

UDC 94(477)(092)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.19.233836

Valentyna PISKUN

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of department of M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 4 Tryokhsviatytska, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01001 (baturin@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-3817-0852

Researcher ID: 3764790/valentyna-piskun/

Viktorija TELVAK

PhD (History), Assistant Professor, Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0003-4671-743X

Researcher ID: 3026747/viktorija-telvak/

Валентина ПІСКУН

доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувачка відділу, Інститут української археології та джерелознавства імені М. С. Грушевського Національної академії наук України, вул. Трьохсвятительська, 4, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01001 (baturin@ukr.net)

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (viktoriatelvak75@gmail.com)

ABOUT A LONER IN SOLITUDE

(Review: Hyrych Ihor. Viacheslav Lypynsky: The Farmer and the Soldier (The relation between the democratic and the conservative in his historiosophy). Kyiv, 2019. 310 p.)

ПРО САМІТНИКА У САМОТНОСТІ

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

Modern monographs devoted to V. Lypynsky were replenished by a new monographic study, "Viacheslav Lypynsky: The Farmer and the Soldier (The relation between the democratic and the conservative in his historiosophy). K.; 2019, 310 p.". The author of the study is a well-known Kyiv scholar Ihor Hyrych. The figure of Viacheslav Kazymyrovych Lypynsky has long attracted the scholar with his extraordinariness, his challenge not only towards the social environment in which he grew up and matured as a scientist, but also towards the powerful spirit in a sick body. Numerous source publications, analytical articles of I. Hyrych, and as a result – a reviewed monograph – all this significantly add to forming a wholesome portrait of a key ideologist of the Ukrainian conservatism.

In the title of the monograph, the author used one of the self-description of V. Lypynsky, which prompts the reader to search for an answer to the question: “Why did the main character of the study identify himself as a “farmer and a soldier?”. Throughout the pages, the attentive reader will find the answer and delve into the palette of life events of the main character of the story. Secondly, clarifying part of the title “The ratio of the democratic and the conservative in his historiosophy”, in our opinion, in somewhat constricted manner conveys the essence of what is stated in the study. Because the author tried not only to outline the essence of historiosophical views of Viacheslav Lypynsky as an intellectual, but also to show the context of philosophy of life, the environment of influence on his formation as a person, the connection of events and actions, sources of a creative laboratory. It is also worth emphasizing the successful combination of scientificity with a special manner of presentation, when complex theoretical reflections are transmitted in accessible language. This, in turn, expands the possible readership.

An important component of the coverage of the thinker’s biography is the author’s introductory article. From the first page, Ihor Borysovych brings the reader to the reception of V. Lypynsky’s personality as a Ukrainian statesman. He notes that he was “the first to propose to define the issue of independent Ukraine as the cornerstone of the political struggle of the Ukrainians for national liberation” (p. 7). But the author does not provide the title of the work or the time of such a statement. Enumerating the merits of V. Lypynsky as a historian who was able to rise above belonging to the Polish ethnic group and become a political Ukrainian, I. Hyrych rightly emphasizes the revolutionary nature of the slogan about the need for a political nation. However, the following statement of both the main character of the story and the author, who repeated this opinion without any reservation, is debatable. *It is the awareness of belonging to a certain territory that makes a person a representative of a certain nation: even the currently dominant culture or language does not yet determine that a person is non-Ukrainian.* Thus, Lypynsky expressed the revolutionary belief for the then society that it was a conscious choice that makes a former Maloros, “Rusky”, a Pole or a Jew a Ukrainian” (p. 9). We agree that a person’s conscious choice is decisive in such a complex issue as national identification, but its exclusively territorial component is not decisive, but only locational for a particular person. It can also be a place of action and even self-realization as a person. However, if a person does not share or care about the culture of the people among whom he/she lives, does not know its language cannot fully comprehend the prospects of their own and their descendants within the territory, not to mention belonging to the nation. And the proof of that is the family history of V. Lypynsky. Among those Poles who lived at the territory of Right-Bank Ukraine and had a certain reverence for it and even spoke Ukrainian, they failed to support the Ukrainian independence movement ideologically. This is exactly what Maksym Slavinsky wrote sadly in a review of Kostya Matsievych’s memoirs “The Life of my Contemporary”. “At that time, the Polish community failed to justify its intentions. Its ideological picture appeared much later, in fact, already in exile, in the works of the late V. Lypynsky, especially in his complicated and hot ”Letters to the Brothers-Farmers”. But this ideology came when there was no urgent need for it. “That is, between theoretical concepts and the practice of existence an insurmountable gap of conventions, circumstances and imperfections can be sometimes.

In the Introduction, the author elaborately reviewed the historiography of the issue. He focused on the characteristics of the works of the interwar period more thoroughly. At the same time, it is stated rather briefly about the polemic and critical remarks regarding the

historiosophical heritage of V. Lypynsky by the representatives of the republican democratic Ukrainian state school (p. 12). Modern V. Lypynsky historiography is written filigree, objectively, without bypassing any of the authors and paying tribute to each.

Chapter I “I. Republican Conservative: V. Lypynsky before the Ukrainian Revolution (1917 – 1921)” is quite rich and informative in its content. In this section, the chronology of events in V. Lypynsky’s biography from 1882 to 1917 falls on the outline of events, relationships with different people. For example, to name a few: “V. Lypynsky in 1907 – 1914”, “Itinerary of V. Lypynsky’s Movements”, “Health Problems”, “Workshop (salon) of Maria Trebinska in Kyiv (at the end of the 1890s – 1909)”, “Viacheslav Lypynsky in Geneva”, “V. Lypynsky Educator”, “Nobility in Ukraine” (1909), “Agricultural Work on the Farm “Rusalivsky Chahari” and the others. Ihor Hyrych is a brilliant connoisseur of sources, events, and portrays various images of V. Lypynsky in: relations with Ukrainian figures, in complex psychological states, in writing works and discussions around them, in search of a scientific concept of his own intentions. However, the author’s thesis that the appearance of “Z dziejów Ukrainy” in 1912 “immediately places him (V. Lypynsky – authors) among the most prominent historians of Ukraine” seems somewhat unexpected and substantiated insufficiently for us (p. 40). Neither in principle, nor in the discussions of the then intellectual circles, nor in the receptions of contemporaries, such statement was noticed. Although some changes took place in the scientific life of V. Lypynsky. He was elected a full member (academician) of T. Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv and the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kyiv.

It is known that in July 1913 V. Lypynsky settled in the estate of his uncle on the maternal line Adam Rokytsky in the village of Rusalivka in Cherkasy region. He lived there for almost a year among the “Ukrainian elements” of the Polish nobility. “Adam Rokytsky presented V. Lypynsky with a lot of land in the Rusalivsky Chahari tract, which is 5 layers away from Rusalivka. Vyacheslav Kazymyrovych received 160 tithes” (p. 42). It was here that he tried to become the farmer who would not only have love of the land and produce on it, but also immerse into relations with the Ukrainian peasantry. However, this experiment did not last long.

In the communication and business circle of V. Lypynsky in the pre-war period were: Vasyl Domanytsky, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Serhiy Yefremov, B. Yaroshevsky. He is published in the Rada newspaper, *Przegląd i Krajowość*. And as I. Hyrych states, – “The figure of V. Lypynsky at this time is becoming not only visible in public circles, but also dangerous for the political agitation of the Polish parties on the Right Bank” (p. 47). Journalistic discussions are gaining wide scope and publicity. The author of the monograph examines in detail V. Lypynsky’s positions on various issues, including such a sensitive issue for both Ukrainians and Poles as the “Lithuanian” question in Poland and in our country” (p. 63), on the territorialism of the meeting and relations with the local population, the imperial whims of the Poles, and etc. Ihor Borysovych also draws attention to the then everyday life of Viacheslav Kazymyrovych, his financial affairs, relations with his father, bohemian lifestyle (pp. 79–80) and characterizes the unrealized intentions and lost works of his character (pp. 92–95).

Chapter II of the monograph is entitled “*Political and ideological background of V. Lypynsky’s activity*”. In this chapter, I. Hyrych tried to answer the question – when exactly V. Lypynsky “became one hundred percent conservative and supporter of monarchical power” (p. 98). In his search, the author turns to comparisons, analogies, opinions of different people who knew V. Lypynsky and contacted him. He considers the relations between Viacheslav Kazymyrovych and the Ukrainian national democracy at the beginning of the twentieth century

and the attitude of the democrats towards V. Lypynsky; relations with Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Yevhen Chykalenko, Andriy Zhuk; relations with the Ukrainian Social-Democracy and Polish political and cultural forces. Due to the saturation of eventful factual material in this section, it sometimes seems that the author's opinion on a particular issue is incomplete.

In Chapter III "Historiosophy of V. Lypynsky in his political journalism" the author analyzes several problems that were actualized in 1908 – 1917 by Vyacheslav Kazymyrovych. First of all, he draws analysis of the political pamphlet "Our Situation in Rus'-Ukraine" (1909), in which V. Lypynsky characterized the Polish public opinion of the time, classifying it into groups: 1) conservative regional (landlord); 2) national democratic (all-Polish); 3) "intellectual" gradual (where Russian cosmopolitanism is combined with feeling for the Ukrainians and 4) regional democratic (p. 140). And although these groups were slightly modified, the directions remained quite unchanged. I. Hyrych quite rightly notes that V. Lypynsky "even before the revolution distinguished between the book-theoretical approach to the Ukrainian question by the clerisy and the deep, genetically rooted instinct of the masses to gain freedom, the militant instinct of resistance to foreign armed forces, which try to stop" (p. 143). The thoughtful reader will be interested in the item "The ratio of class and national. Revolutionary for gaining independence". V. Lypynsky condemned the destructive force of class riots firmly (p. 149), was a supporter of private land ownership and considered the leadership function of the nobility in the Ukrainian society, although he was aware of its small number.

Probably the most relevant of all the questions addressed by V. Lypynsky in the pre-revolutionary period were the concepts of "nation", "territorialism", "independence". I. B. Hyrych believes that "V. Lypynsky's idea of territorialism solved two key tasks of the national cause, which could not be solved by the traditional populist national democratic thought. Firstly, this idea made it possible to overcome the problem of unstructured society in the national sense, because the Ukrainians were declared all the inhabitants of the Ukrainian land, regardless of their ethnic origin, but on the basis of the Ukrainian culture. As a result, the constant mental opposition between the Ukrainians, on the one hand, and the Poles, the Russians, and the Jews, on the other hand, was theoretically overcome.... Secondly, the idea of territorialism solved the problem of building an independent state because in mind it drew the state borders between Ukraine on the one hand, and Russia and Poland – on the other hand. The latter were the main stakeholders in the continuation of Ukraine's colonial status" (pp. 172–173). It is difficult to agree with this opinion because to overcome the unstructured Ukrainian society only by declaring all residents the Ukrainians at the beginning of the twentieth century was not possible. Social unstructuredness, in our opinion, depended not so much on the recognition of the existing social hierarchy at that time as, in the context of modernization changes, on the access to the use of resources (private, public). And since the Ukrainians, the the Poles and the Jews were limited by the empire in their capabilities (of course, each in his own way), respectively, each aimed to care not only about solving their national question within the Ukrainian territory, but mainly – solving their own state building and national independence. For the Ukrainians, such a non-state-imperial resource was cooperation, which allowed not only to buy land, but also to compete with Russian and other assets in Ukraine and invest in cultural and educational work. And thus expand the resources for statehood. And territorialism in itself can solve national issues only "theoretically".

Chapter IV "Vyacheslav Lypynsky during the Ukrainian Revolution and in Exile" immerses the reader in the most turbulent period of life of the Ukrainian intellectual. It was

then that he started active party and political work, joined the creation of the Ukrainian Democratic Agricultural Party, became a diplomat and one of the promoters of the hetman's ideology in the world, cooperated with the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin. The author of the monograph rightly states that the historical study "Ukraine at a Turning Point" (1920) was an outstanding work of V. Lypynsky, which, according to many historians, marked the beginning of state historiography (p. 211).

At the end of the chapter, the author reviews in detail the causes of V. Lypynsky's conflict with Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky and its consequences and summarizes quite succinctly: "V. Lypynsky did not tolerate fundamental compromises, just as he did not tolerate the compromises of the rotten ones" (p. 264).

The last chapter of the book "Letters to the Brothers-Farmers": Ideology, Social Concepts and Messages" is devoted to the conceptual work of V. Lypynsky, which substantiates the idea of a labour monarchy. As the author notes, "the work itself has a systematic and consciousness forming direction" (p. 267). The reader will find for himself not only the pleasure of the author's vision of the perception of the monarchical idea, but also the reception of it in later times. Fascinated by the object of his research, I. Hyrych could not help but fall under the influence of the powerful intellectual and personal charisma of V. Lypynsky and, in our opinion, somewhat overestimates the resonance of his ideas at that time.

As a summary, it is quite correct to state that I. B. Hyrych coped with the task of "combining both components: factual history and interpretive history" completely (p. 17). Readers will enjoy reading the intellectual biography of an extraordinary individual, a lone hermit, Viacheslav Lypynsky, for whom the struggle and scientific defense of independent Ukraine became the meaning of life.

*The article was received November 07, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 19/05/2021.*