

Vitalii Yaremchuk

Віталій Тельвак, Василь Педич, *Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського*, Світ, Львів 2016, 440 с.

The eminent historian, social and political activist, one of the leading ideologists of modern Ukrainian national project – Mykhailo Hrushevsky, remains one of the most recognizable figures in the public perception of the distant and recent past of Ukraine. One of the numerous evidences is the results of opinion polls designed to find out the attitude of modern Ukrainian society to historical figure of M. Hrushevsky and he always appears at the top of public sympathy. He is one of the few historical figures who generally are positively perceived in different social and cultural environments, ideological and political groups. Such a reputation is on the merits of our hero who left the great intellectual, ideological and theoretical legacy that has been taking part in creating a modern image of Ukrainian history, and, to some extent, the current construction of the Ukrainian nation and state. The interesting fact is that almost a triumphal reincarnation of Hrushevsky in modern Ukraine still managed to take place even after more than half of a century of demonization, defamatory Soviet propaganda and official communist historiography.

Various manifestations of Hrushevsky's genius (I would dare to use such an unfashionable among modern professional historians and intellectual circles of Ukraine superlative) caused a great interest of professional humanities and social sciences scholars to this extraordinary man. Nowadays, there are thousands of publications of different levels of quality about the historian and diversities of "orbits", in which his human, professional, social and political qualities were realized. Among these, we should recognize the absolute minority of those studies, scientific quality of which at least reaches the level of their "object."

A recondite is one of the defining phenomena related to the activities of Mykhailo Hrushevsky – the establishment, operation and evolution of elaborated by his efforts primarily an informal group of researchers referred to

in literature as "Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky" ("Galician historical school of M. Hrushevsky", "school in Lviv of M.Hrushevsky"). I believe that the issue is not about quantity and even, to some extent, the quality, because there is an already formed tradition in the elaboration of this communicative phenomenon as a whole as well as its certain segments (including the role of Shevchenko Scientific Society in the formation of the school, scientific achievements of Hrushevsky's students in Lviv, the relationship between students and the teacher, etc.). It is about narrowing of a research perspective to certain "canonical topics" and stories that began in the interwar and Diaspora historiography. It seems that the obvious limitations of modern Hrushevsky studies, in the context of the novelty of modern Science studies and scholar issues, the broadening of empirical information and introduction of previously unknown sources, urged V. Telvak and V. Pedych to review the established opinion and prepare a modern (in sense of its correlation to the current state of science) research about Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

There is no point in repeating all the issues in this, I would say thorough and innovative monograph, and highlight how the authors, as it is declared in the introductory part of the book, "rethink previous historiographical tradition". This work contains that much of interesting historical information and no less extraordinary interpretation of it that to analyze the whole book within the review does not seem possible. The work is written according to classical models of monographs, in particular, it has a thorough foreword and introduction, which reveals the research "laboratory" of the authors, carefully processed structure, appendix, which contains a number of previously unknown documents and photographs of individual representatives of the school, quite informative biographemes of Hrushevsky's students, list of references and name index. The work is characterized by a perfect knowledge of the subject, absence of unjustified statements; the same concerns uncertain issues, where authors caution from unequivocal statements (for example, in case of considering the reasons for prohibiting Hrushevsky's classic seminar at the university). For those who want to get a comprehensive understanding of the book of V. Telvak and V. Pedych, we highly recommend it for careful reading. We set a more attainable goal – to analyze the innovative ideas represented by the authors.

Therefore, we would like to note that for the first time in this monograph the authors gave the detailed list of school members, its grounds and main organizational forms. Clear criteria for defining who can be the member of the school were introduced: the work under the guidance of Hrushevsky in his

scientific seminar at Lviv University and / or visits by young historians (not always students of this school) of informal meetings with Hrushevsky during free from lectures time (so-called *privatissima*), involving them into cooperation with the structures of the Shevchenko Scientific Society for scientific debut in the form of original research and for many students – further activities in the chosen field, and finally – the evidence of students claiming their belonging to a closer circle of Hrushevsky's students. Clearly outlining the "territory" of the school, V. Telvak and V. Pedych convincingly demonstrated that not every student can be considered the member of the school (as Jaroslav Hrytsak ironically mentioned "and the dead, the living and the unborn" Ukrainian historians). Thus, the circle of representatives of the scientific community consisted of 22 people. Instead, the authors rightly refuted the fact of belonging to the school of many Ukrainian historians who were under Hrushevsky's influence or just were attending his lectures at Lviv University. For the first time the study investigated the informal, but respectable (considering working atmosphere and trustful mood in the team of scientists) «institution» of *privatissima*.

The authors conducted a detailed and multidimensional analysis of the communicative nature and psychological climate that existed in Hrushevsky's Lviv historical school. As it may be deduced from the text, Hrushevsky's school could be characterized by the spirit of solidarity and mutual work, which led to significant results, demonstrated by Hrushevsky's students. The main and, in many cases, the only creator of such a climate was M. Hrushevsky himself. Authors disproved the legend of the authoritarian leadership style of Hrushevsky imposed on his students, proving their statement by numerous of examples. Hrushevsky demanded efficiency and devotion to science; he did not hide all the complexities and ingratitude his students could encounter, which was natural for young historians of that time. However, it is the matter of fact, that from the very beginning – since choosing the research topic and throughout the scientific socialization of the students, Hrushevsky treated them in almost fatherly way. It was not only a scientific support, he provided students with professional advice and helped in archival heuristics, took care of publications of his students' papers and protection of their doctoral papers. In a situation of absolute poverty of most of his close colleagues, he often provided his students with financial support, often supporting them with his own resources or helped attaining funding from SSS. As the authors of the research mentioned, the students themselves often wrote to their teacher at the time of financial distress.

As once again has been shown in the numerous examples of the peer-reviewed monograph, very trusting relationship have been established in the near circle of Hrushevsky's young adepts during the period of his life in Lviv. M. Hrushevsky himself has introduced a kind of direct and open communication style with his students that, as the authors of the monograph note, contradicted with the way of communication inherent to the Galician reality of that time. Mentor's younger colleagues have mostly reciprocated his feelings by asking for his advice concerning not only the purely scientific, but rather everyday problems. It is interesting to read the fragments of work of V. Telvak and V. Pedych, where they mention the discussions on various non-scientific affairs between Hrushevsky and his students. It is shown that Hrushevsky, aiming to encourage the academic career of the young followers of the Ukrainian science, beguiled them out of the temptations of the rapid social and political life of that times, or, as it seemed to him, of premature marriages. It was especially difficult to Hrushevsky to accept the realities of his young followers' post-student life. These young people, having no prospects for the continuation of the scientific work in the Lviv University, lured by the Polish influences, had to go to the province to earn for their living. M. Hrushevsky has made great efforts to help them to move to bigger cities or to Lviv. Such emotional intimacy, as V. Telvak and V. Pedych have noticed, has been quite a unique phenomenon in the realities of European humanitaristics of that time, with mostly conservative communicative practices, peculiar to them (for example, there is a famous emotional detachment between the Mentor and students within the historical school of Vasyl Klyuchevsky).

At the same time, the authors of peer-reviewed monograph looked at the famous problem of conflicts in the Lviv historical school with a fresh pair of eyes. The conflict in the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1913 has appeared the most devastating, and resulted in M. Hrushevsky's refusal from the presidency of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and other projects related to this institution, as well as in his fleeing from Galicia in 1914. This topic has long been a *cheval de bataille* for the experts and most of them adhere to conditionally "compromising" view, by laying the blame for the deployment of conflict on the two opposing sides. On the basis of many facts, it has been proved that this and other, lesser-known controversies, gained momentum primarily due to the attitude of some students to Hrushevsky (S. Tomashivsky, J. Krevetsky, S. Rudnytsky and, to a lesser extent, a number of others) that has not always been correct. And the conflict of 1913, according to the authors, has been generated by not only mere misunderstandings between the Mentor and students, but "brought from the outside", from the Galician political

environment that has not forgiven M. Hrushevsky's sharp and critical assessments of the Galician political establishment. The authors do not exculpate Hrushevsky, but specific examples show that in almost all the conflict situations in which he has not been a source of aggravation of relations, he tried directly, without using gossips and intrigues, to determine the causes of the unfortunate misunderstandings, and even has been the first to extend a friendly hand to such zealous critics as S. Tomashivsky. And in the following, even if reconciliation had not occurred, the prominent historian kept the pattern of respect in attitudes towards his ungrateful students. In view of the many facts presented in the book, one should agree with the authors that M. Hrushevsky "has been fiery and emotional, but an ungrudging man," he has not provoked, but rather "dampened down" the controversies, the very level of conflict in Hrushevsky's environment in Lviv has been greatly exaggerated by the previous researchers.

The peer-reviewed monograph has refuted a number of historiographical legends and false statements on the figure of Hrushevsky. In particular, the recently distributed thesis on the assumed "bribery" of Hrushevsky by Iryna Kolesnyk, researcher from Kyiv, has been rejected as totally fictional, the one that does not comply neither with the existing empirical data, nor the socio-cultural and educational practices, accepted at the time of the functioning of the Lviv historical school. The authors have put a number of practical arguments against Lubomir Vynar's thesis on "Kyiv" school of Hrushevsky as a continuation of "Lviv" one, by insisting on two different schools created by one scientist. Each of them had its own distinctive features in terms of the cadre's peculiarities, orientation on the certain chronological – objective expanses, finally – in a sense of radically different socio-political and historiographical and ideological circumstances, in which they have evolved. An empirical evidence in favor of the idea of the existence of Hrushevsky Lviv historical school "in the active phase" (according to the terminology of V. Telvak and V. Pedych) by 1914 instead of 1913 has been provided as well.

Based on the study of a wide range of issues relating to both social and cultural, as well as intellectual dimensions of the school (primarily concerning the revision of its representatives in the field of Ukrainian history), the authors of the peer-reviewed monograph have brought a number of incredibly substantial arguments within two groundbreaking conclusions of the overall plan. Firstly, it has been shown that the Lviv students of Hrushevsky not only had the purely historiographical view in the period of active functioning of his school, as well as their Mentor, but also supported his social and political ideas and political goals. By relying on the "conceptual skeleton, designed by their

teacher" they "have increased its "muscles" of the historical reconstruction", and soon, in the postwar period, encouraged the school to the acquisition of new features of a "statist" trend in Ukrainian historiography. Secondly, an appropriate and justified conclusion that the Lviv scholar phenomenon combined "the features of the classic "didactic" and "historiosophical" schools" has been made on that basis, and such a synthesis, according to the authors, "has been quite a unique one in the Ukrainian scientific culture".

A separate storyline of the monograph on the "passive" phase of the existence of the school after Hrushevsky's departure from Lviv seems absolutely groundbreaking. It has been shown that despite the tense or difficult personal relations with some students and the ideological and political differences with most of representatives of the Galician interwar historiography environment, an intense scientific and personal contact with a large part of former students has remained. M.Hrushevsky tried to support his younger colleagues by their inclusion to his "Kyiv" research projects, financially assisted the families of dead students that were close to him, and kept the memories about his former coworkers by the specific acts (that have not brought any dividends to him, but only troubles in terms of quite difficult Soviet reality), even of those, who has brought him so much grief (S. Tomashivsky).

Without questioning the high scientific level of the peer-reviewed monograph, let us beg leave to speak about the two points that could have been, as it seems, corrected (or justified more convincingly). The statement of the authors that Hrushevsky Lviv historical school is "the most important thing in our humanitaristics" requires more detailed explanation. At least, the mentioning of some similar phenomena, this issue could be compared to, according to the authors, would have been worth noting. We suggest that the materials in the section on creative works (contributions) of the representatives of the school in the area of the pastimes of Ukraine are worth conceptualizing in a broader way, on the background of the historiographical tradition of that time and from the point of view of the later / modern achievements of the scientific thought (although it should be emphasized that some parallels with the later historiography have been drawn by the authors). We can conclude that peer-reviewed monograph is a significant event in modern Ukrainian historiography, past which cannot pass indifferently.

Thumaczenie Diany Telwak