

THE

Volume LI, No. 3

Fall 2020

# SIXTEENTH CENTURY JOURNAL

*The Journal of Early Modern Studies*



0361-0160(202023)51:3;1-G



**History of Ukraine-Rus', Vol. 4, Political Relations in the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries.** Mykhailo Hrushevsky. Trans. Andrij Kudla Wynnnykyj. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 2017. 470 pp. \$119.95. ISBN 978-189486548-7.

REVIEWED BY: Anatole Upart  
University of Chicago

An installment in the long Hrushevsky Translation Project, volume 4 comes out as another outstanding translation work of Andrij Kudla Wynnnykyj, an editorial achievement for consulting editors Robert Frost and Yaroslav Fedoruk, and for the project's editor-in-chief, Frank E. Sysyn. At more than four hundred pages, this volume addresses a singularly important period in the political and cultural history of Ukrainian lands, fundamental for the formation of Ukrainian identity: the shift from Late Middle Ages into the early modern period had witnessed an incorporation of the lands of the old Kievan Rus' into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the fourteenth century and consequent incorporation of these territories into the larger Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the Union of Lublin of 1569. The Union provisioned for a transfer of Podlachia, Volhynia, and the Kiev palatinate, territories comprising the western half of what is now Ukraine, from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Crown of Poland, thus making Ukrainian lands a direct subject of Polish Kingdom and its legislative, executive, and judicial apparatus.

The Hrushevsky Translation Project had been initiated with the sole purpose of translating and publishing all ten original Ukrainian-language volumes of *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* (History of Ukraine-Rus'), written by Mykhailo Serhiyovych Hrushevsky (Михайло Сергійович Грушевський, 1866–1934). The monumental work is a must-read for any historian of Ukraine and of the region at large, as it could be considered the earliest comprehensive attempt in the modern period to write a Ukrainian national history not by a member of institutional structures in power in the region: Poles, Russians, and Soviets. Historiographically it carries singular importance, as Hrushevsky's scholarship had regained its particular relevance to the newly independent Ukrainian state (since 1991), constituting the most thorough examination of Ukrainian history undertaken by a non-Russian and non-Soviet historian. Furthermore, Hrushevsky's work in promotion of Ukrainian culture and knowledge of regional history, freed from imperial Russian interpretive bias, had its counterpart in his political activity.

After being involved in national movements on both sides of the Ukrainian border (under Russian and Austro-Hungarian rules), Hrushevsky was a founding member of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party in the Galician lands and, with the collapse of Russian Empire and the establishment of one of the independent Ukrainian entities, he was elected as the president of the Central Rada (parliament) of the Ukrainian People's Republic (1917–20). In this turn of events, the newly independent Ukraine was headed by someone who was not necessarily a seasoned politician, but a nationalistic scholar armed with ideas of socialism and democracy. Plagued by a strife between Ukrainian conservatives and liberals, pro-Russian imperial "White Russian" forces, and pro-Bolshevik local communists, Ukrainian People's Republic ultimately succumbed to the imperial ambitions of the now Bolsheviks-led Russia. Even though many of the Ukrainian politicians that had been involved in the independence movement, such as former members of Central Rada, were imprisoned or executed by Stalin's regime, Hrushevsky had managed to incur a censure as a scholar and an internal exile within Soviet Union. Hrushevsky's works, despite his rather Marxist understanding of history, have nevertheless been deemed suspect due to their obvious nationalism and critical presentation of a role Russia had played in Ukrainian history.

It is important to note that in the West, institutions of Ukrainian scholarship and culture outside of Ukraine had been established largely by Ukrainian émigrés who comprised remnants of the nationally minded cultural elite that escaped Stalinist purges of the 1930s. To them, the examples of the Ukrainian People's Republic and of Hrushevsky's scholarship had set precedents for an independent self-determining Ukraine and Ukrainian scholars writing their own country's history. These ideals (political and academic) could be practically realized in Ukraine itself only in 1991. It is precisely with these ideals in mind that places such as the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies were created. The Institute's Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research has been instrumental in promoting knowledge in the West of Ukrainian sources; the Hrush-evsky Translation Project has been one of several translation projects the center had sponsored. In some way, comprehensive translation of the most important works by Hrushevsky should be seen as an integral part in the ongoing project of (re)building Ukrainian national identity after decades of Soviet rule or, as Hrush-evsky would add, after centuries of Polish, Tatar, and Russian domination.

Following a short editorial preface are the two scholarly essays by Svitlana Pankova and Robert Frost, introducing the book and its place within the three-volume group that deals with the Polish-Lithuanian period of Ukrainian history, and explaining the historiographic significance of Hrushevsky's work in general and this volume in particular, a product of the first years of the twentieth century (1901–7). In that, the two essays are excellent, contextualizing Hrush-evsky's scholarship within the precise historical and political developments he was involved in at the time. Quite telling is Frost's positioning of the very process

of writing this rather anti-Polish volume vis-à-vis Hrushevsky's simultaneous involvement in questionable politics that resulted in the assassination of the local ethnically Polish Austrian governor by a Ukrainian student associated with Hrushevsky, and the latter's published apologia of the terrorist act. Although larger studies have been written in the past two decades, such as Frank Sysyn's *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian and National Awakener* (Saskatoon: Heritage Press, 2001), and Serhij Plochij's very recent and excellent *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), the essays by Pankova and Frost are a great (and shorter) format of introducing anyone to the contested period of writing Ukraine's history by a Ukrainian, and the resultant rediscoveries, erasures, and/or whitewashings that, in fact, had been characteristic of national scholarships in the region where for centuries nearly every ethnic border had imperfectly overlapped with a political one.

The volume is divided into five chapters that examine the rise of the Lithuanian Duchy, annexation a large portion of Kievan Rus' by Lithuania in the second half of the fourteenth century following the Mongol invasion of 1240s, the fate of Galicia (in Western Ukraine) contested by the Polish Kingdom and Lithuania, administrative reorganizations in the Grand Duchy in response to the incorporation of the Ukrainian lands, and fate of the lands within the new Polish-Lithuanian joint state. Chapter 4 is especially interesting, as it slightly moves our focus away from Polish-Lithuanian concerns onto the relations between Ukrainian lands and the Crimean Khanate and Tatars, and the role, according to Hrushevsky, the Tatar raids played in the formation of Ukrainian self-defense strategies and thus of Ukrainian national identity.

One of the key points, and probably the most contested one by any number of non-Ukrainian historians in Eastern Europe, of the whole Ukrainian history project of Hrushevsky is, of course, contained in the very title of his magnum opus (Ukraine-Rus'), an idea that Ukraine—a medieval toponym referring to borderlands of Kievan Rus' later popularized in the early modern period, and only applied as an ethnonym (i.e., Ukrainians) for the first time in 1830—has a direct continuity (cultural, ethnic, confessional, etc.) with Kievan Rus' that had existed in the ninth to thirteenth centuries in roughly the same territories as modern Ukraine. Such suggestion would still be "heretical" to someone subscribing to the official Russian version of the narrative, that stresses a precisely parallel kind of continuity (ethnic, political, ecclesiastical, etc.) of Kievan Rus' instead in the north, personified in the Duchy of Vladimir-Moscow that had formed the core of Muscovy and then of the Russian Empire and later Soviet Union. To understand the full extent of the importance of Hrushevsky and the influence his ideas exercised on the formation of Ukrainian history, one has to take him at his own words. Now that his works are translated, the whole work and this volume in particular become, in my view, a rather relevant if not altogether timely reading not only for students of Eastern European history, but also

for a more general public that should include foreign policy advisors. The latter, in my opinion, should take Hrushevsky in tandem with Frost, Pankova, Plochij, and Sysyn. As Benedetto Croce said, “all history is a contemporary history.”

