The break of the 19th – 20th centuries is one of the most popular periods in modern studies of the Ukrainian historiography. Along with that, from a methodological point of view, the bio-historiographical approaches are dominating in the works of the most of Ukrainian scientists, which are justified, but leave space for realization of other research projects. Among them is a study of collective forms of scientific work that would have enabled some combination of certain biographies of the Ukrainian historians in one canvas of creation process of new historical knowledge, which would have combined the individual and the collective.

Thus, a book under review written by a famous Ukrainian Hrushevsky’s scholar, Vitaliy Telvak (Professor of the Chair of Ancient History of Ukraine and Special Historical Disciplines of Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University in Drohobych) and Vasyl Pedych (Assistant Professor, Chair of History and Political Science of Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas) is a realization of this approach to study the Ukrainian historical thought.

Using the example of the Mykhailo Hrushevsky's School in Lviv, the authors have demonstrated how to write a biography of historian in a medium of the contemporaries and to emphasize the efforts of leading scientists in the field of education of new generations of researchers.

Appealing to the problematics of the Historical School in Lviv are explained by the authors by the fact that it was the most important scholastic phenomenon, both from the point of view of effectiveness, and of temporal range of influences, and it would be difficult to quarrel with this statement. Really, the Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s Historical School in Lviv heralded the transfer of the Ukrainian science to a new level of professionalization. The Galician Center, established by a prominent Ukrainian historian, is rightly considered as the first national culture creative team,
whose representatives deliberately implemented a research program of the Ukrainian science thoroughly elaborated by the head.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky and his Galician Historical School as the first purely national scholastic phenomenon of a humanitarian nature used to be in the focus of researchers. However, a lot of stereotypes that, without any critical examination, are recognized as axiomatic, «traveling» around the pages of many publications, have been collected for more than century of reflection of the Hrushevsky – scholarship around studying of Lviv School. Therefore, the authors sought to rethink these phenomena, taking into account both the growing sources, and new theoretical proposals.

The research tasks, determined by Vitaliy Telvak and Vasyl Pedych, are quite ambitious and let look at Lviv Historical School in a broad context and under unusual point of view. Firstly, the authors seek to describe the process of the creation and spreading of a concept «Hrushevsky’s School» in the scientific community and also to describe features of its existing in the historical science in 20th – the beginnings of the 21st centuries. Also they study the informative possibilities of different source systems for an informatory enrichment of a concept itself and spreading of Lviv scholastic problematics. Secondly, authors seek to study the Lviv scientific center of Ukrainian scientists as a scholastic practice. To do this, they apply to a complicated complex of interconnected issues: structural specifics and staff of school, its communicative principles, and issues connected with leadership and psychological climate, students’ reception of historiographic practices of a teacher, etc. Separately the authors studied an issue of transformation of the scholastic traditions developed by Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the years of the First World War I and within interwar time, that is almost unstudied for today. Thirdly, the authors sought to find out the contribution of the Galician students of M. Hrushevsky to the development of diverse concrete-historical problematics of the Ukrainian science. In this case, they succeeded in paying attention to more motley palette of a subject of which students of the Lviv’s professor took more interests than it was commonly believed: their
contribution to the regional studios, sociocultural history of the Ukrainian clergy, processing of a historiographic perspective, etc. was considerable.

The authors consider that the socio-cognitive approach, offered by Odessa researcher Tetiana Popova, which, when applying to the historiographical perspective, provides a study of total impact of internal (internality, cognitive) and external (externality, social) factors on the development of science, is a general theoretical and methodological basis of their work.

The research studies of V. Telvak and V. Pedych are also focused on a complex of ideas of cultural and intellectual history. In contrast to a traditional history of historical science, this movement tends to the methodological pluralism, interdisciplinarity, focuses a researcher primarily on the study of intellectual activities and processes in the field of humanitarian, social and natural knowledge in a concrete historical and sociocultural context.

The book consists of two parts. The first contains three sections about historiography and sources of research subjects, the Lviv School is shown as a scientific phenomenon (structure, representation, communication principles, etc.) and the contribution of students of M. Hrushevsky in studying of diverse concrete historical problematics are investigated.

Please note that especially interesting, in our opinion, is an issue, posed by the authors, connected with creation of a collective portrait of the M. Hrushevsky’s Historical School in Lviv. Summing up the observations on its members, they pay attention to the necessity of differentiation of «horizons» and «contours» of this informal association. In the first case, there are all the grounds to speak about hundreds of supporters of the historiographic ideas of M. Hrushevsky, which include not only his students, but also many outstanding Ukrainian intellectuals of the end of 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries (Viacheslav Lipinsky, Mykola Vasylenko, Dmytro Doroshenko, etc.). In this sense, it is possible even to state that school of M. Hrushevsky was supported by all Ukrainian society of the end 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries. But when accepting the historical ideology developed
by Hrushevsky, these people, for various reasons, did not complete training guided by him and independently chose a way of serving to the Ukrainian deed. Actually, this fact is a key feature of belonging to the scientific school, which outlines its «contours», for authors. Therefore, the authors attribute twenty two students of M. Hrushevsky to the structure of the Lviv School, who studied the secrets of historical craft guided by him, received a subject of scientific research realized in at least one independent publication in the format of article. Along with this formal criterion the authors point to the importance of understanding of belonging to the informal creative team guided by M. Hrushevsky, by young members of the Lviv Historical School, sharing not only the theoretical and methodological guidance of the teacher, but also his political and ideological beliefs. The authors boldly call the Lviv School the outstanding scholastic phenomenon in the Slavic world considering a comparative short duration of school’s existence (less than twenty years) and general adverse conditions for development of the Ukrainian science in the conditions of a constantly growing conflict with the Poles, who owned territory at that time, on the one hand, and, on the another hand, a fundamentality of contribution of the students of M. Hrushevsky to the modernization of national science.

The researchers emphasize that the scholar problem in the modern Ukrainian historiography is often focusing on the analysis of formal structures and quantitative indicators of the scholarly school. Therefore, the issues connected with peculiarities of interpersonal communication of representatives of a certain research community are examined quite rarely.

Summing up my observations on the communicative nature and psychological climate of the M. Hrushevsky Historical School in Lviv, V. Telvak and V. Pedych point that in this respect it considerably associable with the Volodymyr Antonovych’s Historiographic School in Kyiv. Reflecting his own successful experience of communication with the teacher, Lviv professor inherited his behavior in establishment of contacts and communication with younger colleagues. But in contrast to the Kiev School, there was an insignificant difference in age between
Mykhailo Hrushevsky and most of his students (10–15 years), and absence of social barriers naturally reduced a psychological distance, deepening emotional proximity and adjusting on frankness in communication both between teacher and students, and among young researchers. All of this contributed to the formation of democratic climate of the school and was reflected in all the spheres of its functioning, interpersonal communication, discussion of research projects, ways and forms of their realization, presentation, etc.

This democracy was inherent also to the culture of conflict situations: the parties sorted out their positions frankly, they were always ready for quick overcoming contradictions, because all recognized the value of joint scientific work and reaching the ideal goal of modernization of Ukrainian science. At the same time, the authors also mention a theme of a classical conflict of «fathers and children» when the head of school not always was in time for reacting to the growing ambitions of the students. The most acute conflict, as result of which in year 1913, student’s environment was divided in to the supporters and opponents of the teacher, and non-scientific factors related to the complexity of the social and political environment in Galicia were provoked.

The authors note that the identity of a personality of M. Hrushevsky as a benevolent, sociable, straightforward person, extremely demanding as to himself and to the closest circle of employees, is discerned through a prism of reflected by them communicative practices. In general, the noticed communicative features not only allowed effective functioning of the school within nearly twenty years, but also made it possible, after a forced break, further cooperation of its members in the interwar period.

The second part of the book unites three annexes: little-known reviews of M. Hrushevsky and the Polish professors of the Lviv University of the doctorates of the Galician historians, biographies of the researchers of the Lviv Historical School and also photo annexes containing the portraits of the members of the school (we can
only regret that the photos provided by authors are not enough for a total volume of the book).

Finally, we will note that the offered by the authors attempt of comprehensive study of the Lviv Historical School as historiographical phenomenon should contribute not only the expanding of the issues of researches of the Hrushevsky’s scholarship, but also for rethinking of stereotypical phenomena of research schools for Ukrainian scientific culture, and appealing to marginalized practices of organizations of such schools, which enriched the intellectual history of Ukraine.

Thus, a general impression from new work of the famous researchers of a problematics of the Hrushevsky’s scholarship of Vitaliy Telvak and Vasyl Pedych is quite positive. It is necessary to emphasize that the book is addressed not only to historians-Hrushevsky’s scholarship, but also to wide a range of readers, and then it is written easily and is easily perceived that distinguishing it favourably too.

I recommend these publications under review to receive award named after Ivan Franko.

_Vitaliy Andryeyev, Anton Kostenko (Kherson)_