukrainian patriot was effectively predetermined: without a court verdict, he was sent into exile in the Russian hinterland¹⁸. At the same time, scholars highlighted the solidarity shown by Russian academics in efforts to alleviate the fate of their unjustly punished colleague, which resulted in his transfer from Simbirsk to the university city of Kazan, and subsequently to the second Russian capital, where Hrushevskyi developed extensive public activity among the Ukrainian community in Moscow.

Some of the aforementioned themes were presented in a memoiristic mode. Of particular significance in this regard are the detailed recollections of Yurii Siryi (Tyshchenko), which began to be published in the immediate postwar years. In these memoirs, the long-time associate of the Lviv professor provides an exceptionally detailed account of his acquaintance with the historian, his move to Kyiv using a forged passport, his intensive work in the Kyiv editorial office of «Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk», and his involvement in the development of the book trade, among other matters¹⁹. The renowned publisher depicted all these episodes with numerous previously unknown details and with sincere sympathy and respect for Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, whom he regarded as one of the most outstanding intellectuals in Ukrainian history.

A holistic account of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's time in Lviv was provided in a brief memoiristic note by the prominent Galician public figure, anthropologist and zoologist, educator, and – during the interwar period – the final chairman of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Ivan Rakovskyi. Having been a long-time collaborator of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in various civic institutions, Rakovskyi personally witnessed the multifaceted nature of Hrushevskyi's service to Ukrainian society. It was Rakovskyi who offered a panoramic depiction of the intensity with which Hrushevskyi immersed himself in virtually all spheres of the cultural life of Galician Ukrainians. Notably, however, he largely omitted from his account the historian's conflicts with the

leaders of regional political groupings. Reflecting on Hrushevskyi's extraordinary capacity for work, the memoirist left the following telling recollection: «Thus, whenever one happened to come to Professor Hrushevskyi, he was always engaged in his scholarly work [...]. The professor worked with remarkable endurance and speed [...]. He was an ideal head of the institutions he led: he truly guided them, set the direction of their activities, and carefully oversaw the proper execution of his instructions as well as the resolutions of the governing board»²⁰.

A considerable amount about Mykhailo Hrushevskyi was also written by his political opponent during the period of the Ukrainian Liberation Struggles, Dmytro Doroshenko, in his well-known memoir «My Recollections of the Distant Past (1901–1914)». He devoted particularly detailed attention to Lviv professor's stay in St. Petersburg in late spring and summer of 1906. Recalling that time, Doroshenko noted: «Hrushevskyi was regarded by all of us as the leader of the Ukrainian national movement in Russia. His great scholarly and civic merits, his extraordinary organisational talent, earned him immense authority and profound respect. In our eyes, he was a symbol of all-Ukrainian unity; his word at that time was law for us. He was then at the height of his powers, full of energy and broad plans. With Hrushevskyi's arrival in St. Petersburg, everyone submitted to him unconditionally, and he became the ideological leader both of the editorial board of «Ukrainskii Vestnik» and of the Ukrainian Parliamentary Community»²¹. This passage subsequently became widely cited in studies devoted to Mykhailo Hrushevskyi.

Some attention to Lviv twenty-year period of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's life and activity was also devoted by the aforementioned Mykola Kovalevskyi in his well-known memoir «At the Sources of the Struggle». As one of Lviv professors' collaborators at the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the memoirist was among the first in historiography to point to the significant influence of «Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk» on the growing interest in politics among both Galician and Dnipro-region youth. At the same time, he repeatedly emphasised the considerable authority enjoyed by the head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society within student circles: «Students admired Hrushevskyi and held him in great affection, for he was the first university professor to take an interest in the life of the youth and to participate in it through his counsel. Indeed, it was he who took care of establishing a student aid fund and organising a public collection in its support»²².

Conclusions. The material presented allows us to conclude that Ukrainian diaspora intellectuals during the second half of the 1940s through the first half of the 1960s demonstrated sustained and intensive interest in Lviv period of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's socio-political service. Overall, interpretations of the scholar's public initiatives were predominantly favourable, as historians consistently emphasised the unifying (sobornist) imperative underlying both the socio-political and the cultural-scholarly activities of the author of *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. In their reconstructions of Hrushevskyi's political biography, however, diaspora Ukrainian studies were largely not original, as they generally relied on the historiographical tradition of jubilee and memoir-based Hrushevskyi studies produced during the first third of the twentieth century. At the same time, diaries and memoirs of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's contemporaries who were able to emigrate to the West in the postwar period introduced a substantial amount of new factual material and original interpretive models. Moreover, the dynamic development of Ukrainian social sciences and humanities in the free world encouraged historians to engage in continual reassessment of classical Hrushevskyi studies themes, moving toward their contextual and comparative interpretation. As a result, for example, an interpretation emerged that viewed the publicistic writings of Lviv professor as an effective instrument of national and cultural education for Ukrainians divided by imperial borders. Thus, the historiographical achievements of the postwar two decades made possible the emergence of Hrushevskyi studies as an interdisciplinary field in the year marking the centenary of the Great Ukrainian.

¹ А. Атаманенко, *Українське історичне товариство: ідеї, постаті, діяльність (1965–1991)* [Ukrainian Historical Association: Ideas, Individuals, Activities (1965–1991)], Острог, Вид-во Національного університету «Острозька академія», 2010, с. 503–527.

² В. Тельвак, *Вивчення історико-теоретичної спадщини Михайла Грушевського в історіографії української діаспори (1939–1990 рр.)* [Study of the Historical and Theoretical Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in the Historiography of the Ukrainian Diaspora (1939–1990)], in «Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична», 2000, вип. 35–36, с. 354–366; В. Тельвак, *Теоретико-методологічні підстави історичних поглядів Михайла Грушевського (кінець XIX – початок XX століття)* [Theoretical and Methodological Bases of Historical Views of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi (End of the 19th – the Beginning of the 20th Century)], Дрогобич, Вимір, 2002, с. 13–41; В. Тельвак, М. Сабінський, «Бої за Грушевського»: доба Української революції в дискусіях діаспорних інтелектуалів повоєнного двадцятиліття [«Battles for Hrushevskyi»: Era of Ukrainian Revolution in Diaspora Intellectuals Discussions of Post-War Twenty Years], in «Емінак», 2022, вип. 1 (37), с. 100–109; В.В. Тельвак,

- В.П. Тельвак, *Сучасне грушевськознавство: здобутки, втрати, перспективи* [Modern Hrushevskiy Studies: Gains, Losses, Prospects], in «Український історичний журнал», 2021, № 5, с. 4–16.
- ³ В. Міяковський, *До біографії М. Грушевського (Студентські роки 1886–1890)* [To the Biography of M. Hrushevskiy (Student Years 1886–1890)], in «Краківські вісті», 1944, ч. 69, с. 2–3.
- ⁴ В. Дорошенко, *Життя й діяльність Михайла Грушевського* [Life and Work of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy], in «Михайло Грушевський. Вибрані праці видано з нагоди 25-річчя з дня його смерті (1934–1959)», Нью-Йорк, Накладом Гол. Управи ОУРДП в США, 1960, с. 12; В. Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's Creative Heritage in the Estimations of Contemporaries (End of the XIX – 30s of the XX Century)], Київ–Дрогобич, Вимір, 2008, с. 356–405.
- ⁵ М. Андрусак, *Михайло Грушевський (У 20-ліття смерті батька сьогочасної української історіографії)* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy (On the 20th Anniversary of the Death of the Father of Modern Ukrainian Historiography)], in «Свобода», 1954, ч. 227, с. 2.
- ⁶ В. Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)*, с. 356–405.
- ⁷ М. Кордуба, *Михайло Грушевський* [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy], in «Краківські вісті. Тиждень», 1941, ч. 39, с. 6.
- ⁸ М. Ковалевський, *При джерелах боротьби* [At the Sources of Struggle], Іннсбрук, Накладом Марії Ковалевської, 1960, с. 80.
- ⁹ М. Андрусак, *Михайло Грушевський*, с. 2.
- ¹⁰ Я. Пеленський, *Українська національна ідея у світлі творів Михайла Грушевського та В'ячеслава Липинського* [Ukrainian National Idea in the Light of Works by Mykhailo Hrushevskiy and Viacheslav Lypynskiy], Київ, Наш формат, 2019, с. 98.
- ¹¹ Я. Пеленський, *Українська національна ідея у світлі творів Михайла Грушевського та В'ячеслава Липинського*, с. 27.
- ¹² В. Дорошенко, *М. Грушевський – громадський діяч, політик і публіцист* [M. Hrushevskiy – Public Figure, Politician and Publicist], in «Овид», 1957, № 6, с. 17.
- ¹³ Я. Пеленський, *Українська національна ідея у світлі творів Михайла Грушевського та В'ячеслава Липинського*, с. 90–96.
- ¹⁴ П. Ковалів, *Грушевський і українська мова* [Hrushevskiy and the Ukrainian Language], in «Україна», 1950, ч. 3, с. 150.
- ¹⁵ В. Дорошенко, *Життя й діяльність Михайла Грушевського*, с. 18.
- ¹⁶ В. Дорошенко, *М. Грушевський – громадський діяч, політик і публіцист*, с. 17.
- ¹⁷ В. Тельвак, *Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття)*, с. 356–405.
- ¹⁸ М. Кордуба, *Михайло Грушевський*, с. 6.
- ¹⁹ Юр. Сірий, *Київ (Уривок з споминів)* [Kyiv (Excerpt From Memories)], in «Літературно-науковий збірник», 1946, ч. 1, с. 45–77; Ю. Сірий, *Велетень української науки (уривок зі спогадів про М.С. Грушевського)* [The Giant of Ukrainian Science (Excerpt From the Memoirs of M.S. Hrushevskiy)], in «Україна», 1949, ч. 2, с. 78–84.
- ²⁰ І. Раковський, *Проф. Михайло Грушевський у Львові* [Prof. Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in Lviv], in «Альманах УНСоюзу на 1952 рік», 1952, с. 82–87.
- ²¹ Д. Дорошенко, *Мої спомини про давнє минуле (1901–1914)* [My Memories of the Ancient Past (1901–1914)], Вінніпег, Манітоба, 1949, с. 83.
- ²² М. Ковалевський, *При джерелах боротьби* [At the Sources of Struggle], с. 79.

References

- Andrusiak M., Mykhailo Hrushevskiy (U 20-littia smerty batka sohochasnoi ukrainskoi istoriografii) [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy (On the 20th Anniversary of the Death of the Father of Modern Ukrainian Historiography)], in «Svoboda», 1954, ch. 227, s. 2.
- Atamanenko A., Ukrainske istorychne tovarystvo: idey, postaty, diialnist (1965–1991) [Ukrainian Historical Association: Ideas, Individuals, Activities (1965–1991)], Ostroh, Vyd-vo Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia», 2010, 672 s.
- Doroshenko D., Moi spomyny pro davnie mynule (1901–1914) [My Memories of the Ancient Past (1901–1914)], Vinnipeh, Manitoba, 1949, 167 s.
- Doroshenko V., M. Hrushevskiy – hromadskiy diiach, polityk i publitsyst [M. Hrushevskiy – Public Figure, Politician and Publicist], in «Ovyd», 1957, № 6, s. 15–19.
- Doroshenko V., Zhyttia y diialnist Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Life and Work of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy], in «Mykhailo Hrushevskiy. Vybrani pratsi vydano z nahody 25-richchia z dnia yoho smerti (1934–1959)», Niu-York, Nakladom Hol. Upravy OURDP v SSHA, 1960, s. 11–30.
- Korduba M., Mykhailo Hrushevskiy [Mykhailo Hrushevskiy], in «Krakivski visti. Tyzhnevyyk», 1941, ch. 39, s. 5–6.
- Kovalevskiy M., Pry dzherelakh borotby [At the Sources of Struggle], Innsbruk, Nakladom Marii Kovalevskoi, 1960, 717 s.
- Kovaliv P., Hrushevskiy i ukrainska mova [Hrushevskiy and the Ukrainian Language], in «Ukraina», 1950, ch. 3, s. 150–155.

9. Miiakovskiy V., Do biohrafii M. Hrushevskoho (Studentski roky 1886–1890) [To the Biography of M. Hrushevskyi (Student Years 1886–1890)], in «Krakivski visti», 1944, ch. 69, s. 2–3.
10. Pelenskiy Ya., Ukrainska natsionalna ideia u svitli tvoriv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho ta Viacheslava Lypynskoho [Ukrainian National Idea in the Light of Works by Mykhailo Hrushevskyi and Viacheslav Lypynskyi], Kyiv, Nash format, 2019, 256 s.
11. Rakovskiy I., Prof. Mykhailo Hrushevskyi u Lvovi [Prof. Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in Lviv], in «Almanakh UNSoiuzu na 1952 rik», 1952, s. 82–87.
12. Telvak V., Sabinskyi M., «Boi za Hrushevskoho»: doba Ukrainskoi revoliutsii v dyskusiiakh diaspornykh intelektualiv povoiennoho dvadtsiatylittia [«Battles for Hrushevskyi»: Era of Ukrainian Revolution in Diaspora Intellectuals Discussions of Post-War Twenty Years], in «Eminak», 2022, vyp. 1 (37), s. 100–109.
13. Telvak V., Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorichnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevskoho (kinets XIX – pochatok XX stolittia) [Theoretical and Methodological Bases of Historical Views of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi (End of the 19th – the Beginning of the 20th Century)], Drohobych, Vymir, 2002, 236 s.
14. Telvak V., Tvorchyia spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykh (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's Creative Heritage in the Estimations of Contemporaries (End of the XIX – 30s of the XX Century)], Kyiv–Drohobych, Vymir, 2008, 494 s.
15. Telvak V., Vychennia istoriko-teoretychnoi spadshchyny Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v istoriografii ukrainskoi diaspory (1939–1990 rr.) [Study of the Historical and Theoretical Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in the Historiography of the Ukrainian Diaspora (1939–1990)], in «Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Serii istorichna», 2000, vyp. 35–36, s. 354–366.
16. Telvak V.V., Telvak V.P., Suchasne hrushevskoznavstvo: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy [Modern Hrushevskyi Studies: Gains, Losses, Prospects], in «Ukrainskyi istorichnyi zhurnal, 2021, № 5, s. 4–16.
17. Yu. Siryi, Veleten ukrainskoi nauky (uryvok zi spohadiv pro M.S. Hrushevskoho) [The Giant of Ukrainian Science (Excerpt From the Memoirs of M.S. Hrushevskyi)], in «Ukraina», 1949, ch. 2, s. 78–84.
18. Yur. Siryi, Kyiv (Uryvok z spomyniv) [Kyiv (Excerpt From Memories)], in «Literaturno-naukovyi zbirnyk», 1946, ch. 1, s. 45–77.