
The above volume collects together the papers from three conferences organized in New York and Cologne in 1994–95. Most show evidence of more recent revision and readers can be assured of a high quality throughout. The vast majority of contributors also stick closely to the general theme.

There are sixteen contributions in all. In the first section (‘The Early Modern Period’), Viktor Zhivol, David Frick, Zenon Kohut, Hans-Joachim Torke and Frank Sysyn address the complicated interaction of Ruthenian, East Slavic and ‘Commonwealth’ identities in the two centuries either side of 1654. All provide a rich discussion of rapidly changing identities, pronouns and place names; and are appropriately counterfactual rather than teleological. The reader is not subjected to the assumption of an existing or eventual Ukrainian identity as manifest destiny. Most also feed off David Frick’s apt comment that ‘at least for some of the Ruthenian elite, mental geographies changed more slowly than, and at times in directions somewhat different from, political realities’ (p. 20).

In part two (‘The Imperial Period’), Olga Andrievsky’s essay on the ‘Failure of the “Little Russian Solution”’ provides an intriguing foretaste of her forthcoming book. Andreas Kappeler discusses ethnic hierarchies; Christine Worobec looks at the Russian and Ukrainian peasants. Serhy Yekelchyk provides another of his stimulating essays in cultural studies by looking at school history texts in the nineteenth century. Paul Bushkovitch widens the context: answering the question ‘What is Russia?’ by arguing that the empire’s state-centred identity politics meant that even the East Slavic ‘ethnic’ identity was relatively underdeveloped. George Grabowicz argues that the Kotliarevshchyna embodied more than the burlesque. Its characteristic Ukrainian strategy combining subtle imperial subversion and Aesopic self-assertion can also be found in writers as seemingly ‘imperial’ (i.e. Soviet) as Pavlo Tychyna.

In the third section (‘The Twentieth Century’), Oleh Ilnytskyj gives a provocative analysis of the crucial contest between Russian and Ukrainian ‘high cultures’ at the turn of the century, and asserts that ‘among Ukrainians, the death of the all-Russian idea, as an idea, occurred long before 1991’ (p. 304) — as early as the 1910s in fact. Although Ilnytskyj cites many Ukrainian Modernists writing convincingly to this effect, this remains an untested proposition at the level of mass social consciousness. Yuri Shapoval writes on ‘The GPU-NKVD as an Instrument of Counter-Ukrainization in the 1920s and 1930s’: that is, on the institutional pluralism which allowed one section of the Bolshevik elite to oppose the Ukrainization policy from its
inception. Shapoval’s Ukrainian colleague Stanislav Kulchytsky discusses the debates surrounding the establishment of the Ukrainian SSR. Dieter Pohl discusses the differential impact German occupation had on Ukrainians and Russians in 1941–43; and Mark von Hagen argues the case that the First World War decisively accelerated the maturation of the ethnic question in the Romanov empire.

How well does all of this fit together? The declared general theme of the volume is the study of ‘the construction, destruction, and reformulation of identities among Russians and Ukrainians of all social origins’; not just as ‘Ukrainians’ and ‘Russians’, but as actual or potential bearers of other selves, including past ‘“all-Russian” and East Slavic identities’ (p. ix). A related aim is therefore to demonstrate how the Ukrainian idea has shaped Russian identity just as much as that of its own target audience. As such, the collection succeeds admirably. This is an unusually coherent and always interesting volume, of great value to historians and students of national identity alike.
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