

HISTORY OF UKRAINE-RUS', vol. 10, THE COSSACK AGE, 1657–1659. By Mykhailo Hrushevsky. Trans. Marta Daria Olynyk. Ed. Frank E. Sysyn (editor in chief), Andrew B. Pernal and Yaroslav Fedoruk (consulting editors), with the assistance of Myroslav Yurkevich. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2014. c, 327 pp., b/w portrait, 3 maps, table, notes, bibliography, addenda to the bibliographies, index. ISBN (hardcover) 978-1-894865-37-1.

It is difficult to view volume 10, the last volume of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi's great *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, as an entirely satisfying climax to his great enterprise. That is hardly surprising. As Yaroslav Fedoruk documents in his extensive introduction, it was written in the most difficult of circumstances, and was only published three years after the author's death (25 November 1934) by Kateryna, Hrushevs'kyi's daughter, who undertook laborious editorial work in highly unpleasant conditions. The optimism with which Hrushevs'kyi had returned to Kyiv in 1924 had long since dissipated. In the aftermath of the Bolshevik victory in the civil war, the political climate had been encouraging. Hrushevs'kyi was no Marxist, but the great champion of the populist view of Ukrainian history hoped to establish a *modus vivendi* with the Bolsheviks, who claimed to be acting in the people's name.

Hrushevs'kyi's return coincided with the launch of the new Ukrainization policy. He took up the direction of two key institutions within the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: the Chair of the Modern History of Ukraine and the Chair of the History of the Ukrainian Nation. His return offered the prospect of renewed access to archives that were central to his project, but Hrushevs'kyi was no longer the energetic young professor who had swept into Lviv in 1892. After 1924 he undertook little archival research; the institutional framework provided by the Academy was the greater attraction. For the first time since 1914, Hrushevs'kyi had funding to establish a cadre of historians and students under the Archeographic Commission, leadership of which he assumed. This team accumulated the impressive source base underpinning the last two volumes of his *History*. In these years, Hrushevs'kyi wrote volume 9, the most extensive of all, published in two parts in 1928 and 1931: the three-part English translation in this series runs to an imposing 1,807 pages.

Volume 9 covers the heroic years of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, from 1650 to Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's death seven years later. Hrushevs'kyi laid out his populist interpretation of the Cossack uprising against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and presented his critical assessment of Khmel'nyts'kyi's role in Ukrainian history. The context and content of volume 10 are completely different. By 1931 the political climate in Kyiv and in the Academy, now controlled by a grim Bolshevik cadre, had changed dramatically. Ukrainization had been jettisoned, and while Hrushevs'kyi's reputation, his authority in Ukrainian society, and his impressive scholarly achievement provided a degree of protection, the new leadership soon began undermining his position.

Although he was elected to the fellowship of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 1929, Hrushevs'kyi was criticized for failing to provide a plan of action to fulfill the demands of the Five-Year Plan for 1928–1933, his funding was reduced, and eager Marxist-Leninist students lined up to attack his *History*. The second part of volume 9 languished for two years at the publisher before its release in 1931. Osyp Hermaize, head of the Archeographic Commission, was arrested in July 1929, along with Mykhailo Slabchenko, who had just been elected to the All-Ukrainian Academy. In September 1930, the Academy liquidated the Chair of the History of Ukraine. At an Academy plenum in January 1931, for the first time since his return to Ukraine, Hrushevs'kyi was publicly condemned by Volodymyr Zatons'kyi, the People's Commissar for Education, who accused him of anti-Soviet activities. It was not long before his position deteriorated further. On 23 March, Hrushevs'kyi was arrested in Moscow; although he was released in April, he was refused

permission to return to Kyiv, and he spent the last years of his life in a small, uncomfortable apartment in Moscow.

It was in Moscow that the greatest of all Ukrainian historians wrote the last volume of a work that he had originally planned to extend into the eighteenth century and beyond. His personal library and extensive notes remained under lock and key in his Kyiv apartment. Deprived of his team of researchers, he was in no position to replicate the wide-ranging, scrupulously detailed vision of the other volumes of the *History*. The strain took its toll, and Hrushevs'kyi's health rapidly deteriorated. Afflicted by a progressive disease of the eyes, he was losing his sight. Without Kateryna's dedicated assistance he would not have been able to write anything at all.

The subject matter of volume 10 was almost as depressing for Hrushevs'kyi as his personal circumstances. Khmel'nyts'kyi's death ushered in the period of Ukraine's history known—with good reason—as the “Ruin.” Cossack unity and the alliance between the Zaporozhian Cossacks and the Ukrainian people, which Hrushevs'kyi had traced with conspicuous enthusiasm in volumes 8 and 9, were at an end. Volume 10 opens with Khmel'nyts'kyi's funeral and the election of Ivan Vyhovs'kyi; it ends with the 1658 Treaty of Hadiach. The volume breaks off without a conclusion, at the point where Hrushevs'kyi laid down his pen forever. The unity of the Ukrainian nation had crumbled. While many Ukrainian nobles and many among the *starshyna* (senior Cossack officers) sought accommodation with the Commonwealth, the pro-Moscow party remained strong. These divisions and the long years of bitter warfare had doused the fervor of the Ukrainian people, the true heroes of the *History*.

For Hrushevs'kyi, the lack of unity among the Cossack leadership constituted treason against the Ukrainian people. Instead of forming the Ukrainian nation and building a strong, independent state that might have secured its position among the modern nation-states, factions in the Cossack leadership sought protection from neighboring powers, and formed pro-Polish, pro-Muscovite, and pro-Ottoman parties. Aware that his personal authority had kept the *starshyna* together, Khmel'nyts'kyi sought to pass on the position of hetman to one of his sons. Tymish predeceased him, however, and although the aging hetman succeeded in having his younger son, Iurii, elected his successor while he was still alive, Iurii was young and lacked political experience. A substantial party in the *starshyna* favored the principle of free election, just like the Polish *szlachta* against whom they had fought so long, and challenged Iurii's legitimacy on these grounds. Soon after his father's death, Iurii was sidelined and Vyhovs'kyi took over as hetman.

It is possible to discern Hrushevs'kyi's views on these developments, although the reality of his situation ensured that the strong, certain voice of the volumes published before 1914 is even fainter in volume 10 than in volume 9. There were, however, still ways in which Hrushevs'kyi could hint at his views. In volume 9, he outlined in detail the course of events and cited sources at great length, sometimes publishing extensive documents in toto, almost without commentary. His limited access to literature and his notes meant that he could not write in such detail in volume 10. Nevertheless, he could achieve much through the artful selection of the events he was describing, the way in which he formulated the narrative, and the framing of the documents.

For Hrushevs'kyi, the Hetmanate embodied the tradition of statehood that was necessary if Ukrainians were to be counted among Hegel's historic nations and therefore worthy of the right of self-determination. The Hetmanate lacked several of the necessary institutions of statehood, however, and had not secured the recognition from other states that was vital if it were to establish itself as part of the embryonic state system emerging in Europe after 1648. In the difficult situation in which the Cossacks found themselves upon Khmel'nyts'kyi's death, the support of neighboring powers was necessary; that support came at a price, however. By 1657, this unpalatable reality was all too clear in the case of relations with Muscovy, which asserted its authority as soon as Khmel'nyts'kyi was dead. Cossack leaders believed that under the terms of the 1654 Treaty of Pereiaslav, they had merely accepted the tsar's protection. Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich viewed matters differently. Once Khmel'nyts'kyi was dead, a Muscovite envoy informed the *starshyna* that the number of Cossacks in Ukraine was to be limited to 28,000, with only 12,000 in the Sich. The *starshyna* were to send taxes from Ukraine to Moscow rather than retaining them, as had previously been the case.

The vision of autonomy and Cossack self-government abruptly evaporated. The *starshyna* lacked the resources to achieve independence; it therefore had to choose between various competitors for its loyalty and support. Charles X of Sweden, whose invasion of Poland-Lithuania had stalled, forcing him to retreat after the spectacular successes of 1655, hoped to draw the Cossacks into a great coalition with Brandenburg and Transylvania. Sweden was far away, however, and the Commonwealth had powerful allies. The Transylvanian army of György Rákóczi was large but ill-disciplined, and it was easily defeated by the Poles, while Charles X had to abandon Poland in the summer of 1657 to repel a Danish attack. Vyhovs'kyi and a powerful faction in the *starshyna* that rejected Muscovite servitude favored rapprochement with the Com-

monwealth. King Jan II Kazimierz Waza's government sent the adroit Stanisław Kazimierz Bieniewski to negotiate what became the Treaty of Hadiach. For the rival faction in the *starshyna* and most ordinary Cossacks any agreement with the Commonwealth was unacceptable, however. Hadiach merely ushered in a period of civil war in Ukraine that launched the Ruin.

Volume 10 tells the story well; it ends, however, with Hadiach. It is certain that Hrushevs'kyi never intended to break off at this point, and there are indications that he planned to take the narrative at least to the death of Peter I in 1725. Yet there are also signs that after 1929 Hrushevs'kyi, already ill, lost the urge to write about this tragic period in the history of the Ukrainian nation. Despite the loss of much of Hrushevs'kyi's personal archive, Fedoruk, in his excellent introduction, uses the correspondence of Hrushevs'kyi's wife, Mariia, and the testimony of their daughter, Kateryna, to question the tradition that the manuscript of another volume of the *History*, or parts of it, lie in a dusty corner of some Russian or Ukrainian archive. In his final years, Hrushevs'kyi was also working on his history of Ukrainian literature, and it is likely that in his last, miserable years in Stalinist Moscow, the eminent historian preferred to concentrate on a more inspiring topic than the Ruin. Fedoruk's case is convincing, and it seems that the abrupt ending of volume 10 really did bring the great enterprise to a definitive close.

From Hrushevs'kyi's death until 1991, it was difficult for Ukrainians to read most of his prodigious output. Since then the situation has changed dramatically. His works have been published and republished, and a deluge of scholarly and popular works devoted to one of Europe's great historians have appeared. This volume is a worthy addition to the magnificent Hrushevsky Translation Project, generously funded by the Petro Jacyk Foundation. Like all the volumes, it draws on the best of this scholarship—and much more besides—to take its place among its predecessors in what constitutes the best edition of the *History* in any language. Volume 10, like the others, has been scrupulously edited by Frank Sysyn. He and his team, in particular Myroslav Yurkevich, devote close attention to the considerable problems of rendering in readable English the terminology and concepts of a distant era and a distant land. As in all the volumes, there is an editorial preface written by Sysyn, alongside two introductions written by leading specialists of the period. Andrew B. Pernal gives a clear and detailed analysis of the structure and composition of volume 10, while Yaroslav Fedoruk presents a vivid picture, based on considerable scholarship and a wide range of sources, of Hrushevs'kyi's last years. The translation, by Marta Daria Olynky, is excellent. Despite its abrupt ending, volume 10 is an entirely appro-

priate conclusion to the *History*. Hrushevs'kyi's symphony remained unfinished, but he had achieved much of what he had set out to achieve. The timely completion of this magnificent project has revealed to the Anglophone world the richness and complexity of Ukrainian history in one of the best possible rebuttals of Putin's ham-fisted attempt to justify his criminal invasion of Ukraine through an appeal to history.

Robert Frost
University of Aberdeen