or scoundrel, depending on your point of view. Schwartzbard, who calls himself "The Dreamer," blames Petliura for the slaughter of more than 50,000 Jews during Ukraine's brief post–World War I independence. It was then that a sizable number of Ukrainians celebrated their freedom by conducting a massive pogrom. Petliura joins Schwartzbard, the man who killed him, in a conversation that provides an interestingly bipartisan perspective on that particular Ukrainian pogrom, history, and even the meaning of life.

Volodymyr’s second dream-like conversation is with the Ukrainian Bohdan Stasyynsky, the KGB assassin of two Ukrainian nationalist émigrés in 1950s Munich. Initially Stasyynsky was “recruited” into the KGB by means of a threat to imprison his Ukrainian nationalist sister. Once inducted, however, his reluctance quickly converted to such murderous enthusiasm and lethal competence that it won him the Order of the Red Banner. His most prominent victims were the Ukrainian nationalist writer Lev Rebet and the controversial Ukrainian nationalist Stefan Bandera. Stasyynsky and Volodymyr engage them both in revealing conversation. Later Volodymyr converses with Lenin and even old pig-eyes, The Exceptionally Great Leader of Mother Russia himself.

These otherworldly conversations are about historic inevitability, criminality, guilt, restitution, redemption, and futility, and they are the most interesting aspect of the novel. Tragicomic and rich in biting wit, they capture the ironies of history that are especially rife in this part of the world. They even explore fundamental existential issues in an interestingly madcap way.

Some aspects of Ukrainian-Jewish-Russian history are so tragic that they require satire just to ease the pain. This book delivers. Unfortunately, the author now and again adds a bit too much irony and absurdity. Authors of satirical novels walk a tightrope over the chasm of excess. Lean a little bit too far, one way or the other, and things go wrong in a hurry. Classic satires like Voltaire’s Candide, Heller’s Catch 22, or Grass’s The Tin Drum walk this wire with disciplined balance. Had the author consistently exercised similar precision, this book would be totally delightful. At times, however, Motyl loses balance and overdoes it. This is why reading The Jew Who Was Ukrainian is similar to eating an incredibly rich dessert. It remains delicious only in measured amounts.

Despite this irregular excess, however, Motyl’s book remains valuable because it shrewdly explores centrally important issues that zealotry invariably obscures. I recommend it for those who prefer their history well seasoned.

Gary Clabaugh, La Salle University


The process of identity formation—be it personal, gender, religious, ethnic or any other kind of identity—is rarely, if ever at all, straightforward and unproblematic. This is all the more true for the endlessly contentious and always hotly debated topic of national identity. Whether one agrees with Benedict Anderson’s by now classic concept of “the imagined communities” or adheres to what historians refer to as “primordialist” views, perhaps no investigation of national identity can resolve all the controversies and answer all the “who’s, how’s, and why’s.” This, however, is not to imply that these questions are not worth asking. And Zenon Kohut’s collection of essays brilliantly showcases that by looking at complex issues in a diligent, scrupulous, and comprehensive manner, by questioning conventional binaries, and by refusing to be satisfied with simplistic conclusions, it is after all possible to advance our understanding of how Ukraine’s historical narrative has been and continues to be created. One major misconception
the essays help to debunk is that the construction of Ukrainian identity comes down to a simple dichotomy of "Little Russia" vs. "Ukraine." To dispel it, Kohut offers a nuanced and sophisticated discussion of the complexities, tensions, and multiple facets of this process, which he sees as not only encompassing Western influences but also as stemming from the cultural and political legacy of Kyivan Rus. The underpinning premise of the entire collection is the author's strong conviction, refined throughout more than thirty years of research, that the construction of the Ukrainian state and nation "began in the early modern period rather than simply being the 'invention' of nineteenth- and twentieth-century national builders" (xi).

The collection's thematic breadth is truly impressive. Part 1 includes essays on Russo-Ukrainian unity in the early modern period; the Little Russian identity; the Ukrainian elite in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as well as its integration into the Russian nobility in the eighteenth century; the idealized image of Cossack Ukraine; the politics of Hryhorii Poletyka; and the autonomy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the Hetmanate. In Part 2, the author discusses topics ranging from the biblical and ethnic origins of Slavs; the two early modern concepts of Russia; Ukrainian historiography in the Russian Empire; and the current Russo-Ukrainian relations; to the image of Jews in Ukrainian history; the Haidamaka movement in contemporary historiography; post-Soviet studies of the Cossack Hetmanate; and, finally, politics and historiography in contemporary Ukraine.

While it is difficult, and perhaps somewhat unfair, to single out specific essays from the entire collection, several individual studies in Making Ukraine deserve a closer look. Particularly significant and noteworthy is the opening essay, titled "The Questions of Russo-Ukrainian Unity and Ukrainian Distinctiveness in Early Modern Ukrainian Thought and Culture." In it Kohut argues that despite being divided between the Russian/Muscovy Empire and the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth and despite developing strong political and cultural allegiances to the two respective states, Ukrainians in the early modern period (roughly from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries) nonetheless insisted "on their own distinctiveness" and "on maintaining essential differences" (34). Kohut claims that "the whole Little Russian concept was nothing more than an intellectual justification" (34) for the various possible manifestations of loyalty to the Russian empire. "In the late nineteenth century," he continues, "Ukrainian intellectuals emancipated themselves from the Russian connection, positing that Ukraine was different from Russia in all respects: language, literature, culture, history, and politics" (35). In Kohut's opinion, any serious study of Ukrainian nation-building is not feasible without a careful consideration of the very concept of "Little Russia," including its dubious etymology and complex historical evolution. This problem is examined in great detail in the second essay, titled "The Development of Little Russian Identity." Kohut traces its origin to the Mongol invasion of 1240 and the destruction of Kyiv, which subsequently led to religious struggles over the residence and title of the metropolitan "of Kyiv and all Rus". He refers to A. Solovyov's 1947 study "Velikaia, Mal'ia i Belaia Rus" ("Great, Little, and White Rus"), which suggests that the ecumenical patriarch and the Greek prelates introduced the "great/little" distinction in order to distinguish between the metropolitans of Suzdal and Halych-Volyn (Galicia-Volhynia) (40-41). The conclusion Kohut reaches after a thorough and insightful analysis is that "the Little Russian legacy played a paradoxical role in the Ukrainian nation-building process" (56). Although it "initially stimulated the Ukrainian national movement," it may have also "hampered its further development" (57).

Another important and sensitive question Kohut explores extensively is the representation of Jews after the Khmelnytsky Uprising, an event that received drastically different interpretations in Russian, Polish, Jewish, and Ukrainian historiographies. While "Jews have mourned the Khmelnytsky massacre as an unprecedented outburst of anti-Jewish violence, […] Ukrainians have celebrated the uprising as a war of liberation from foreign oppression" (242). Kohut contends that due to various reasons Ukrainians have developed a stereotypical image of the Jew as an oppressor/exploiter, who—very much like the Poles at that time—violated, in their opinion, the Cossack liberties and the rights of the Orthodox Church (256). Ultimately, this image became
perpetuated, especially in the *Istoritia Rusov*, and internalized not only in historical writings but also in literary texts (i.e., *dumy*). Whereas Kohut acknowledges the fact that contemporary Ukrainian intellectuals deny anti-Jewish sentiments, he also maintains that "their embodiment in historical memory would prove difficult to modify" (270). What Kohut tacitly implies—or modestly decides not to mention—is that a gradual modification is nonetheless possible through studies like his, which illustrate that despite some dark pages in the past relationships between the two nations, the anti-Jewish sentiment is to a large extent an unfortunate stereotype.

The value of Kohut’s collection can hardly be overestimated. Although these essays have been published previously, in many instances both in English and Ukrainian, as now compiled, refined, and united by an underlying theme in Kohut’s single volume, they will not only be extremely rewarding to readers interested in Ukrainian and Eastern and Central European history but will also serve as a cornerstone of current Ukrainian historiography.

*Roman Ivashkin, University of Alberta*


The latest in the long and rich tradition of scholarly writing on travel literature, Margarita D. Marinova’s study juxtaposes Russian and American perspectives on the United States and Russia, respectively, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The author mentions several times that the work is by no means exhaustive, and indeed, to exhaust this topic would take considerably more than 190 pages! Instead, Marinova analyzes a number of works that bring into relief specific episodes of cultural exchange, realization, or awareness. She then uses these moments to illustrate and elucidate the shifting attitudes about and relationships between the Russian and American cultural imaginations between 1865 and 1905. She uses ideas such as Stephen Greenblatt’s “mimetic capital,” de Certeau’s theories on everyday life, and, in particular, Bakhtin’s early work on the self-Other and author-hero relationships to great effect in her analysis. Despite the use of the word “transnational” in her title, however, she does not address the critical discourse on the transnational in this work.

The book is organized into four sections, each devoted to a particular category of Russo-American travel writing. The first gives an overview of three Russian travelers’ accounts of visiting the United States when relations between Russia and the U.S. were fairly friendly: Eduard Tsimmerman, Pavel Ogorodnikov, and Grigorii Machtet. She organizes the chapter around their descriptions of encounters with various groups including “The Indian,” “Ex-Slaves,” “American Women,” and “White American Men.” Although Bakhtin’s ruminations on self and Other constitute a major theoretical underpinning for Marinova’s work on the whole, she uses them most effectively in this chapter to bring encounters between traveler and unfamiliar being/idea/culture to the fore for thoughtful discussion. The second chapter similarly highlights the experiences of American travelers in Russia during the same period. Mark Twain, the best-known writer Marinova discusses, is given brief treatment before she begins a vivid account of the work of Edna Proctor and J. Ross Browne. The brevity of the Twain section may be understandable, however, given the breadth of existing scholarship on his works; her subsequent extensive discussion of Proctor and Browne shows the value of these two largely forgotten authors.

Her third chapter visits the 1880s and 1890s travelogues of several writers, most notably Isabel Hapgood, an American translator of Russian literature, and Vladimir Bogoraz-Tan, a Russian traveler in America. Marinova begins the chapter with an interesting discussion of Russian and American historical convergences during this period (to name a few: the political turmoil and anxiety caused by the assassinations of Abraham Lincoln, Alexander II, and James Garfield;