

Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Volume 5: *Sociopolitical and Church Organization and Relations in the Lands of Ukraine-Rus' in the 14th to 17th Centuries*. Translated by Marta Skorupsky and Marta Daria Olynyk. Myron M. Kapral, Consulting Editor and Frank E. Sysyn, Editor in Chief with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press: 2019. lxii + 550 pp. \$119.95. Review by CAROL B. STEVENS, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

I must begin this review with acknowledgements and congratulations: to the editor-in-chief, Prof. Frank Sysyn; to HTP's managing editor Uliana Pasicznyk; to the many committed editors, translators, scholars, and bibliographers who worked on individual volumes; as well as to the generous contributors who supported the translation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's ten-volume *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. The volume under review (2019) and the immediately subsequent volume #2 (2021) mark the completion of the project. Hrushevsky's magisterial work offers an unequalled, detailed overview of events in the territory of what is now known as Ukraine, prior to the eighteenth century. When first published, this careful, late nineteenth-early twentieth-century examination not only offered a wealth of detail and interpretation about an understudied area and period. For a long time, it also remained **the** important scholarly voice offering a 'national' history of Ukraine, which for many years after its publication was a kind of study severely discouraged. Hrushevsky's examination included institutional, legal, and political events, but also careful scrutiny of the social, economic, and religious history of the many ordinary folk of different strata and ethnicities who inhabited the area. The understanding that it conveyed of a national history was thus far from a simplistic political vision. The CIUS translation makes this remarkable study accessible to English speakers and readers, and the work of cooperating scholars also makes it clear to twenty-first-century readers how interpretations of this story have been supplemented and changed since these volumes were written.

The translation of this particular volume (#5) completes an important subseries (volumes 4, 5, 6) within Hrushevsky's larger work. Together these three volumes examine the so-called "Polish-

Lithuanian period;” that is, an era of complex transition between Old Rus’ (‘ending’ in the early fourteenth century) and the Cossack period (from the first quarter of the seventeenth century). The intervening years were a contingent moment when Poland and Lithuania each moved into, individually absorbed, and then jointly controlled broad stretches of what is now Ukraine. Their presence had varying impacts on the many peoples of area: economically, socially, politically, and religiously. Hrushevsky published these three volumes with amazing rapidity, at two-year intervals. At the same time, he recognized and dealt with the fact that these volumes broached matters that had not been well studied, and for which the source materials were not easily to be found. As a consequence, he not only used extant histories, often correcting them or disputing their findings, he also examined and often even published source materials that had not previously been widely available.

These historiographic problems were particularly complex because the territory of ‘Old Rus’ experienced these externally-imposed changes unevenly. In part of the area, the Polish presence and its influence was strongly and quite immediately felt. Elsewhere, the lands where the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had recently assumed control experienced more gradual and de-centralized change, while some other areas were only partially and ineffectively controlled by either outside power. In volume 5, Hrushevsky studies the resulting legal, administrative, and religious changes and their impacts on different strata of the population.

Broadly speaking, the first two hundred pages of the volume offer a closely reasoned and negative assessment of Polish influence. Redefinition of the nobility was the key factor. For this stratum, as for others, there were military obligations under the Polish crown, including the presence of land tenure conditional on military service. Ruthenian nobility in Polish Crown territories as a result had somewhat different, and in many ways, lesser rights than their Polish counterparts. By contrast, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was more concerned with Ruthenian inclusion into the Lithuanian nobility, even permitting Ruthenian participation in many of the decisions that involved its status. But as Lithuanian norms evolved toward the Polish standard, the re-definition of noble status overall represented an expansion of

local noble privilege both legislatively and administratively. As a result, Hrushevsky argues, the expansion of noble privilege resulted in a diminution of peasant rights. The free peasants, landless peasants, and slaves of Old Rus' gradually lost rights, leading to the gradual enserfment of the peasantry. Hrushevsky further argues that burghers, who had hitherto operated under German town law, found it difficult to adapt this framework to the constraints imposed by their new rulers. In this context, since the Polish crown was disposed to privilege Germans and Poles, Ruthenian burghers were both the most numerous and the most negatively affected, as the system of governance and taxation changed, and the social standing and wealth of the stratum, as a whole, declined. Hrushevsky points out that these broad changes did not represent an approach to western-style feudalism, but rather were changes dependent upon the particular military structure and demands of (what became in 1569) the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. As Myron Kapral makes clear in his attachment to note 2, beginning on page 423, twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars agree with this conclusion.

A slightly smaller section of volume 5 discusses the impact of these political and administrative changes on the local organization of the Orthodox Church, which ultimately led to the creation of the Uniate Church. For Hrushevsky, a key point was that Orthodox institutions in lands under the control of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish Crown by definition occupied a status inferior to that of the Roman Catholic Church, with an attendant loss of privilege. The disorganization that resulted from this situation instigated a movement for reform, and forces in favor and against union with Rome (Council of Florence) developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. A variety of factors, from the role of the Orthodox Church to the activities of the Patriarch of Constantinople from 1589, led to the emergence of the Uniate (or Ukrainian Greek Catholic) Church from 1595–96.

As we have become accustomed to see in this series, volume 5 of Hrushevsky's *History of Rus'-Ukraine* is translated into fluent and easily-readable English, which is no easy task. The notes to the volume indicate the areas which have been significantly investigated by scholars in the Soviet and post-Soviet world. Although there have been significant studies of Ukrainian and other social groups in Ukrainian

territories in this era, contributed by Polish, Russian, and Lithuanian scholars, it is notable that, for a variety of political and other reasons, studies of the Jewish presence in the area have largely been contributed by contemporary scholars outside the Slavic world.

To conclude, this volume offers us a unique perspective written at the turn of the twentieth century about Ukraine before 1800, one that—unusually for its time—takes into account the social history of those resident in the territory of Ukraine. It offers us a unique and unparalleled vision of how a broad-minded and evidence-based scholar of Ukrainian nationalist persuasion viewed his subject at the turn of the twentieth century. It has a great deal to offer those of us who study this region and its impact on those further west.

Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva. *Ivan Mazepa and the Russian Empire*, trans. Jan Surer. Montreal & Kingston, London, Chicago: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020; xiv + 406 pp. Review by GALINA YERMOLENKO, DESALES UNIVERSITY.

Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva's Russian-language 2007 book, updated by the author and translated into English in 2020, deals with a controversial figure of Ukrainian history, Hetman ('ruler') Ivan Mazepa (1639–1709). Due to his siding with the Swedish King Charles XII against Peter I, in the 1709 Battle of Poltava of the Great Northern War, Mazepa has been traditionally viewed as a traitor in Russian historiography but considered a hero in post-Soviet Ukraine. In the West, Mazepa was popularized in the works of such Romantic writers as Lord Byron and Victor Hugo. The latter recounted a piquant moment of Mazepa's youth, when he was tied naked to a wild horse's back and made to ride in that fashion through the Polish and Ukrainian landscapes in punishment for his adulterous affair with a Polish lord's wife.

Tairova is not interested in the popular legends about Ivan Mazepa, nor does she narrate his comprehensive biography. Rather, the author focuses on the key moments of Mazepa's political career, involving his relations with Peter I and the Russian political elite, on the one hand, and his interactions with the Cossack leaders and his twenty-