

Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Volume 9, Book 2, Part 1: *The Cossack Age, 1654-1657*. Serhii Plokhyy, Frank E. Sysyn, eds. Marta Daria Olynyk, trans. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2008. Pp. lix, 566. ISBN: 978-1-894865-10-4.

This is the fifth volume in the superb translation series by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies to publish in English Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* (*Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, 10 vols. in 11 books, 1898-1937). The first part of *The Cossack Age, 1654-57* extends from mid-1653 to mid-1655. It treats the 1653 diplomatic and military prolegomena that brought about Russian-Zaporozhian Host rapprochement and Muscovy's declaration of war against the *Rzeczpospolita* (Ch. 6, 1-128); the Pereiaslav Agreement, Ukraine's constitutional moment and consignment to an unwelcoming relationship with its northern potentate (Ch. 7, 129-267); early 1654 diplomatic correspondence among the *dramatis personae* (the Hetmanate, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Crimean Khanate, Muscovy, Moldavia), the inauguration of the Thirteen Years' War in mid-1654, and the ensuing military campaign history, which in Hrushevsky's account is heavily tilted towards Cossack operations in the south and gives sparing attention to Muscovy's Smolensk and Eastern Belarusan operations (Ch. 8, 268-370). A final section includes a variety of topics such as the journey by Patriarch Makarios of Antioch through Ukraine and his descriptions (inscribed by his son, Paul of Aleppo), campaign and battlefield history from 1654 to 1656, the Polish and Crimean Tatar devastation of the Bratslav region, and Sweden's declaration of war against Poland (Ch. 9, 371-501).

The key chapter in his work is VII: "The Pereiaslav Agreement" (129-267) — or Pereiaslav *agreements* as there were several between January and March 1654 — for it was the Pereiaslav event that cast Ukraine to its fate. Here and elsewhere, Hrushevsky conveys the limitations of his sources, exhaustively poses questions on possible motives of personages, avoids unilinearity, and spritely weaves through his disputations the extensive historiographical conflicts over Pereiaslav.

Hrushevsky exhibits manifold narrative abilities by simultaneously scoping conflicting sources and squeezing from them the contradictions, confusion, rash determination, and indecision of all the regional leaders and their supporters and opponents and then presenting their crisscrossing

motivations and declarations. The contingency of the principal actors' motives and actions is always kept poignantly alive and pulsing before his readers, a feat that very few, if any other, Ukrainian and Russian historians of the early modern Eastern Slavs were able to accomplish. He achieves in all of this a genuine literary grace exceeding that of Imperial Russian historians, S.O. Solov'ev and V.O. Kliuchevskii, whom Hrushevsky on some level was emulating.

As an example: "Or is the contrary true — that on the basis of various talks that were none too planned or consistent, the crafty Muscovites were extracting those careless observations and expressions of the hetman and his secretary that might, in their opinion, prove useful later to hook the 'topknots' [*khokhly*] and bring them down from the high-blown clouds of festive phraseology, so liberally strewn during those solemn ceremonies, and plant them on the perfectly real ground of official Muscovite administration?" (167).

He argues that the Russians patiently waited for the Poles and the Ukrainians to wear themselves down, before making their move to align themselves with the Cossacks. This is a judgment contrary to the standard one wherein the Muscovites were sucked into the Ukrainian vortex reluctantly and then obligated to team up with the Cossacks whom they regarded as wayward allies. Hrushevsky avers that Khmel'nytsky and his delegates were dupes, but willing ones, and unhesitatingly and unromantically portrays the egoism and shortsightedness of the Ukrainians.

Inherent contradictions crippled the Zaporozhian Host insofar as the intermediating role performed by the Poles that the pre-1648 Cossacks routinely — but not always — had accustomed themselves to. But the Cossack officers, thinking of themselves at times more like representatives of a military caste seeking better articulation of their service prerogatives and emoluments and also as fiduciaries negotiating for the autonomy of Ukrainian (the Cossack Host's) spheres of social and political action, automatically sought — and in vain — from the Muscovites the same prerogatives they had received from the Poles.

The quality of this volume is breathtaking. It is the result of such devotion and heroic labor as always makes the reader realize how scholarship is a special calling in life. The editors and translators performed magnificently in their tasks by providing splendid toponymic and personal name transliterations from the three Eastern Slavic and their earlier parent tongues and from the Polish, Romanian, Crimean Tatar, Ottoman Turkish, and other Middle Eastern languages; a solid editorial preface that describes the many contexts determining why terms were translated in the manner they were; a broadly encompassing glossary that provides the meanings of the above languages' official terminology; several good maps; a superb translation of Hrushevsky's text and footnotes; and a lengthy index of geographical and personal names. A highlight moment is a fine 27-page article by Serhii Plokyh on the history of both this volume and the author at

the time of its composition in the late 1920s and his catastrophic fall from grace immediately afterwards, Hrushevsky's running battles with his critics, and the myriad debates over Pereiaslav's significance.

Hrushevsky's massive detail, precision of analysis, compelling argumentation, and depth of knowledge in telling his story speak for themselves in bringing early modern Ukraine front and center to educated readers. In particular historians of Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy need to familiarize themselves with his work. Though not unsurprisingly he does not deal with these polities in the same depth as he does Ukraine, his volume sheds important light upon both and other adjacent societies. The editors of these volumes should continue their extraordinary scholarly work for the succeeding volumes in this series. The reviewer's one request is that the editors introduce topical sub-headings into the index and in the glossary tighten up the translation of Russian officials' titles.