UDC 94(477)«1933/1939»:327
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/2307-7778/2026.2.13

Taras MALYNOVSKYI
PhD Student at the Department of History of Ukraine
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University,
2 Kotsiubynskoho Street, Chernivtsi, Ukraine, 58012 (tarasmalynovskyy@gmail.com)

Тарас МАЛИНОВСЬКИЙ
аспірант кафедри історії України
Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича,
вул. Коцюбинського, 2, м. Чернівці, Україна, 58012 (tarasmalynovskyy@gmail.com)

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7843-6399

ROMAN SMAL-STOTSKY'S POLITICAL JOURNALISM IN 1933–1939 AS AN IMPORTANT ASPECT OF HIS POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Abstract. The purpose of the article *is to reconstruct the structure of Roman Smal-Stotsky's political journalism between 1933 and 1939 and to establish its place within the system of his political work.* ***The research methodology*** *combines classical source criticism, historical discourse analysis and conceptual history; the material was obtained through a continuous examination of the digitised run of the Warsaw weekly Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński.* ***The scientific novelty*** *lies in treating Smal-Stotsky's journalism of these years as a single body of work distributed across three platforms – the Paris weekly Tryzub, the publishing programme of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, and Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński, with an additional outlet in the French-language Prométhée – and in introducing into scholarly circulation his specific interventions of 1933 together with documented evidence of the debate they provoked.* ***Conclusions.*** *The chosen period coincides with the years of the author's greatest institutional weight, when he simultaneously held a professorship at the University of Warsaw, served as secretary and editor of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute, and chaired the Warsaw Prometheus Club, having come to all of this from the post of envoy and plenipotentiary minister of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Berlin. His journalism was organised around five recurring thematic clusters and several leading discourses – civilisational, representative and moral. It performed the tasks of agenda-setting, narrative formation and coalition-building, that is, the very tasks he had previously carried out in diplomatic service, and it may therefore be regarded as an early form of public diplomacy conducted on behalf of a stateless political community.*

Key words: *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński, political journalism of the Ukrainian interwar emigration, Prometheism, public diplomacy, Roman Smal-Stotsky, Tryzub, Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw.*

ПУБЛІЦИСТИКА РОМАНА СМАЛЬ-СТОЦЬКОГО 1933–1939 РОКІВ ЯК ВАЖЛИВИЙ АСПЕКТ ЙОГО ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ

Анотація. Мета статті *полягає у тому, щоб реконструювати структуру публіцистичної діяльності Романа Смаль-Стоцького (1893–1969) у 1933–1939 рр. і показати її місце в системі його політичної праці. Обґрунтовано вибір хронологічних меж: на цей відтинок припадає період найбільшої інституційної ваги автора, коли він одночасно обіймав професуру у Варшавському університеті, посади секретаря і редактора Українського наукового інституту та головував у варшавському клубі «Прометей», прийшовши до цього з посади посла і вповноваженого міністра УНР у Берліні, яку обіймав до ліквідації посольства 1923 р.* ***Методологія дослідження*** *поєднує класичну джерелознавчу критику, історичний дискурс-аналіз та історію понять. Матеріал здобуто суцільним переглядом оцифрованого комплекту варшавського тижневика «Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński», що зберігається у відкритому доступі, з відновленням пагінації за колонтитулами і датування за тижневою шкалою випусків.* ***Наукова новизна*** *полягає у тому, що публіцистичний корпус Р. Смаль-Стоцького 1933–1939 рр. уперше розглянуто як системне ціле, розподілене між трьома платформами – паризьким*

«Тризубом», видавничою програмою Українського наукового інституту у Варшаві та «Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński» з додатковим виходом на французький «Prométhée». До наукового обігу введено конкретні його виступи 1933 р. і документально простежено полеміку, яку вони спричинили, – від сатиричного випаду під псевдонімом «Kos» у червневому числі до відгуків Станіслава Лося і Якуба Гоффмана в липні та серпні. ***Висновки.*** *Корпус структурований п'ятьма наскрізними тематичними кластерами і кількома провідними дискурсами: цивілізаційним, представницьким і моральним. Публіцистика у цей період виконувала завдання встановлення порядку денного, формування наративу і коаліційного будівництва, тобто ті самі, які автор раніше виконував на дипломатичній службі. Показово, що висунута ним у липні 1933 р. пропозиція звести за одним столом польських і українських учених за кілька місяців дістала інституційну форму: у грудні того ж року в Українському науковому інституті засновано Польсько-українську комісію, доповідь про цілі якої виголосив він сам, а секретарем комісії обрали також його. Це дає змогу розглядати його публіцистику як ранню форму публічної дипломатії бездержавної політичної спільноти.*

Ключові слова: *прометеїзм, публічна дипломатія, Роман Смаль-Стоцький, Тризуб, українська міжвоєнна публіцистика, Український науковий інститут у Варшаві, Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński.*

Problem statement. The political history of the interwar Ukrainian emigration is increasingly treated in recent scholarship as a field of activity in its own right, rather than as a catalogue of formal diplomatic failures. When the government-in-exile of the Ukrainian People's Republic lost international recognition in 1923, the political work of its former members did not cease; it moved into new forms, among which journalism came to occupy a leading place. Yet the habit of reading the emigration's published output either as a literary phenomenon or as raw material for biographical portraits has obscured its properly political function. This is particularly true of Roman Smal-Stotsky (1893–1969) – a former envoy and plenipotentiary minister of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Berlin, later the long-time secretary and editor of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, and one of the central figures of the Promethean movement – who between 1933 and 1939 carried on systematic journalistic work simultaneously on three platforms: the Paris weekly Tryzub, the publications of the Institute, and the Polish-Ukrainian weekly Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński, with a further outlet in the French-language bulletin Prométhée. The uncertainty surrounding his place in the scholarship is compounded by persistent confusion with his father, the linguist Stepan Smal-Stotsky, which leads either to the attribution of the father's philological work to the son or to the neglect of the son's independent political profile.

The relevance of this perspective is connected with the current interest in the strategies of stateless political communities that resort to public diplomacy and soft power in the absence of conventional state representation.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The historiography of the interwar Ukrainian political emigration has gradually moved beyond the view of this phenomenon as a closed episode of «failed diplomacies», treating it instead as an autonomous field of political, intellectual and informational work. The institutional environment of the State Centre of the Ukrainian People's Republic in exile is outlined in the monograph of V. Troshchynskyi [1], while the historiography of the question as a whole has been summarised by V. Yablonskyi [2]. The scholarly and educational activity of the Ukrainian emigration in interwar Poland, including the setting in which the Ukrainian Scientific Institute operated, has been surveyed by A. Portnov [3]. The wider international context of the Ukrainian question within the Polish-German-Soviet triangle is analysed in detail in the fundamental monograph of R. Torzecki [4]. On the western side, T. Snyder returned to scholarly attention the theme of Promethean cooperation between Polish and Ukrainian figures and their dealings with British and French intelligence [5].

A separate and, for the present subject, closest body of work consists of biographical studies. The main facts of Smal-Stotsky's life were recorded in the essay by V. Radzykevych, published in the

Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1963 for the scholar's seventieth birthday [6, p. 11]. His figure has been examined most consistently by O. Dobrzhanskyi: first in a biographical essay written jointly with V. Danylenko [8], later in a collective work on the struggle of the Bukovinians for Ukrainian statehood, in which a separate chapter is devoted to Roman [9], and finally in a dedicated study of Smal-Stotsky's ideological convictions as a figure of the Promethean movement in Poland [10]. A recent synthesis of the history of the Smal-Stotsky family, in which a separate section is given to Roman on the basis of archival material, has been offered by O. Dobrzhanskyi and P. Tsmukh [7, p. 39–40]. To this group belong encyclopaedic and reference entries, as well as obituaries and memoir publications that appeared in the émigré press after his death in 1969.

These works provide a reliable factual outline of the biography and delineate Smal-Stotsky's ideological profile. His journalism, however, interests scholars mainly as a source for reconstructing his views, not as a subject in its own right. The question of how this body of texts was actually organised – across which publications it was distributed, according to what rules it was built for each of them, and what response it met in the milieu it addressed – has not so far been posed. Neither as a whole nor in its distribution across platforms has the journalistic output of 1933–1939 been studied separately. It is this gap that defines the novelty of the present study.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to reconstruct the structure of Smal-Stotsky's political journalism in 1933–1939 and to show its place within the system of his political work. Four practical tasks follow from this: to justify the chosen chronological boundaries and to establish the author's political standing at the moment when he began this activity; to describe the three principal platforms of his journalistic work; to identify the thematic clusters of the corpus; and to characterise the leading discourses through which his argument was constructed. A separate task is the introduction into scholarly circulation of specific journalistic interventions established through the digitised run of Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński.

Presentation of the main research material. Chronological boundaries and Smal-Stotsky's political standing. The choice of the years 1933 to 1939 requires explanation, since Smal-Stotsky's journalistic work covers a wider span. The ground for narrowing it is not the convenience of the material but the logic of the biography.

Smal-Stotsky came to Warsaw with a diplomatic record behind him. Having received his doctorate at the University of Munich in 1915, he worked during the First World War in the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, including in the prisoner-of-war camps, and from 1916, after his election to the organisation's central leadership, settled in Berlin. In December 1918 he was appointed envoy of the West Ukrainian People's Republic to the German government; after the union of 1919 he became counsellor of the combined legation of the Ukrainian People's Republic, and from 1921 its envoy and plenipotentiary minister in Berlin. He held that post until the legation was wound up in 1923, that is, until the moment when the government-in-exile lost international recognition [7, p. 39].

It is precisely here that the line falls after which his political work changes its form. Deprived of state representation, he turned first to academic work: in 1923–1924 he taught at the Ukrainian Free University in Prague, and in 1923 and 1925 he studied at the Slavonic institute of the University of Cambridge and lectured at colleges in London and Cambridge. From 1926 he settled definitively in Warsaw.

The Warsaw period was not uniform. Its second half differs from the first in that three institutional positions coincided within it: a professorship at the University of Warsaw, work at the Ukrainian Scientific Institute as secretary and editor, and the chairmanship of the Warsaw Prometheus Club, which Smal-Stotsky headed from 1928 to 1939 [7, p. 39–40]. At various times he also served in the government-in-exile as minister of culture, deputy minister and minister of foreign affairs, and deputy prime minister. In other words, in the second half of the 1930s three structures stood behind

his public word – a university chair, a research institute and a political club – while he himself had the experience of a plenipotentiary representative of a state.

The lower boundary is set by the year 1933. It saw the culmination of the famine in Ukraine, while in Germany the National Socialists came to power; both circumstances altered the themes and the addressee of his interventions. The upper boundary is set by 1939: with the outbreak of war the Warsaw institutions ceased to function, and Smal-Stotsky moved to Prague, where he taught at Charles University until 1945 [7, p. 40]. The years 1933–1939 are therefore not an arbitrarily excised segment but the period in which his institutional weight and his public activity coincide at their highest point.

The three-platform architecture of his journalistic work. The corpus of Smal-Stotsky's journalism for 1933–1939 is structurally distributed across three principal platforms, each with its own editorial policy, audience and political function; to these is added a marginal fourth channel, the French-language bulletin Prométhée.

The first platform was the Paris weekly Tryzub, the principal organ of the State Centre of the Ukrainian People's Republic in exile, which appeared in Paris from 1925 to 1940 [11]. Tryzub served as the representative organ of statehood in exile, addressed above all to the Ukrainian diaspora in France, Czechoslovakia and the western Ukrainian lands. Smal-Stotsky's contributions here take the form of analytical surveys of Soviet nationality policy, responses to European political events, reviews and commentaries. The rhetoric is politically explicit, addressed to a reader who already stands within the national-statehood discourse, requires no elementary explanation of terms, and accepts arguments about Ukraine as a political subject.

The second platform was the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, founded in 1930, in which Smal-Stotsky held the posts of secretary and editor [3; 7, p. 39] and which became in practice the academic and political centre of Ukrainian representation in interwar Poland. The Institute published the series Works of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute, organised public lectures and prepared papers that generically belong to the borderland between an academic study and a political memorandum. Its audience consisted of Polish and European academic and political elites, attendees of public events, and readers of scholarly publications. This platform demanded a different register: detached and scholarly, resting on sources, documents and linguistic and cultural argument, which turned a political thesis into the outcome of an academic conclusion.

The third platform was the Polish-Ukrainian weekly Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński, published in Warsaw from 1932 to 1938 under the editorship of Włodzimierz Bączkowski. The publication emerged as an intellectual tribune of the "third line" of Polish-Ukrainian understanding, outside the official channels of the National Democrats and of the Promethean wing of Polish politics [4]. Here Smal-Stotsky's journalism is dialogic and polemical in character: the articles address the Polish intelligentsia directly, respond to its claims and misgivings, and argue for a common anti-Soviet perspective. The generic range comprises articles, polemical replies and current commentary on Ukrainian and Soviet politics.

How this platform actually worked is best shown by the polemic that unfolded in the pages of the bulletin in the summer of 1933. It began over a trifle. In the issue of 25 June a feuilletonist writing under the pseudonym «Kos» ridiculed a review by Father Dzerowycz of Ivan Fylypchak's book Kulchytsky, the Hero of Vienna, published in the Lviv periodical Dzwony. The satirical piece, entitled Apostoł pod Wiedniem, mocked the very notion that the glory of the victor at Vienna might be taken from Sobieski in favour of the Ukrainians [12, p. 11].

Two weeks later, on 9 July, Smal-Stotsky replied [13, p. 5–6]. His open letter to the editor, Ukraińcy pod Wiedniem, is built not on indignation but on evidence. He refers to a lecture by I. Nimchuk summarised in issues 17 and 18 of the Lviv Nova Zoria, quotes Sobieski's letter to his wife – «ja o niczem tak nie myślę, jak o Kozakach» – lists the Cossack colonels present at Vienna,

points to the inscription «Rex Poloniae – Dux Ukrainae» on the Viennese monument to the king, and encloses with his letter photographs of old engravings from his own collection.

Two things here are notable. The author stresses that he speaks not as a professional historian: «nie jestem historykiem, a filologiem» [13, p. 6]. And instead of resting content with a polemical advantage, he puts forward a concrete proposal – that the editors invite one eminent Ukrainian and one Polish scholar to establish the historical truth. He thus moves a newspaper dispute into the realm of institutional procedure.

The intervention did not close the discussion but propelled it. Already on 30 July the Polish publicist Stanisław Łoś joined in with extended reflections on Sobieski's own descent and with a call to write the history of Ukraine from the standpoint of statehood continuity [14, p. 4–5]. On 20 August Jakób Hoffman, writing from Cracow, adduced General M. Kukiel's figures on the numbers and financing of the Zaporozhian troops at Vienna, drawn from the Sejm accounts and contemporary military reports [15, p. 5]. Hoffman explicitly calls this «the discussion under way in the pages of the Bulletin», supports Łoś's call, and concludes that Smal-Stotsky's wishes have «in the main been realised».

Thus, from the end of June to the end of August 1933 the Polish-Ukrainian weekly conducted a public discussion spread over four issues, in which our author was the second voice in sequence and the most consequential in its effects. He alone among the participants did not merely argue about facts but proposed a mechanism for establishing them.

And in December of the same year the bulletin reported that an organisational meeting of the Polish-Ukrainian Commission had taken place at the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw (rendered in the Polish text of the bulletin as U. I. N., that is, Ukraiński Instytut Naukowy) [16, p. 9]. The meeting was opened by the president of the Institute, O. Lototsky; the report on the aims of the commission was delivered by Smal-Stotsky; M. Handelsman, M. Korduba, S. Szober and L. Wasilewski took part in the discussion. M. Handelsman was elected chairman of the commission and Smal-Stotsky its secretary; the commission worked in two sections, historical and linguistic-philological, and in the second of these he served as deputy chairman.

The sources do not attest any direct causal link between the July proposal and the November meeting, and we do not undertake to establish one. The proximity, however, is evident: what the author publicly demanded in a newspaper polemic acquired an institutional form a few months later – with the same division into historical and philological areas – and he himself entered that structure as its secretary. The episode shows the mechanics of the platform in miniature: a satirical sally, a substantial reply, the taking up of the discussion on the Polish side, and the transition into the realm of organised cooperation.

The marginal fourth channel was the French-language bulletin Prométhée, the organ of the Promethean movement, which appeared in Paris from 1926 to 1938. Ukrainian material here was coordinated with representatives of the other Promethean peoples – Georgians, Azerbaijanis, the mountain peoples of the North Caucasus, Crimean Tatars – and Smal-Stotsky acted as one of the key participants in the Ukrainian section.

The distribution across three platforms was not accidental. Each platform corresponded to its own segment of the audience and its own political function, and their simultaneous operation made it possible for the Ukrainian position to be present at once in émigré circles, in the academic milieu and in the Polish public sphere.

Thematic clusters of the corpus. The thematic range of Smal-Stotsky's journalism in 1933–1939 is organised around five recurring clusters, present on all three platforms and redistributed among them only in proportion.

The first cluster is the critique of Soviet nationality policy and of the famine of 1932–1933. As early as 1933–1934 Smal-Stotsky records the theme of famine in Ukraine as evidence of the deliberate

destruction of the peasant foundation of the nation; the peak of thematic intensity falls in 1936, when his separate book The Ukrainian Language in Soviet Ukraine appeared, with a documentary survey of linguistic Russification as a component of the same strategy [17]. This cluster carries at once an informational and a legal-political function: making material public for the western reader and preparing the ground for arguments in international law.

The second cluster is Promethean federalism and the project of liberating the non-Russian peoples of the former empire. The arguments rest on the thesis of the multi-ethnic character of the USSR and of a Ukrainian state as the key to its dismantling. Publications of this cluster are most heavily concentrated in Prométhée and in Tryzub, but appear regularly in Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński as well, in the form of a dialogue with Polish Prometheans.

The third cluster is Polish-Ukrainian understanding. It is most densely represented in Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński, which is natural given the editorial line of a publication that declared itself a tribune of understanding outside official party channels [4]. Documentarily this cluster is traceable in the episode of 1933 described above: the author seeks common ground not in current politics but in shared historical memory, and it is on that ground that he advances his proposal of institutional cooperation [13, p. 5–6]. It is characteristic that the object of understanding here is the past rather than a programme for the future.

The fourth cluster is language and cultural identity as a political resource. Smal-Stotsky's linguistic training tells here. Language is interpreted not as a purely philological phenomenon but as an instrument of national and political subjecthood: the deformation of a language is the deformation of that subjecthood, and the defence of a language is the defence of the political framework of the nation.

The fifth cluster is Ukraine within the European civilisational space. The journalism of this cluster articulates the thesis of Ukraine's historical and cultural belonging to Europe, of Ukraine's role as the eastern outpost of European civilisation, and consequently of the stake that European states hold in the Ukrainian question. This is audience-strategic argument, directed at the Polish and western European reader.

Journalism within the system of political activity. Four conceptual resources serve as the theoretical support for interpreting the corpus: the notion of public diplomacy in J. Melissen's version [18], J. Nye's concept of soft power [19], R. Koselleck's historical semantics of concepts [20], and R. Wodak's critical discourse analysis [21]. Together these instruments make it possible to view journalism not as a literary genre but as a functional equivalent of political communication in conditions where the conventional channels of a state are unavailable.

After 1923, when the government-in-exile lost international recognition, the Ukrainian political emigration faced a structural challenge: how to continue working with European governments and publics without the status of a state. The answer lay in a functional redefinition of journalism: instead of accompanying diplomacy with information, it took over part of the diplomatic tasks directly – speaking to foreign elites on behalf of a stateless political community. For Smal-Stotsky this transition was particularly organic, since he made it with the experience of a plenipotentiary representative of a state in Berlin behind him.

Smal-Stotsky's journalism in the period under study performs three such tasks. The first is agenda-setting: the Ukrainian question is systematically introduced into European political discourse as a question of the first order rather than an internal affair of Poland or of the USSR. The second is narrative formation: the famine is presented as the deliberate destruction of a nation, Soviet nationality policy as systematic ethnocide, and the Promethean project as the natural framework of liberation. The third is coalition-building: journalistic texts open space for joint action with Polish Prometheans, with Caucasian and Turkic emigres, and with parts of French and British political circles.

Several leading discourses run through the entire corpus, lending scattered texts the appearance of a single political line. The most conspicuous is the civilisational: Ukraine is consistently inscribed

within the European cultural and legal space, while Bolshevik Russia is presented as a phenomenon of a different order, alien to that space by its very nature. The second discourse is representative: the right to speak on Ukraine's behalf is assigned to the political emigration and denied to Soviet institutions, which, on his argument, merely simulate Ukrainian statehood. The third is moral: the choice between independence and dependence is presented not as a question of political expediency but as a question of dignity, and it is in this register that his most emotionally charged texts are written.

These discourses do not exist in isolation from one another. They overlap, reinforce one another, and together give the reader a ready framework within which each new publication is recognised as a continuation of those preceding it.

The key characteristic of this corpus as public diplomacy is its addressivity: it works simultaneously with three different target audiences – the Ukrainian diaspora, the Polish elite, and the international academic and political milieu – while retaining semantic unity, which distinguishes it favourably from propagandistic models oriented towards a single addressee. In this sense Smal-Stotsky's journalistic practice of 1933–1939 may be regarded as an early form of the public diplomacy of a stateless community, anticipating the theoretical conceptualisation of the phenomenon by at least half a century.

Conclusions. The reconstruction of Roman Smal-Stotsky's political journalism in 1933–1939 permits the following conclusions. First, the chosen period coincides with the years of the author's greatest institutional weight: in these years the University of Warsaw, the Ukrainian Scientific Institute and the Prometheus Club stood behind him simultaneously, while he came to journalism with the experience of envoy and plenipotentiary minister of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Berlin. Second, his corpus of this period possesses a stable three-platform architecture – the Paris Tryzub, the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, and the Polish-Ukrainian Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński with an additional outlet in Prométhée – in which each platform performs a specific function, and their simultaneous operation ensures the presence of the Ukrainian position at once in the émigré, academic and Polish discursive spaces. Third, the corpus is structured by five recurring thematic clusters and by several leading discourses – civilisational, representative and moral – which lend individual publications the appearance of a single political line. Fourth, journalism constituted an important aspect of his political activity: it performed the tasks of agenda-setting, narrative formation and coalition-building, that is, the same tasks he had previously carried out in diplomatic service. In this sense it may be regarded as an early form of public diplomacy on behalf of a stateless political community.

The prospects for further research within the author's series comprise two subsequent subjects: Smal-Stotsky's scholarly and journalistic activity in the United States after 1947, and his work during the Ukrainian Revolution and the first post-revolutionary years, 1918–1929. A separate line is a comparative analysis of the discursive strategies of Ukrainian émigré journalism alongside those of other stateless communities of the Promethean circle, which would make it possible to identify shared typological regularities of early public diplomacy in the interwar period.

The Use of Artificial Intelligence. While preparing this article, artificial intelligence tools were used exclusively for language editing, grammar checking, translation, or other supporting tasks, without using the content they generated as the results of academic work.

Bibliography

1. Трощинський В. П. Міжвоєнна українська еміграція в Європі як історичне і соціально-політичне явище. Київ : Інтел, 1994. 259 с.

2. Яблонський В. Державний центр УНР в екзилі у 1920–1992 рр.: історіографія проблеми. *Український історичний журнал*. 2020. № 4. С. 155–165. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2020.04.155

3. Портнов А. В. Наука у вигнанні: наукова і освітня діяльність української еміграції в міжвоєнній Польщі *(1919–1939)*. Харків : ХІФТ, 2008. 256 с.

4. Torzecki R. *Kwestia ukraińska w polityce III Rzeszy (1933–1945)*. Warszawa : Książka i Wiedza, 1972. 375 s.

5. Snyder T. Sketches from a Secret War: A Polish Artist's Mission to Liberate Soviet Ukraine. New Haven : Yale University Press, 2005. 339 p.

6. Радзикевич В. Професор доктор Роман Смаль-Стоцький. *Записки Наукового товариства ім. Т. Шевченка*. Нью-Йорк ; Париж, 1963. Т. CLXXVII. С. 11–15.

7. Добржанський О., Цьмух П. Родинне дерево Степана Смаль-Стоцького. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету імені Юрія Федьковича. Історія*. 2021. № 2 (54). С. 34–44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31861/hj2021.54.34-44

8. Даниленко В., Добржанський О. Роман Смаль-Стоцький. *Україна XX ст.: культура, ідеологія, політика.* 1999. Вип. 3. С. 51–66.

9. Брицький П., Добржанський О., Юрійчук Є. Буковинці у боротьбі за українську державність (1917–1922 рр.). Чернівці : Золоті литаври, 2007. 483 с.

10. Добржанський О. До питання про ідейні переконання визначного діяча прометеївського руху в Польщі Романа Смаль-Стоцького. *Przegląd Wschodni*. 2021. T. XVI. Z. 2 (62). S. 1–11.

11. Тимошик-Сударикова А. М. Паризький журнал «Тризуб». 1925–1940 роки: формування та функціонування. Київ : Наша культура і наука, 2012. 200 с.

12. Kos. Apostoł pod Wiedniem. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, 1933. R. 2. Nr 8 (25 czerwca). S. 11. URL: https://archive.org/details/jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl.NDIGCZAS095764_1933_008 (дата звернення: 06.09.2026).

13. Smal Stocki R. Ukraińcy pod Wiedniem. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, 1933. R. 2. Nr 10 (9 lipca). S. 5–6. URL: https://archive.org/details/jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl.NDIGCZAS095764_1933_010 (дата звернення: 06.09.2026).

14. Łoś S. Na marginesie zwycięstwa pod Wiedniem. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, 1933. R. 2. Nr 13 (30 lipca). S. 4–5. URL: https://archive.org/details/jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl.NDIGCZAS095764_1933_013 (дата звернення: 06.09.2026).

15. Hoffman J. Jeszcze na temat Sobieskiego pod Wiedniem. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, 1933. R. 2. Nr 16 (20 sierpnia). S. 5. URL: https://archive.org/details/jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl.NDIGCZAS095764_1933_016 (дата звернення: 06.09.2026).

16. Nowa Komisja w U. I. N. Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński. Warszawa, 1933. R. 2. Nr 31 (5 grudnia). S. 9. URL: https://archive.org/details/jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl.NDIGCZAS095764_1933_031 (дата звернення: 06.09.2026).

17. Смаль-Стоцький Р. Українська мова в совєтській Україні. Варшава : Український науковий інститут, 1936. 272 с. (Праці Українського наукового інституту).

18. Melissen J. (ed.). The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 221 p.

19. Nye J. S. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. New York : PublicAffairs, 2004. 191 p.

20. Koselleck R. Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten. Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp, 1979. 389 s.

21. Wodak R., Meyer M. (eds.). Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London : Sage Publications, 2001. 200 p.

References

1. Troshchynskyi, V. P. (1994). *Mizhvoienna ukrainska emihratsiia v Yevropi yak istorychne i sotsialno-politychne yavyshche* [Interwar Ukrainian Emigration in Europe as a Historical and Socio-Political Phenomenon]. Kyiv: Intel, 259 p. [in Ukrainian].

2. Yablonskyi, V. (2020). Derzhavnyi tsentr UNR v ekzyli u 1920–1992 rr.: istoriohrafiia problemy [State Center of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Exile in 1920–1992: Historiography of the Problem]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 4, 155–165. https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2020.04.155 [in Ukrainian].

3. Portnov, A. V. (2008). *Nauka u vyhnanni: naukova i osvitnia diialnist ukrainskoi emihratsii v mizhvoiennii Polshchi (1919–1939)* [Science in Exile: Scholarly and Educational Activity of the Ukrainian Emigration in Interwar Poland]. Kharkiv: KhIFT, 256 p. [in Ukrainian].

4. Torzecki, R. (1972). *Kwestia ukraińska w polityce III Rzeszy (1933–1945)* [The Ukrainian Question in the Policy of the Third Reich]. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 375 p. [in Polish].

5. Snyder, T. (2005). *Sketches from a Secret War: A Polish Artist's Mission to Liberate Soviet Ukraine*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 339 p.

6. Radzykevych, V. (1963). Profesor doktor Roman Smal-Stotskyi [Professor Dr. Roman Smal-Stotsky]. *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka*, CLXXVII, 11–15. [in Ukrainian].

7. Dobrzhanskyi, O., Tsmukh P. (2021). Rodynne derevo Stepana Smal-Stotskoho [The Family Tree of Stepan Smal-Stotsky]. *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho universytetu imeni Yuriia Fedkovycha. Istoriia*, 2 (54), 34–44. https://doi.org/10.31861/hj2021.54.34-44 [in Ukrainian].

8. Danylenko, V., Dobrzhanskyi, O. (1999). Roman Smal-Stotskyi. *Ukraina XX st.: kultura, ideolohiia, polityka* [Ukraine of the 20th Century: Culture, Ideology, Politics], iss. 3. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, pp. 51–66. [in Ukrainian].

9. Brytskyi, P., Dobrzhanskyi, O., Yuriichuk, Ye. (2007). *Bukovyntsi u borotbi za ukrainsku derzhavnist (1917–1922 rr.)* [Bukovinians in the Struggle for Ukrainian Statehood]. Chernivtsi: Zoloti lytavry, 483 p. [in Ukrainian].

10. Dobrzhanskyi, O. (2021). Do pytannia pro ideini perekonannia vyznachnoho diiacha prometeivskoho rukhu v Polshchi Romana Smal-Stotskoho [On the Ideological Convictions of Roman Smal-Stotsky, a Prominent Figure of the Promethean Movement in Poland]. *Przegląd Wschodni*, XVI, no. 2 (62), 1–11. [in Ukrainian].

11. Tymoshyk-Sudarykova, A. M. (2012). *Paryzkyi zhurnal «Tryzub». 1925–1940 roky: formuvannia ta funktsionuvannia* [The Paris Journal «Tryzub», 1925–1940: Formation and Functioning]. Kyiv: Nasha kultura i nauka, 200 p. [in Ukrainian].

12. [Kos]. (1933). Apostoł pod Wiedniem [The Apostle at Vienna]. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, R. 2, nr 8 (25 June), p. 11. [in Polish].

13. Smal Stocki R. (1933). Ukraińcy pod Wiedniem [Ukrainians at Vienna]. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, R. 2, nr 10 (9 July), pp. 5–6. [in Polish].

14. Łoś, S. (1933). Na marginesie zwycięstwa pod Wiedniem [On the Margins of the Victory at Vienna]. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, R. 2, nr 13 (30 July), pp. 4–5. [in Polish].

15. Hoffman, J. (1933). Jeszcze na temat Sobieskiego pod Wiedniem [More on Sobieski at Vienna]. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, R. 2, nr 16 (20 August), p. 5. [in Polish].

16. Nowa Komisja w U. I. N. (1933). [A New Commission at the Ukrainian Scientific Institute]. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński*. Warszawa, R. 2, nr 31 (5 December), p. 9. [in Polish].

17. Smal-Stotskyi, R. (1936). *Ukrainska mova v sovietskii Ukraini* [The Ukrainian Language in Soviet Ukraine]. Warszawa: Ukraiński Instytut Naukowy, 272 p. [in Ukrainian].

18. Melissen, J. (ed.). (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 221 p.

19. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: PublicAffairs, 191 p.

20. Koselleck, R. (1979). *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* [Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 389 p. [in German].

21. Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (eds.). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 200 p.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 26.08.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 16.09.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 13.11.2026

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