

Vitali Telvak

(Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ukraine)

ORCID: 0000-0002-2445-968X

**Igor Hyrych, Vyacheslav Lypynsky: farmer and soldier
(The ratio of democratic and conservative aspects
in his historiosophy), Kyiv 2019, 310 p.**

**[Гирич Ігор, В'ячеслав Липинський: хлібороб і жовнір
(Співвідношення демократичного і консервативного
в його історіософії), Київ 2019, 310 с.]**

The author of the peer-reviewed book, Ihor Hyrych, is well known not only among his fellow historians, but also to a wide circle of Ukrainian audience that is interested in its native past. As one of the few Ukrainian public intellectuals, he is often a guest expert on numerous TV and radio programs. Such popularity of the scholar is conditioned both by the diversity of his interests (Ukrainian socio-political historiography, historical didactics, Kyiv studies, etc.) and by his deep knowledge and original interpretation of events and phenomena of Ukrainian intellectual history of 19th and 20th century. I. Hyrych's creative works are also focused on Lypynsky studies: his numerous critical texts, source publications, analytical and synthetic investigations are a remarkable component of modern studies on the prominent ideologue of Ukrainian conservatism.

However, most of these texts were published at the end of the last century in low-circulation publications which became inaccessible even to researchers a few years ago. Therefore, we, Igor's colleagues and friends, have repeatedly emphasised the need to republish these texts, as he did a few years ago with his studies on M. Hrushevsky. The implementation of these plans was enabled by the "Program for the Development of Priority Research Areas". However, in contrast to the above-mentioned collection of texts about M. Hrushevsky, this time I. Hyrych quite rightly decided not just to collect and systematise his own publications by thematic rubrics, but to creatively rethink and refine his Lypyn-

sky works, presenting them in the form of a monographic study. As a result, the reader received a qualitative intellectual biography of Vyacheslav Lypynsky. The author gave his monograph an interesting title which refers us to one of the self-characteristics of Lypynsky.

The book starts from the detailed "Preface" where I. Hyrych raises several important issues. First of all, he convincingly proves the relevance of the creative heritage of Lypynsky for modern Ukrainians. While somewhat idealising V. Lypynsky, the author gives emphasis to the altruism of the historian, his courage to go against the traditional beliefs and his uncompromising stance in defending Ukrainian state interests. Most politicians of that time and our contemporaries lack this kind of determination. After that, the author gives a brief but comprehensive review of Lypynsky studies, focusing on the monographic elaborations of recent decades and omitting numerous causal texts. While the historiographical review was exhaustive, we would like to rebuke the author for his excessive modesty as he did not mention his own historiographical works, which made his picture of modern Lypynsky studies far from complete. At the end of the introduction, I. Hyrych outlined the task to dialectically combine the factual and interpretive components in the reconstruction of V. Lypynsky's intellectual biography with an emphasis on its pre-war component. At the same time, it is difficult to agree with the author's assurance that the peer-reviewed book belongs to "popular science" genre (p. 18). In our opinion, as we will try to show below, the issues chosen by I. Hyrych require sound knowledge of the socio-political and historiographical contexts of V. Lypynsky's time.

The first part of the monograph "The Republican Conservative: V. Lypynsky before the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921" is devoted to extensive problems of social ideology formation as well as to Lypynsky's historiosophy. First of all, the author presents the biographical outline of the pre-revolutionary period of Lypynsky's life in his studio, quite rightly focusing on little-known problems. Thus, the reader learns about Lypynsky's years of study in Ukraine and abroad, the emergence and complication of health problems, the beginnings of social activity, the peculiarities of educational work, agricultural life on the farm "Rusalivski Chagari" and more. The author clarifies the historian's participation in the publication of the "History of Ukraine-Rus" by Mykola Arkas and the preparation of the work "Nobility in Ukraine". I. Hyrych describes this period in particular detail and he is the one to have initiated this discussion in modern historiography.

After that chapter I. Hyrych reconstructs an important problem "Vyacheslav Lypynsky – a publicist" through the prism of several key topics: relationships with prominent activists of the Dnipro social movement (S. Efremov and B. Yaroshevsky) and cooperation with magazines "Rada" and "Regional Re-

view". Finally, I. Hyrych addresses the purely intellectual component of the period under study, telling about the genesis of the idea and the difficulties with the implementation of the project "Z dziejów Ukrainy" [From the history of Ukraine]. The author concludes the first part of the book with interesting comments on V. Lypynsky's unfinished creative plans. He also mentioned Lypynsky's manuscripts, complete or incomplete, that were never published, disappeared during the revolutionary events and are now considered to be lost.

The author reconstructs the above-mentioned range of problems in wide socio-political and historiographical contexts which were significant for the formation of modern Ukrainian nation of the last third of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. In such a way, the author convincingly presents V. Lypynsky's personal development from a Kyiv grammar school student struggling with self-identification to a "religious missionary of the Ukrainian idea" who was confident in the correctness of his own ideas (p. 34). Another important feature of the section is a successful tracing of the perception of Lypynsky's intellectual innovations. The author also depicts his daily life, not always an attractive one, describing the Ukrainian intellectual more realistically. At the same time, I. Hyrych could not help but fall under the influence of V. Lypynsky's powerful intellectual charisma, somewhat overestimating, in our opinion, the importance of his ideas at that time. Thus, the statement that the study "Z dziejów Ukrainy" "immediately puts him [V. Lypynsky] among the most prominent historians of Ukraine" (p. 40) seems lacking sufficient argumentation. Neither the mentioned perception of Lypynsky's work, nor the discussions of that time among Ukrainian researchers substantiate this statement.

The second part of the monograph is devoted to a comprehensive reconstruction of the political and ideological background of V. Lypynsky's activity in the late XIX and early XX centuries. In this section, I. Hyrych implements the ambitious task of finding out "whether Vyacheslav Kazymyrovych was a 100% conservative and supporter of monarchical power during that period, or whether he changed his views at the beginning of the Ukrainian Revolution in 1917; how conservative thinking and democratic practice were correlated in V. Lypynsky's social ideology" (p. 98). This discussion has lasted for a long time in Lypynsky studies. Defending his own vision, the author again chose a plot approach in clarifying this important problem, recreating the relationship between Lypynsky and representatives of the leading trends of Ukrainian and Polish politics (Ukrainian and Polish National Democrats, Social Democrats, Radicals, Conservatives, etc.). Thus, this part of the study is extremely saturated with factual and original observations. It also reconstructs the genesis of V. Lypynsky's communication with Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Andriy Zhuk, Yevhen Chykalenko and others. Summing up his reflections, I. Hyrych convincingly proves that before

the outbreak of the Ukrainian War for Independence V. Lypynsky consciously associated himself with the democratic movement, as it organically followed from the logic of social and political life of the Dnipro region.

The author analyses these aspects in the broad historiographical context of the period under study, rightly emphasizing the growing sympathy of Lypynsky for the neo-romantic ideology, which gradually won the hearts of intellectuals from Central and Eastern Europe. I. Hyrych's successful attempts to show V. Lypynsky through the eyes of his contemporaries and to find out the peculiarities of the perception of his public service in the Polish and Ukrainian circles are also important. However, the author's statement that M. Hrushevsky, according to V. Lypynsky, was a "producer", because he was "engaged in entrepreneurial activity" in the early twentieth century requires sufficient argumentation (p. 105). We do not know such facts from the biography of the author of "History of Ukraine-Rus".

The third chapter of the peer-reviewed book is devoted to the analysis of socio-political views of V. Lypynsky in 1908–1917 in accordance with the main structural elements of his philosophy of Ukrainian society. In this part, I. Hyrych focused on the following aspects: the problem of correlation between conservative democracy and right-wing Narodnik movement in V. Lypynsky's political constructions, the ratio of class and national aspects in his theory, the presence of populist ideas in the scientist's discourse, his vision of ways to solve the Polish issue in Ukraine. In addition to this, the researcher focused on elucidating the categorical apparatus of state historiosophy, analysing the specifics of the content and articulation of such concepts as "nation", "territorialism" and "independence" in pre-revolutionary times. The author paid the greatest attention to analysing the peculiarities of V. Lypynsky's key concept of the "Ukrainian nobility" and the interpretative metamorphoses that it underwent during the 1900s and 1920s. I. Hyrych demonstrates an excellent knowledge of the broad context of ideological discussions in Central and Eastern Europe.

It is particularly interesting to observe the author's convincing attempt to show state and Narodniks historiosophy not as conflicting philosophies, but as complementary ones. The author presents V. Lypynsky's vision as an important addition to Hrushevsky's traditional scheme of Ukrainian history. (p. 175). I. Hyrych uses perception approach in presenting the raised problems: using various sources, he reproduces the importance of Lypynsky's historiosophical suggestions for the general public. Lypynsky's ideas are demonstrated as relevant both for Polish-Ukrainian / Russian-Ukrainian relations of the first half of the twentieth century and for modern Ukrainians as well. Among the minor mistakes of this part of the book we would like to mention a factual error: in the 19th century there was no Poznan Voivodeship (p. 166), but the Grand Duchy of Poznań.

The last two parts of the book are devoted to the analysis of various issues of life, socio-political and creative activities of V. Lypynsky during the Ukrainian Revolution and in the interwar period. At the beginning, I. Hyrych acquaints the reader with the biographical outline of the last period of Lypynsky's life. He specifically focuses on the years of creative work in Badeg near Graz. The period of V. Lypynsky's diplomatic work is reconstructed in great detail: we learn about the staff of the embassy headed by the historian and his care for the reputation of his subordinates, measures to ratify the famous secret article of the Brest Treaty, the opinion on Kholmshchyna issue and attempts to detain Galician soldiers on the territory of Ukrainian state, search for a difficult compromise with the leaders of "white" Russia, etc. The true achievement of this part is the masterfully reconstructed relations of Lypynsky with Pavlo Skoropadsky, Hetman's entourage in Wannsee, Dmytro Doroshenko, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Stepan Tomashivsky, Dmytro Dontsov, Wilhelm Habsburg (Vasyl Vyshyvanyi).

The fourth chapter focuses on a comprehensive analysis of the work that began the state historiography – "Ukraine at a turning point". In order to avoid an extensive depiction of the content, I. Hyrych followed Lev Bilas and conceptualized five problems which V. Lypynsky interpreted in a new way in Ukrainian historiography for the first time. The author successfully deconstructs the prevailing historiographical stereotypes and shows the common intentions of republican intellectuals and supporters of Hetman historiosophy. I. Hyrych fully substantiates the coexistence of two versions of Ukrainian state philosophy in historiography and political thinking: conservative (Hetman) and democratic (republican).

The researcher has also analysed the source base of Lypynsky's "Ukraine at a turning point", as well as reconstructed a wide perception of this work among Ukrainian intellectuals in exile, in Galicia and in the occupied by Bolsheviks Dnipro region. As a result, I. Hyrych convincingly concludes about trendiness of V. Lypynsky's ideas. However, sometimes the author unjustifiably extrapolates such popularity to the previous pre-war period. Thus, in our opinion, the statement that "I. Kryp'yakevych was under the strong influence of V. Lypynsky even before 1914" is ungrounded (p. 188), because we do not know any historiographical, epistolary and memoir sources to confirm this. A statement that "those were the writings of the conservative V. Lypynsky that had a greater influence on intellectuals than the writings of the democrat M. Hrushevsky" is not convincing enough for us as it lacks a special historiographical study (p. 234).

The last fifth part of the book is devoted to a comprehensive clarification of the ideology, social concepts and messages of the most famous work of V. Lypynsky "Letters to the Brothers-Farmers". I. Hyrych acquaints the reader with the biographical outline and the ideological context of the publishing of

this iconic work for Ukrainian historiosophy, the peculiarities of its academic and social perception. He also presents an interesting analysis of architectonic, stylistic and discursive features of the text. This allowed the author to draw a convincing conclusion – “V. Lypynsky’s book resembles the work of Scripture in the presentation of the material, its didactic means and form” (p. 271). The author also provides an interesting interpretation of the main social messages of the “Letters” that were transmitted with a fundamental uncompromisingness to alternative social science theories. Revealing the ideological diversity of work, I. Hyrych focuses on the main issues raised in it: the phenomenon of national statehood, the peculiarities of Ukrainian monarchism, the search for an ideal system of social relations, understanding the place of the Church in public life and more. Summing up his analysis, the author, following the conclusions of Ivan Lysyak-Rudnytsky, convincingly substantiates the inevitable relevance of “Letters” for Ukrainians not only in the twentieth century, but today as well. At the same time, the author also mentions those thoughts of V. Lypynsky which have lost relevance during the last century.

While most of the observations presented in this part are accurate, we would like to note a slight oversimplification of the historiographical situation of that time, e.g. the author’s thesis that “M. Hrushevsky’s students were more inclined to perceive V. Lypynsky’s concept than the works and thoughts of their teacher” (p. 268). As far as we are aware of the problem, the iconic representatives of the Lviv school of Ukrainian scholars, who were not directly engaged in the political conflict with the teacher (first of all, M. Korduba, V. Harasymchuk and I. Krypyakevych), perceived the concepts of two leading historians as complementary and not conflicting historiosophical opinions.

In the afterword, I. Hyrych continued his reflections on the relevance of V. Lypynsky’s legacy, but in the context of all the issues raised in the book. From the standpoint of his own historiosophical beliefs, the author argues that despite some clear archaic features of Lypynsky’s legacy, we should incorporate such elements of his worldview as idealism in treating one’s own country, maximalism in the requirements towards political leadership, respectful attitude to nation’s past and understanding the priority of developing Ukrainian political nation. As I. Hyrych rightly emphasises, these “lessons” of V. Lypynsky might give Ukraine a chance to endure current turmoil with dignity.

Finally, we would like to note that in our review we have not exhausted all the issues raised in the peer-reviewed monograph. It is much richer in covered issues, profound observations, interesting and unexpected conclusions, presented in the intellectually refined style of the author. Therefore, we hope that our review will be an impetus for Ukrainian researchers to get acquainted directly with I. Hyrych’s book that has become a notable phenomenon of the Lypynsky studies in recent decades.